



FC Sofia 2025

28-30/3 2025 - JEF Europe

Minutes

Friday 28.03.2025

Official opening

Welcome address by JEF Europe, Martin Penov (Executive Board, Vice President):

Dear delegates, dear colleagues, dear members of the Presidium, dear honorable guests: for a very long time I wanted to stand in front of you here, in this building. I truly wish you had come in better circumstances: for the past weeks, in every corner of Europe, JEFers have been raising their voices for democracy, accountability, and the embrace of the principle of human dignity, things which are very elusive in our region, especially in recent times. Silence has a price; it can cost people their freedom, it can cost people their safety, and sometimes it can cost people their lives. That's what we witnessed here in the Balkans earlier this month, when we launched our Democracy under Pressure campaign, when 59 people in North Macedonia lost their lives, some of them friends of our network. I'd like to ask you to stand up, for a minute of silence. (*minute of silence*)

Thank you. As we enter a new political reality, one where norms we were used to no longer apply, with security terms really put into question all over Europe, I'd like to reflect on why the EU rose in the first place, right after the Second World War: the idea of a pan-European union requires critical reason and the reflection of the older experience, but also the unshakable faith of the young and their possibility of realisation. A united Europe should not only be a lasting Europe of interest, but a Union of spirit or even more a Union of hearts.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Now, you have probably heard this type of similar message many times, we quite often open conferences on quite similar remarks, on why Europe should be united, not by just treaty but by spirit. We have to remind ourselves that these words come from another Bulgarian who pronounced them more than a hundred years ago, in 1926, during the first Pan-European Congress in Vienna, Professor Ivan Shishmanov, who for the people coming from Bulgaria, or who have studied in this university, might know very well. Truly a remarkable man, he should be considered Bulgaria's first federalist: a patriot, an academic, but above all a convinced European. He founded and then led the European section in Bulgaria. Thanks to him, this building, from an institute of higher education, became Sofia University, exactly where we are standing today. His vision was really about a truly united Europe, one where Slavic culture, as well as Bulgarian, were part of it. During his speech in Vienna, the Bulgarian language was for the first time heard on the European stage. Sadly, he did not live to see this dream come true, to see the EU as we know it, and neither did his son, because as he was Prime Minister, he was executed by the communist army of infamous people, and for which they treated the European movement in Bulgaria for half a century.

And yet we are here. Despite wars, repressions, occupations going on for more than 20 years, young federalists are finally gathering right here, in this very building again. Because we persevere, because we watch the students' protests in Serbia, the situation of these days in Georgia, in Belarus or Russia where it's full of activists in jail, and the devastating situation of Ukraine. And we know the way forward. We know what the way for a stronger Europe is. We have been repeating it for over 70 years now as federalists. In every direction we look, we see despots grab onto power, bringing nothing but destruction in their countries. We must learn politics, we must learn strength. Because it's the only thing they'll understand. And that's the only way we can be reassured that the European spirit can keep going also in the future. Now it's time for Europe to prove itself. Federation is no longer just a dream, it's a task that I am sure our generation will fulfill.

This is why, with great pleasure, I can say: Welcome to Sofia!

**Welcome address by JEF Bulgaria Mustafa Hadzhisuleiman and Dimitar Uzunov:
Mustafa Hadzhisuleiman (JEF Bulgaria, National delegate):**

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Dear Presidium, dear secretariat, it is my immense pleasure to welcome all of you, all the observers, all the JEFers in general, to our beautiful city of Sofia. We are really excited to host this Federal Committee of our beloved JEF Europe. I am also especially delighted to see so many familiar faces, people who have already participated in previous seminars in Sofia. It's always amazing to reconnect with all of you.

Just some technical information:

As for the hosting organisation section, I can assure you that with our team we will make sure everything goes smoothly, especially regarding logistical matters from the venue to the accommodation, the food, and our mood in general so you can focus on the important discussions and work we have planned for tomorrow. Also, if you need anything during these days, feel free to reach out to someone from our team.

Now more than ever, we need to stay consolidated and united. We must advocate for a strong federal union. JEF is not only a political platform; it's a space where we can help each other and exchange ideas, and it's amazing to share ideas with young people from all over Europe. That's the JEF spirit: the spirit of collaboration. I'm looking forward to the discussions for a better and more united Europe. I would like to extend my welcome to Sofia and Bulgaria, and I will now leave the floor to our International Officer, Dimitar.

Dimitar Uzunov (JEF Bulgaria, Observer): Dear friends, for me it's also a great honor to welcome you all to Sofia for the JEF Europe Federal Committee. I'd like to express my gratitude to all of you for making this journey possible, to my hometown. I'd also like to thank my colleagues in JEF Bulgaria for making this all happen, and also thank you to the Mayor of Sofia for opening this event.

The location of our gathering is symbolic. Sofia is one of Europe's oldest cities, between East and West, between cultures, history, and the future. It has been called many names, but one thing remains constant: change.

We are here to push for a change towards a more united federal Europe. A united Europe is not just a geographical or political project but a space of freedom that must be actively defended, where all nations support it and where our shared values are stronger than any force trying to divide us.

As a Bulgarian, I must say that our country has a deep legacy in federalism. As

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Martin said earlier, Professor Shishmanov had a vision for a united Europe, not only as an ideal but as a necessity – a Europe of minorities, where respect was the foundation. He thought that the only way to prevent another war in Eastern Europe was to create a common social tolerance, a Magna Carta for all of Europe, a Europe where no country could dominate.

The idea did not die with him – even under communism, they kept his vision alive. For the first time in history, a Federal Committee is being held in Bulgaria right now, and this is proof that his dream was not in vain.

When we applied to host the Federal Committee, we did so because we understood the importance of being at the frontier of Europe, where our values have been tested the most, and when we saw the urgency of bringing federalism to places where democracy is the most fragile. Looking back, we were right.

We have seen the fight for justice all over Eastern Europe; these struggles remind us why we are here.

These three days are about hope, for our region and our continent to stand together and fight for a true democratic and stronger Europe, where everyone has a voice.

With happiness, JEF Bulgaria welcomes you to this meeting, and I hope we can work well together for our common goals. I also hope you can explore the city beyond the venue and learn more about its history and culture, leaving with good memories.

Once again, welcome to Sofia, and good luck.

Address by the municipality of Sofia

Representing the city, Deputy Mayor Nikola Barbutov greeted the attendees on behalf of the Municipality of Sofia. He welcomed the initiative and underlined the importance of youth engagement in political discourse.

Code of Conduct and Gender Watch

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair) and **Anna van de Moosdijk (Directly-elected FC member, TF Capacity Building co-chair)** presented the Code of Conduct (CofC), as the two contact people.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Xesc Mainzer (JEF Europe, Vice President): Introduced the Gender Watch that aims to track gender representation during discussions and speeches. A summary report would be presented at the end of the FC to ensure inclusivity and balanced participation.

Democracy under Pressure Awards

Martin Penov (JEF Europe, Vice President): Thank you very much, and thank you everyone for being here with us, and for the amazing introduction by JEF Bulgaria. As usual for our Federal Committees, we start with the Democracy under Pressure campaign. Over the past week, this campaign has been part of my daily schedule. We had a lot of media activity, covering many important topics, from the foreign agent laws to the situation in Belarus and the protests happening from Georgia to Serbia.

Many sections across Europe took part in these activities and campaigns, and that's why we want to sincerely thank all of you for the incredible work you did this year. Thank you for the very interesting discussions, from the more cheerful moments to the tough conversations about repression.

Now, we will announce which sections are receiving the awards. Please note that the physical awards will be handed over tomorrow, as some of them have not yet arrived.

So, without further ado, let's move on to the announcements. Although everyone did an amazing job and social media collaboration was exceptional, this year's winner for **Best Street Action** is **JEF Netherlands!**

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate) : Thank you very much for this award, it really means a lot to us. This year's Democracy under Pressure campaign was organised by our local sections in Rotterdam and The Hague. They did a really great job in putting everything together. This award goes to them as well. Thank you for choosing us!

Martin Penov (Executive Board, Vice President): For the **Best Social Media Campaign**, although I'm not sure they arrived yet, the award will be going to JEF France.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



For **Best Local Action**, we are proud to award **JEF Rome!**

And now, for **Best Partnership**, I would like to invite on stage the teams from **JEF Ukraine, JEF Georgia, JEF Serbia, and JEF Romania.**

Tiberia Cercea (JEF Romania, National delegate): Thank you very much. You cannot imagine how much this means to us. Every post we share, every piece of news we spread about what's happening in our countries – it keeps us strong. We stay strong and continue fighting for a European future for each of us. Thank you!

Dan Stanescu (JEF Romania, Observer): Thank you so much for the support. I believe that, thanks to our future relations, Europe will grow stronger in our countries. Thank you again for standing by us.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): This really means a lot to us – to have the opportunity to talk about what's happening right now in Serbia, and to raise awareness about our struggles. I would like to say that this award does not only belong to JEF Serbia, but to every person fighting for democracy in the streets of Serbia today.

Martin Penov (Executive Board, Vice President): There have been amazing campaigns this year for Democracy under Pressure. And now, for the final award, I don't think there will be any surprises here; the award for **Best Overall Campaign Work** goes to **JEF Latvia!**

Visvaldis Knuts Bērziņš (JEF Latvia, National Delegate): Thank you! Honestly, it's a little unexpected. I've been in JEF for four years, and I can confidently say that this year's campaign was one of the strongest we've ever launched. Thank you, Martin.

I would also like to add that it's rewarding to know that Democracy under Pressure isn't just recognized among JEFers. The Latvian government actually got in touch with us to express their appreciation for the work we've done and the efforts we put into the campaign. Thank you once again for this award.

Martin Penov (Executive Board, VP): I want to thank once more everyone who participated, those who shared posts, news, articles, and discussions. Next year will mark the **20th anniversary** of the Democracy under Pressure campaign, so

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



let's work towards making it an even stronger campaign.
Thank you all again, it has been a pleasure working with you!

Overview of Activities for FC

Gergana Blazheva (FC Presidium): Now we move to the introduction of our two Task Forces. I'm happy to welcome Anna van de Moosdijk, directly elected member of the Federal Committee and co-chair of the Task Force on Capacity Building, followed by Paula Schuster, also a directly elected member, representing the newly established Advocacy Task Force. After their updates, we will continue with the political committees' resolutions: **Mirko Ondras** will speak for Political Committee 1, **Nea-Maria Tormanen** will present the work of Political Committee 2, and finally, **Samuel Tammekann** and **Federico Tosi** will present the work of Political Committee 3. Please remember that after these presentations, you will have the opportunity to discuss and submit amendments.

Task Force update

Anna van de Moosdijk (Directly-elected FC member, TF Capacity Building co-chair): Hello everyone! I'm Anna, co-chair of the Capacity Building Task Force. I know these days are going to be intense and tiring, but I would like to ask you to preserve some energy for our session tomorrow, where we will discuss "Funding Futures." Given the recent attacks that pro-European NGOs have faced, it's critical for us to think about diversifying our funding sources as an organization. I look forward to having this important conversation with you. Over the past months, we have also prepared a masterclass on resolution writing – thank you to Samuel for your support – and we recently organized a twinning marathon. We'll be seeing each other throughout the weekend, and I really hope to see many of you at our session tomorrow!

Paula Schuster (Coopted FC member, TF Advocacy co-chair): Hello everyone! I'm Paula, co-chair of the Force Advocacy, which was established during the Federal Committee in Budapest. Over the last few months, we have developed and launched an **Advocacy Survey**, because we felt that advocacy was an underdeveloped area within JEF. The survey is now live and can be found on our community platform under the announcements section. If you want, I can also



send you the link or the QR code. We'll talk more about it tomorrow during our session, where we'll work together to identify policy priorities, exchange best practices, develop toolkits, and shape the future of our advocacy work .I look forward to seeing many of you there!

Introduction of PC resolutions and moving debate on main points of resolutions

Gergana Blazheva (FC Presidium): Thank you Anna and Paula for the updates! Now, moving on to the political committees: First, **Mirko Ondras** will present the work of Political Committee 1, followed by **Nea-Maria Törmänen** for Political Committee 2, and finally **Samuel Tammekann** together with **Federico Tosi** for Political Committee 3. After the presentations, please remember that you can submit amendments online by registering through the platform – but be mindful of the deadline: tomorrow at 8 PM! Voting on the resolutions will take place all day Sunday.

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PC 1 co-chair): Hello everyone, it's a pleasure to be here. In Political Committee 1, we will be focusing on constitutional matters, how we envision a roadmap for a European Constitution, and how treaty changes and constitutional amendments should be pursued. This is at the heart of what JEF Europe stands for: a constitution is ultimately what can turn the European Union into a federal subject. We will discuss four resolutions: Treaty Change; Roadmap to a European Constitution; The Lisbon Treaty – questioning whether it still serves its purpose, or whether its principles are already covered elsewhere and lastly the Governance of the Eurozone. Talking about treaty change is central to our advocacy efforts during this Federal Committee. It is a critical debate that will frame our work in the years ahead.

Nea-Maria Törmänen (Coopted FC member, PC 2 co-chair): Hi everyone. In our committee, we have prepared four resolutions, plus a joint resolution with PC1, which we will cover during our sessions: A Federal EU Budget, with financial independence and prioritized investments; Shaping a European Cultural Identity through support for cultural initiatives; Advocating for a stronger EU Health Policy and better accessibility; A joint climate policy aimed at sustainable solutions (with PC1); and lastly Environmentally sustainable infrastructure and project planning,

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



including better pricing mechanisms and impact assessments. I hope to see many of you tomorrow!

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): Good afternoon JEFers and everyone present. In Political Committee 3, we have prepared five resolutions. I would like to thank everyone for their support and contributions. I'll now give the floor to Federico to present the first one.

Federico Tosi (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair):

Hi everyone! The first resolution concerns EU–UK relations. Initially, the resolution was a quick reaction to Brexit, but we revised it to make it more structured and readable. The main goal remains the same: emphasizing shared values and history, and maintaining mobility, economic ties, and student exchanges. JEF UK actively contributed to this work. Secondly, we discuss Africa–EU relations, stressing the need for fair, reciprocal cooperation instead of paternalistic approaches.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair) : The third resolution focuses on the EU accession process for Balkan countries, proposing ways to streamline and enhance integration.

The fourth resolution addresses the ongoing war in Ukraine and the EU's response. Finally, the fifth resolution defines the EU's future stance toward Russia, including: Firm rejection of Russian sovereignty over occupied territories; Strong support for Ukrainian sovereignty and democracy; Encouragement for EU Member States to isolate the Russian regime while supporting Russian civil society efforts for political change.

As these are new topics, I strongly encourage everyone to read the texts carefully before voting. We especially thank the representatives from the Balkans, UK, Ukraine, and Russian democratic movements for their contributions.

Gergana Blazheva (FC Presidium):

As a reminder: if you want to propose amendments, please register online to access the platform. The deadline is tomorrow at 8 PM sharp. We will vote on all resolutions during Sunday. Now I leave the floor to Martin, who will introduce our next session with the experts.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Martin Penov (Executive Board, VP): Thank you again to all the committees and task forces for their great work. Now, for our final session of the day, we return to the Democracy under Pressure campaign with a panel discussion featuring three professors from Sofia University, who will discuss the current threats to democracy.

The Democracy under Pressure Conference starts

Presentation of community building campaign

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): I'm truly happy to see you all here. Tonight I'd like to talk to you about a dream. I could have started with the famous sentence "I have a dream," but well, maybe our references are not exactly the same still. Tonight, I found that this formulation fits perfectly with what I'm about to present: a collaborative effort called the Volunteers Recruitment and Community Building Campaign.

I'm speaking on behalf of Christelle and Loubna, and throughout my speech, I'll mention all the support we received during this campaign. I was very lucky, because capacity building is a shared dream within JEF it's not just an isolated topic. Together with Christelle and Loubna, the Capacity Building Task Force worked hard on this shared dream. But what is this dream I keep talking about? It's something very basic, yet incredibly useful: having an entire campaign focused on supporting our network to grow, by providing both structural and practical guidance. The objective is actually super simple. Over the years, the Task Force Capacity Building has become an impressive laboratory of resources, combining theory and practical tips. So when your sections ask how to be more visible, more attractive, and how to find enough funds to encourage new members to join, I'm here to present a very new and simple solution, available with just one click. I'm very happy to present to you the campaign booklets. This booklet was designed by Loubna, who I'm deeply thankful to, and we also drew inspiration from a Saturday EB brainstorming in Athens and from calls with several sections. A special thank you to JEF Malta, who dedicated a lot of time to this topic, and also to the TF on Civic Education and the CF Capacity Building for their help with the drafting. I must say, however, that the real star of this guide is our

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



fashionable friend: the crocodile on the cover. You'll find him on every page of this booklet.

Now, how does the booklet actually work? Instead of simply compiling a list of activity ideas, we decided to structure it around monthly-themed activities, so you have new resources for capacity building every month. You'll find a list of fun, informal, formal, online, in-person, outdoor and indoor activities, each one complete with a checklist to help you prepare. Every activity is designed to save you time, and includes a description, a checklist, learning outcomes, and also how to link each activity with advocacy because this was a clear request from the network. Bref, as we say in French, this is meant for everyone: every section, every newcomer, and every experienced JEFer. Now, I can guess what you're thinking: "Another booklet?" But this one's not like the others, because it's actually a campaign, with rewards and opportunities. So, who's ready to play? Who's ready to go back to cheerful moments? For every agenda, every month, you'll have the chance to earn a badge or a sticker to show on social media. For every in-person activity, you can earn stickers. I know I can't see your laptops from here, but I'm sure many of you are sticker collectors like me. And I have great news: from now on, for every new activity, there will be badges and stickers. Be prepared, you might need to make space on another tablet or laptop just to fit them all!

We want to state this clearly: this is a tryout. We're going to test it with you, but the goal is to make it last across the years and the mandates, so that every section can rely on this booklet. Did I mention that in November, during the Congress, the top sections will receive rewards based on the activities and actions they carry out? Yes, you heard me right, additional rewards for sections that actively participate in the campaign.

Now, how do we make sure we follow what you're doing? Sorry to say, there will be emails. There's no way around that unless maybe you tag us on social media when you post pictures of your activities. Please, make sure to tag us. Also, reply to the kind of emails you'll be receiving. You'll see the email address on the screen—it's really important.



I'll conclude now, and I'll be happy to answer your questions. I'm even happier to be fulfilling this dream to be part of a full campaign on capacity building. And actually, on Sunday, we'll be trying out one of these activities. I told you, this is not just a collection of things to do; there are real innovations inside, like the podcast - JEF Talks, and "Ask About EU on Wheels." You might even be interested in a dinner discussion. The idea is to offer something new to help newcomers discover JEF and our organisation.

I want to thank JEF Bulgaria and Martin, and I'll have more chances tomorrow to talk about this game. But let me thank two special people now: Elise from the Task Force, and especially Loubna, who designed the draft and the final booklet. Thank you for your time and support.

This weekend, I've set myself a very personal goal: to talk with as many of you as possible. I want to collect your anecdotes: how did you join, what activities made you feel involved, why did you want to be part of JEF? Don't be shy, tell me your best stories, and if you agree, I'll happily include them in the guide.

Let's remember how fun JEF can be, in its diversity of sections and its creativity.

Closing and logistical information

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary-General) and Dimitar Uzunov (JEF Bulgaria, Observer): shared logistical information.

Saturday 29.03.2024

Start of the FC and formalities

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Good morning everyone, at the beginning, as always, Anna, Samuel. Would you like to come to the floor and briefly guide us through the code of conduct rules once again?

Code of Conduct & Gender Watch



Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair) introduces again the Code of Conduct and the contact persons Anna and him.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much Samuel, we'll go on with the brief introduction of the gender watch by Xesc, the floor is yours

Xesc Mainzer (Executive Board, VP): reminds people about the gender watch and gives the results of yesterday. People identifying as **non-binary took 2%** of the intervention time yesterday, people identifying as **men took 46.4%** of the time, and people identifying as **women took 51.5%** of the time.

Declaration of votes present (roll call)

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. Now we move on to a very fun part of the formalities, which is our roll call, also known as declaration of votes. We'll see who is present.

Brigita Krasniqi (Secretary-General): Good morning everyone, I hope you got some sleep and rested well, and well if not I hope you had fun at least last night.

Declaration of votes:

Sections:

JEF Albania, not present. Proxy to JEF Bulgaria.

JEF Austria, not present, no proxy.

JEF Belgium, not present, no proxy.

JEF Bulgaria, present.

JEF Croatia, not present, no proxy.

JEF Czechia, not present.

JEF Denmark, present.

JEF Estonia, not present, no proxy.

JEF Finland, present.

JEF France, present.

JEF Germany, present.

JEF Greece, not present in the room, no proxy.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



JEF Hungary, present.

JEF Ireland, not present, no proxy.

JEF Italy, present.

JEF Kosovo, not present, no proxy.

JEF Latvia, present.

JEF Luxembourg, present.

JEF Malta, present.

JEF Montenegro, not present, no proxy.

JEF Netherlands, present.

JEF North Macedonia, not present, no proxy.

JEF Norway, present.

JEF Poland, not present, proxy to JEF Netherlands.

JEF Portugal, present.

JEF Romania, not present.

JEF Serbia, present.

JEF Slovakia, not present, proxy to JEF Czechia who is not present.

JEF Slovenia, not present no proxy

JEF Spain, not present.

JEF Sweden, present.

JEF Switzerland, present.

JEF UK, present.

Executive Board:

Christelle Savall, present.

Xesc Mainzer Cardell, present.

Martin Penov, present.

Aléxandros Apostolidis, present.

Hanna Lein-Mathisen, present.

Nikos Chircop, present.

Kati Systä, present.

Alexiane Terrochaire – – Barbançon, present.

Federal Committee elected members:

Gergana Blazheva, present.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Jana Gleim, not present proxy to Gergana Blazheva.
Robin Mudry, present.
Antoine Chabal, not present proxy to Elise Magne.
Elise Magne, present
Anna van de Moosdijk, present.
Julianne Veila, not present proxy to Mirko Ondras.
Maria Martines Lopes, not present proxy to Samuel Tammekann.
Samuel Tammekann, present.
Federico Tosi, present.
Madalin Catalin-Blidaru, not present proxy to no one.
Melanie Thut, not present, proxy to Robin.
Chiara Bertolli, not present proxy to Federico Tosi.
Mirko Ondras, present
Benedikte Svendsen, not present, proxy to Anna
Sofie Rebekka Schlüter Knauer, not present, no proxy.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): So, it is 42 votes. We have reached the quorum by one vote only, so we foresee the votes, the voting periods of course are tomorrow morning, but this should not happen again, so especially sections if they no longer have a quorum, and of course the FC is also a place where sections are represented as opposed to votes and speak-ups, so this is not good.

We will remind ourselves later on that people should be in the room, if necessary we'll have to do a second roll call, but of course the only important votes are going to be tomorrow morning, which makes it even harder for people to arrive on time. Although we started a little late, as you noticed, so please also spread this within the sections who are not here, that it should not happen again, because also it could stop having a quorum and not being able to proceed to votes. If people leave the room, they have to tell it to the secretaries who are taking this, because we need to keep track of the votes present.

We are now moving forward with formalities and we have an election point coming up, which is the election of tellers. So the tellers, it's two people who don't count the votes and who will assist in counting votes, should that be necessary at any point. We need two volunteers for that.



Election of tellers

So **Matthias Meinert from JEF Germany** and **Derk Hans Beemer from JEF Netherlands**. We can elect them by acclamation, if there is no objection to that.

No objection So, you are elected.

Alright, we move on to the next point in formalities. As you may have noticed, there is Gergana and me from the regular FC position. Unfortunately, our third presidium member couldn't make it to Sofia.

So as we did in past instances, we propose to the FC to co-opt a third member, only for the duration of this weekend, which is Valentin Petri (**JEF Germany, Observer**), sitting next to us. We carefully selected him. He already has chairing experience. He is a great fellow JEFer. You can also do that through acclamation.

No objection

Presentation of the agenda for the weekend

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium) presented the agenda in detailed and reminded the FC about the amendment deadline.

So this is our very ambitious agenda for the weekend. I think we can make it, if you're all disciplined.

If not, the Presidium will make sure we are disciplined or we become disciplined. Is there anything else or any objections to the agenda?

We are unfortunately not only in a different time zone and not only very short in time, but we're losing an hour during the upcoming night, because this year is switching to summer time. So it's going to be even harder for everybody to be present tomorrow morning. But well, we can make that. Okay, we also have to be very disciplined for the Q&A sessions, but as Presidium, we will guide you through this, so we'll make sure that not too much time is taken up.

Agenda adopted.

Adoption of the minutes of the FC in Budapest

Now, we move on to the next point, adoption of the minutes of the FC in Budapest. So here, we would like to propose as FC Presidium that we postpone this point. Unless everybody has spent the night studying them and feels like you're so ready,



you know all the details. But that doesn't seem to be the case. So the proposal of the Presidium is to postpone the adoption of the minutes.

We would also like to remind everybody that minutes should be checked. It has always been handled like that. We check it in the statutes, that according to the statutes, the minutes should always be published or uploaded one month after the statutory event in question.

That's Article 40 of the statutes. So let's just keep this in mind for the future. And we'll have an Online Congress coming up later this spring, so that will be an opportunity to accept or adopt these minutes.

So if there are no objections, we will proceed like that and postpone the adoption of the FC Budapest minutes.

Appointment of the Resolutions Committee

It was already mentioned, this is a committee that is composed of representatives from the PCs, the EB and the FC Presidium, which will convene tonight in order to go through all the wonderful amendments that will still be there, put them in order, and make sure the resolutions we have that are presented to us tomorrow are in order.

So we have a proposal for this Resolutions Committee that's going to be Xesc from the EB, Mirko from PC1, Nea from PC2, Samuel from PC3, and myself (Robin) from the FC Presidium. If there are no objections or counter-proposals, we can also appoint this committee by acclamation. ***Committee appointed.***

Reminder on voting system and deadlines

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium) reminds everyone of both.

Finances

Presentation on finances, updated budget 2025 and membership fees

Here there's a regular finance report. The updated budget for the financial year 2025 will also be presented and we will vote on that tomorrow.

And then there is a center point, which is a membership-based proposal that we and especially Aléxandros have been working on for a year.



Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer):

So we start with the data on our membership data, trends and then we will talk about finances and the part about finances includes also for understandable reasons of urgency the situation with our application for an operating grant.

There is a very important and strict deadline, 31st of March, to submit your membership statements for 2024. So the data I am presenting you are up to date until now but they do not include data about 2024. Thank you to the 10 sections that have already sent their membership statements and thankfully the membership statements we have received so far, all the sections that have contacted us have remained stable or have grown.

So for those who were there the last time, this data is the same of course from the last time. Our biggest sections in nominal numbers are Germany, England, France and Italy. Please clap for them. Our biggest sections in relation to the population of the country are Malta, Denmark, Latvia and Luxembourg. Clap for them please. By the way, Malta doubled again. And fastest growing sections, Slovenia and Spain. Clap for them as well. It is important just to have an overview of our total membership rates, how things are evolving through years. JEF is in general stable but with a negative trend.

So every year we lose between 1 and 4.5% of our members. Practically we have also had times when we had much less members but the trend is negative. So this is why we notice there are a lot of activities about enabling our sections to grow more, to focus on recruitment of volunteers because the trend is not yet there. We have only had one year of growth and it was also a small growth, only 1.14%. At the end of 2023 we had 9,403 people. We are in 37 countries and I think it's a lot so let's clap also for ourselves. Kind reminder once again, please try to stick to the deadline of March 31st. I know that in some sections there are internal financial deadlines that are later. Please reach out to us because we can find practical solutions.

Since we are talking a lot about our membership trends, I would like to present to you what is the current state of numbers per country that we have, what is the smallest the section has been and what is the biggest the section has been. So, always the first part is 2023. The second part is the smallest the section has ever been. For none of them it was recent. I can tell you that's a good thing. And the last part is what is the biggest the section has been. So, as you see, JEF has currently

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



in the last six years something between 9,400 and 10,500. The biggest we have been has been 12,368 and the smallest we have been is 6,912. We always rely on your data and we trust you to have the best possible.

Very, very big thanks to the 18 sections that have already completed the membership survey. It's a survey that takes about 10 to 15 minutes to reply to. And this is a very important data for us, also for the people who will come after us. So please open the QR code. I'm letting you have a moment. If possible, please fill it in today. We need the data by mid-April at the latest. But I think it's most reliable if everybody just opens their phone, makes a photo or goes to the link of the QR code and finds 10 to 15 minutes today to fill in the membership survey, please. This data is very useful to provide mid-term and long-term trends. Also because what we want to know is what kind of assistance every section individually needs and what kind of group tendencies there are. So please fill it in.

So we are at the point of our solidarity fund. What we were really happy to improve is that last time in Budapest we approved an internal resolution about the travel solidarity fund. And this way, please go to the membership area and read the full text. It's only two pages. You can have a clear image of the procedure and of the rules and of the principles that the allocation of the travel solidarity fund takes place. This allows you to know in advance how good your chances are when you apply. And this allows you also to know why you may have not been allocated a position with the travel solidarity fund. What I want to say is that the data we have right now and the situation that we're documenting is that the travel solidarity fund is one of our best practices. Ever since it has been established, the phenomenon of small sections or sections from countries with smaller income being repeatedly absent has disappeared. For those who do not know it, JEF, in the past, when we did not have the travel solidarity fund, a lot of times it was the same delegations again and again that did not have the means to send a delegate to our statutory events. It was a big injustice. And the solidarity fund allows us to fund something between 8 and 12 people per statutory event to join it. The criteria include income, individual situation, gender parity and cultural and geographical diversity.

Normally, as you know, in the past, you would get informed about our liquidity at every FC or Congress or online Congress, which meant that you learned about the

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



state of our liquidity three times per year. During the conversations about the situation with our application for the operating grant, it became clear that some sections wanted to have this data per month. And I actually am very happy to see this interest and to be given this space to show you a little clearer the trend. Because as you can see, JEF has a quite big budget that varies per year between 600,000 euros and 900,000 euros. But per month, the amounts vary a lot when it comes to liquidity. You can see that the smallest we have had is around 22,000 euros and 69,000 euros. And the biggest we have had is 300,000 euros in the last month. This kind of fluctuation is actually very normal because it is the result of the operating grant. We receive a very big installment once or twice a year and then we don't receive any money for a very long time. In the past and in the current mandates, the situation with the liquidity has improved massively through the system that we organise the projects. We make sure that the projects don't start all together and don't finish all together. And also that the instalment of money doesn't come all together because this has happened a lot of times in the past. JEF has had a lot of hundreds of thousands of euros of liquidity altogether and then shortly of zero. So this is actually a big improvement but it's still not a situation that allows us to relax because especially November and December and sometimes also January are very hard months as it is the time where very few installments are received. So the money belongs to us but is not in our account. We find a lot of times practical solutions for it. For instance, we accept to pay some of our taxes later on and this means that we may pay slightly more taxes because we pay them with delay. We accept to pay our rent with a small delay and this means we may pay a small fine for having paid it with delay. What matters most importantly is that we do not make people wait too long to receive reimbursements and we pay the salaries on time. I hope it helps a little bit to clear out also the situation why projectification was something that was very important to us because, even the new operating grants that we want to apply for pay in big installments. We do not receive money per month and they do not help the stability of the liquidity necessarily. Projects provide smaller allocations of liquidity in regular times so this is an improvement of our liquidity and I hope it's a good opportunity to understand a little bit more why the combination of projects and of an operating grant is the best solution for everything.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



So, some of you have been in the info sessions so I'm asking for a little bit of patience for the people who are already informed about it but this is an opportunity for good communication and for transparency and also for spreading some information and knowledge about the functioning of JEF Europe. We have currently an operating grant from the program CERV which is the program of the European Union for the values of the European Union. The amount we receive from that is 300,000 euros per year. So it is an important part of our funding between one fourth and half our funding per year depending on the year. What is an operating grant? An operating grant is the fund that an organization receives if it gets to prove that its own function aligns with the thematic priorities of a funder. So when the European Commission runs a program about the values of the European Union we get to apply following a multiannual call. We get to argue that our operation is important enough for us to not get funded for a project but to get funded for our operational costs to receive some money to just exist. The operating grant covers things such as about two thirds of the rent, it covers the salaries of a number of the people of the Secretariat. Very few people receive their full salary through the operating grant but for a lot of the members of our secretariat 50 or 75% of their salary is funded through the operating grant and it is also money that can be attributed to microgrants. So our national and local sections if they have their own legal personality they can apply to receive for a small scale or mid-scale project usually an amount varying between 500 and 5000 euros with a project that is much less complicated than the common procedure to apply for funds. So this is what we have as an operating grant and this is how an operating grant works. And there are many operating grants but CERV is the one that is only for the EU and related to promoting the values of the European Union. Now we wanted to reapply for this operating grant. We have had a very positive experience with it and we relied also on the fact that we have a very good evaluation we have a very good reputation as an organisation that promotes the values of the EU and this meant also of course it is an application, we can never rely that it would have been approved but we believed it had very good chances of getting approved. Our application unfortunately was not submitted because we had a combination of technical problems and a combination of misunderstandings with the instructions. So there were some instructions that said that the text had to be 45 pages and an instruction that said

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



that it had to be 40 pages and there was an instruction that said that you can only upload applications if they are below the limit of pages and another instruction that said that you can upload it and it would just not get evaluated for the extra pages. Those extra instructions cost us more time. At the end we had to cut almost six pages of our content. This cost some extra days of work. We did still upload everything on time and then we had a technical problem that the platform was rejecting the file. We contacted the European Commission and we got explained that they will not reopen the platform and they will not allow new applications after the past of the deadline because the most beneficial condition was applying. We have also asked the Commission to re-evaluate this decision and they replied negative a second time. There is a possibility to do it for a third time and we have done it and we wait for the results but realistically speaking we can never be sure that it will get approved. So we had a plan B: if I may say so we had a plan B and a plan C. We had a combination of plans for what we would do in case it didn't work out and once we saw that we had a technical problem already before getting a reply we started working on our plan B. So we have a number of funding opportunities and we try to see what we can do.

Either way, what we have now is a series of scenarios. We have identified two operating grants that we want to apply for. We sent an email to all our sections informing them about what had happened. We have also had two info sessions to provide with a lot of details: what was the technical mistake we have had, what was the human mistake that we have done, what are the measures that we have taken ever since and what is the new timeline to know how much of it has been well mitigated. The current timeline is and I have to add here and we thank everyone a lot for their engagement.

It was also for us very motivating to see how interested our sections are in reaching out to us and trying to get informed the best way possible and we are very thankful for this engagement and for the people who spend extra time for those open letters because they also are a good opportunity for us to know what kind of reporting you expect from us and it's a pleasure.

What is the current timeline? We are applying for two other operating grants since we already have done most of our homework because we already have written an application for an operating grant and a lot of the texts are similar. We will

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



always apply a lot ahead of the deadline. We aim to apply half a month before the deadline so if we ever face a technical problem again we have enough working days to communicate it with organisations and the operating grants we are applying for have their deadlines of reply so they will tell us if we got accepted between June and August.

We have also intensified our project applications because we want to be sure that our statutory events are not threatened through projectification. So the things that we can already guarantee is that all our statutory events are safe through projectification and that means that the operating grant is a big help but you can rely on us that you will never have a problem organising our FCs and our conferences which is the first priority for us and our application towards all our sections. We will also expect to get the reply from most of the project applications that we have already applied for or that we will apply during the next month. Some calls are opening now also between June and September. This means that we will have a clear image of if we have mitigated the non-application if we have even made an even better situation than we would have had or if the situation is not as good as it could have been but what is the clear state of things sometime by August. I really invite all of you just for the sake of transparency but also to be sure that you can participate in the conversations with fairness and on equal terms with everyone. Those of you who were not there in the info sessions please read the presentations: we share them with everyone per email you should have them.

A big thank you also for the big participation we had over 75 people in the first info session and over 20-25 people in the second info session. This is a big participation rate. It shows your engagement and your interest and we appreciate it a lot.

You can see here the different scenarios that we have about our finances so we already have a project approved and a project running so we will never run below two projects so we already can guarantee that we have our basic events and our capacities for trainings to run our operating costs and then we have a goal of having something between 3 to 8 new projects and of getting one of the two operating grants that we want to apply for.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Now what do the two operating grants mean? There is one operating grant of Erasmus+ on youth which will enable us to do a lot of youth activities that would be very good for our recruitment of new members but the amount of money is 125,000 euros per year so less than half the maximum we would have gotten with CERV. So the first optimistic scenario is that we get the operating grant of Erasmus+ on youth and we get to hit the goal of 3 to 8 new project applications approved. This optimistic scenario means a lot of activities that allow us to recruit new members and it also means that we are allowed to maintain many opportunities for micro-granting as we do right now.

There is a second optimistic scenario with a different operating grant, the operating grant on education. It's also an operating grant of Erasmus+ the amount is slightly higher 180,000 euros so we would get about 50,000 to 60,000 euros more from it and of course it is an optimistic scenario because here we also hit the goal of getting three to eight new projects approved. This would mean actually that we have more money than we initially planned with the past operating grant. It's like if the optimistic scenario one takes place we are back in our old budget and if the optimistic scenario two takes place we are actually even better than before. In this case however we would be getting an operating grant that has to do with education. This would allow us to do a lot of activities in schools and universities. This would allow us to expand our network of experts but this could also mean a difficulty recruiting people especially recruiting people outside universities and schools. We look forward of course to having even more opportunities of advocacy and we tend to in case both operating grants get approved we will have to choose one of them even though they fund different activities unfortunately the rule does not allow to have two operating grants at the same time from the same funder and we don't have a decision that has already been made about it. We do have a preference for the operating grant on education because it is quite more money per year. And in this scenario of course since we get an operating grant we still maintain the possibility to do micro-grantings which we identify as a very good opportunity for all our sections. We have a moderate scenario where we do get an operating grant but we do not hit the goal of 3-8 projects. In this case the micro-granting stays, our operating is guaranteed we will not have a problem funding our statutory events but this means that we will be able to organise less trainings and capacity building

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



activities for the national sections because most of them come indeed through projectification. So we find project calls that are related to our goals and this is how we get to organise trainings for our members or trainings for external people that we hope to gain as members. If we get less than 3-8 projects approved this would mean that we would have less capacities for trainings and this kind of activities but our micro-granting scheme would be saved and our statutory events would be guaranteed as well.

There is a second moderate scenario where we do hit the project target but both applications for an operating grant get rejected. This means that we will need to projectify our statutory events always to safeguard it and this is something that we welcome because those applications have the positive that they don't only concern EU countries, they concern practically almost all our sections. This would mean both moderate scenarios mean a small decrease of our budget then it would be something between four hundred, three hundred, five hundred fifty thousand euros. This is quite below our current budget of six hundred seventy thousand euros.

In this case the positive aspect would be that we would be able to provide a lot of opportunities for trainings, for learning opportunities, for capacity building opportunities, for international networking, etc. through projectification. Projects are amazing when we want to organise international meetings and provide training opportunities to our members. And we have a pessimistic scenario which would be the case where we get both applications for an operating grant rejected and we don't hit the target of 3-8 new projects. This is indeed a very pessimistic scenario because to be honest we already have two projects so it would mean that all our project applications get rejected. But we have to always present to you what could be the worst case scenario. In this case this would mean that our budget is almost cut in half or less and we would be able to provide our statutory events through projectifications and we would be able to probably create one micro-granting opportunity but that would be the maximum capacity. Since we will be using the projects to fund our statutory events this means that we would not be able to give a lot of opportunities for training, learning, capacity building, international travels, etc. And this would mean that we would not be able to provide one micro-granting opportunity.



Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate) : Question of understanding. Thank you. The question is about because when you applied for a CERV: it was meant that the budget was going to last three years. How many years in any scenario is this calculated? Is it each year? Two. This is indeed a negative consequence.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Thanks for the question. CERV would have been three years. Erasmus+ is two years. This has the negative aspect that there is no connection between the JEF mandates. But this is also quite good because it is exactly the years of the mandates. So this would also be creating a lot of transparency for the mandates in the future. And CERV, to be honest, it would have been good to have a third year funded but it was also the last time that it would be three years.

Well, as I told you, you understand of course that we already were discussing what would happen in case our project application gets rejected. So practically, now that we have this problem with applying for the operating grant of CERV we're setting in action all the things that we had prepared for the case where the application would be rejected. So a lot of the things that are happening now were already planned by us as a plan C or plan B. And we just accelerate them and do them earlier. The first thing is, for those who don't know, we have a huge office in Brussels, in one of the best quarters of Brussels. And we're super happy about it because it was very useful for our campaign EurHope. We were able to bring people to the office directly from the parliament because it's a ten minutes walk all the time. There were a lot of activities of our national sections that took place in Brussels and we were always able to provide a very big and practical space, even for community building or team building events, but also for small and mid-scale events of our sections in Brussels for free. So this was a big upgrade of our capacities as an umbrella organisation. To be very honest, this is a very expensive office. We were able to keep a part of the costs down by sub-renting some extra places that it had, which allowed us to support

But in absolute honesty, after EurHope has ended, we do not see a big benefit in keeping this big office, and therefore we have decided that we will not try to

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



extend staying at this office. Our secretariat, and we are very thankful to them for that, has already started brainstorming and visiting to see where we could go next. We already have had internally some discussions. We don't have a concrete proposal or some choices to choose from, but what we have now set as a goal is that the new office should be about half of what our current office is. So it should be an office where meetings can be held, but not really big events can be held. This would save us about 65,000 euros per year.

We currently always run a paid internship position. JEF has done a lot of advocacy also for banning unpaid internships in European Affairs. We are proactively showing a good example by always paying our interns a fair salary. In the current situation it has become important for us to save money, and we will externalise this cost by having this with a subventioned intern through the Belgia civic service or through the European Solidarity Corp. We may do even both, but this saves us at least 13,000 euros per year as well. We have already started projectifying Next Generation JEF, because it's important for us to be sure that at least one micro-granting scheme will be there. So far we are confident that we will be able to projectify Next Generation JEF to maintain our micro-granting opportunity for at least one activity. This would also save us a lot of money, because it means that if we get any of the operating grants approved, this practically saves money from the operating grant, and it reduces the fact that our operating grant is smaller.

Our operating grant as we have now is a very generous one, but one that we are never allowed to spend outside the EU. The operating grants that we are applying for now, with the exception of the UK unfortunately, almost all other sections of ours would be able to profit directly from the operating grant as it is Erasmus+. It is a very big difference for us. It will enable us to do statutory events in countries of the Western Balkans for instance, it would allow us to be more active in Ukraine maybe. So we have a counterbalance from the fact that the amount would be smaller, that the amount would be now distributed to more sections.

The next measure was that we really want to try to be more strict with the cost of our statutory events. The cost of our statutory events the last years are much, much higher than they were a few years ago. The costs are very big and we think we could be able to save a total of around €20,000 per year if we decide to be more strict with the budget of our statutory events. Especially, to be very honest, Madrid and Tartu cost much more than the usual Congress, the usual FC costs.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



We are very happy with our sections that helped us organise it and we are very thankful for their engagement. In the future saving costs must become a more important factor when we organise statutory events. We also try to continue projectify some of our smaller statutory-related events, like the meetings of the EB with the directly elected FC, as we did this year, to make sure that they also get taken out of the cost of an operating grant even if it gets approved. We have calculated that it could be about €22,000.

Our Congress will be in Strasbourg this autumn. JEF Strasbourg and JEF France have done a lot of work to safeguard external funding and I have to say a very big thank you to them. It was a lot of work for us, a lot of work for JEF and JEF Strasbourg. It's really going great and if we proceed with the same dedication of finding external and local funding for our statutory events, this will also save a lot of money.

We decided that we will be organising one capacity building seminar per year instead of two. This also reduces €6,000 of costs. This is a measure that we will not take if we get one of the optimistic scenarios because we will have capacity to organise a second one. But we noticed that currently the demand is actually for one capacity building seminar. So we are willing to organise one instead of two. This reduces also €6,000.

JEF loses a lot of money due to the HR laws as we know them from Belgium because whenever someone quits or discontinues their contract, then they receive a very big payment. Practically almost the whole money of the rest of their contract, even though we need to hire an external person. Those are the laws in Belgium. But in the past, there have been complaints by our employees that they were not happy to stay long term in our team in the secretariat. And especially after FC Tartu, we had a 100% turnover. This meant huge costs for us because we did have to give people the money that the law foresees, but we did have to hire some people back to do the job. So we have taken very seriously our role in being a better employer. It has been a lot of time for the EB. We have gotten a lot of support from our dear FC. I hope our secretariat members are happy with us. We really are improving our conditions as an employer. We have more regular meetings with them. We are really engaging ourselves for a more positive way of

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



giving feedback in a productive and creative way. We allow more home office. We allow a part of the home office to be done in the country of origin, if they're not from Belgium. And we also allow better training opportunities for them as employees. And we have also adapted salaries to inflation. And being a better employer saves a lot of money. It really makes a huge difference because we do not pay people because they quit. I have to be clear. We have had to pay people because they quit. We are not even paying them to work. So it makes sense to convince our employees that we're a good employer, that we care about them, we care about the future opportunities. We are a model youth organisation and we need to be a model employer as well. We're in a very good way. We have received mostly very positive feedback so far. We see that our new employees plan on staying longer term. This makes a big difference for us also for our capacities. You understand that if people do not want to stay more than one or two years with us, some of them even less than a year, then we lose our capacities. The longer someone stays with us, the longer they gather experience, they gather political contacts and they can be even more productive and deliver even better work. So it becomes important to keep people in our secretariat with better HR measures because we don't pay someone because they quit, we pay them to work. Because we save the money that we have to pay in reparations and because we actually have much more competent people staying with us even long time.

And this, of course, goes with a big thank you to the people who have worked in our Secretariat because they have helped us a lot and they did amazing work. So it is too early to give our 2026 budget because it's only March but you will be getting your first idea in our online Congress. The Online Congress is for closing the year but it will be an opportunity to re-communicate with you any open issues that we have regarding those topics. What we have created now is just for you to have a better overview of our planned income. So this is not the full budget because it doesn't have the costs but you can now have a better impression, a better image of what our income sources are planned to be. Whenever you see something in blue, it means that we are very confident that we will get it. And whenever you see something in green, it means that we have gotten it already approved. And red means that we don't evaluate whether we will get it but the call

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



has not opened yet. So we also have to see what is the content of the application, is it an application that we are familiar with and have good experience applying for, etc. But to be honest, I can tell you that some of the things in red, we are also super confident that we will get a good rate. And for those who are not familiar with EU project applications, there is a threshold that allows you to get a funding that is usually 60% or 65% but then there is a concurrence, there is competence, how many people have applied and sometimes it takes evaluations of up to 85% or 90% to really get the project funded. So, so far we always pass the threshold. We have a very good reputation for writing good project applications. This is not always enough to get the funding though because you sometimes really need evaluations of up to 85% or 90%. As you can see, the current realistic plan is 627,000 euros which does not include the possibility of getting anything in the red color already approved. So we are currently more or less in the budget we had already before it.

We also rely a lot that we will get one of the two operating grants. We have a very good experience writing project applications for operating grants so far. Just an update on our projects. We have projects that just finished and they are MYCOMM, Words of Europe, MEET, COYV and our Work Plan for 2024 and our CheckEurope just finished. We already are working, we already started our Work Plan for 2025 and it's going well. We have two projects that continue, Complete EU and Ways of Europe. And also for some of the projects that closed, we are now writing the follow-up project application.

Our discussions about the future of the membership fee was integrated in a broader conversation about fundraising. And we had three working groups and topics that had to do about fundraising in general. So far, for those who were there, a big thank you. And for those who weren't there for reasons of transparency, we had three video calls where about half our sections ended up joining. We had a workshop in Budapest that had three parallel workshops on different topics. We had a separate local activity with the sections of JEF Germany. For those who don't know, we also have to inform the local sections of JEF Germany because they are the ones who have to approve any change in membership fees. And then we had a lot of sections that worked one-on-one with

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



us. A big thank you to those who took time to write emails with proposals to us and to the sections that integrated in their section updates. So when you talk every few months or every few weeks with your buddy in the executive board, you did talk about your ideas about fundraising and that's something we received a lot. I think this is also a good opportunity to clap. It was super participatory and you were all amazing. I think after the conversations that we have had now and after the conversations we had in the info sessions, it's clear to everyone that we don't have a clear image of our finances. And in this sense, out of respect to our sections, we need to freeze the conversation about the amount of the membership fees. Because we are not able to give you a specific scenario. We are not able to tell you how much we need and how much we will be able to provide. And according to the timeline I presented to you, this clear image will be there between June and August. It will be finalised by September. I think it is for everyone's better communication that as long as we don't have data to provide to you and as long as we don't tell you what our needs are and what our capacities are, it makes sense to freeze this conversation on the level of the membership fees. This does not mean that the time you invested in it is wasted and this does not mean that there has been a decision. It is a matter of respect to our sections that we only have this conversation as long as we can expect data from you and you can expect data from us. So I hope I will be able to tell you amazing news in August that we have a 15 billion euros budget. In this case we will not need any membership fees anymore. But as you understand we do not have this image yet and it makes sense to freeze it. Just for also a matter of respect to all the people who contributed in this conversation, the only thing that we freeze is the conversation about the amount of the membership fees. So there have been amazing ideas about what the procedure should be like in the future and this is the thing that we will continue working on.

So what will be the procedure to discuss membership fees in the future? All our treasurers in the past have always said in their final speech I hope the next treasurer raises the membership fees. And this takes a lot of time, a lot of work. And I really appreciate for instance I got a very good transition over from Robin who also had the same issue. It's very complicated, time consuming and energy consuming to talk about membership fees. And we want to take a part of the weight of this procedure away to make it a standard procedure that just in

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



transparency and in friendly terms we talk about it and we take decisions all together in the future. Everything that doesn't have to do with the amount and has to do with the procedure is staying.

And then we had a lot of ideas about fundraising. This includes the idea about a group of project writers of JEF. It will be a working group that you will be receiving more instructions about from me soon. We will do a pilot application for the next calls for project applications. There were some ideas about how to reach out to private sponsors and there were some ideas about how to produce better merchandise. Everything that does not have to do with the amount of the membership fees and whether we should raise it or not stays. And once again I think it's very adequate to clap. We had dozens of people contributing from all our sections and it was amazingly very motivated. Last slide. Any questions? I know this has been a very long presentation and I'm thankful for everyone's patience. I'm thankful also to the Presidium and to the colleagues in the EU who gave me that much time. We had the chance to make a longer explanation with more data than we normally do. And I'm very thankful for everyone's feedback, remarks and questions. Thank you very much.

Q&A finances and discussion on membership fees proposal

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): We have less than half an hour left for the discussion and questions, so we propose to limit the speaking time to one minute per person. Is there any other objection to this notion of procedure? No objection.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): So on methodology, just a remark, you don't have to thank us for providing numbers. We've been asking for these numbers for months, so we're not bored by numbers. This is what we want from the Treasurer and the Board. So thank you for providing numbers. But for us, the reaction is a bit weird, in a sense that mistakes have been made, which can happen. And again, the premise is not personal, it's political, because I think sometimes we mix these two. It's not personal, people make mistakes every day. That's fine. It happens, but the reaction should not be this: we made a mistake, and now let's just move on with these solutions. Like this methodology approach, you know what I mean? So the reaction should not be okay, we have this situation,

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



it's okay. This is not how the relationship between national sections and the Board should be. The sacrifice should be on the same level. So there's no need to thank us, we are trying to find a solution together. So we're not listening to you and saying, okay, we are contributing to this solution. No, that's not the case. We care about the organisation because we are the organization. We're not subject to what you decide.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): Firstly, thank you. Examples for the scenarios were very insightful. I have two progressions regarding the scenarios. But firstly, have you considered to what extent each scenario, how much personnel it could support, how large the Secretariat could be, and especially, which scenario could potentially support a full time presidency. Should it become a factor? And secondly, have you considered how much personnel you will need? Because I could imagine, like, I don't have that much experience, but three to eight projects plus an operating grant, is probably a lot of work on top of everything else that the Board and the Secretariat does. So have you considered how many people you will realistically need to do it? Thank you.

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): One quick question, because you mentioned in the beginning that you're gonna have to pay because of delay for grant and taxes, just to know that this happened like last year. Is this going to be happening this year? And then the second question about projectification for statutory events. From my understanding, it's really hard to use project plans for statutory events in the case that we do not have enough money for the operating grants, does that mean that statutory events, because you said they're safe, will need to be online, for instance, because or maybe you can enlighten us a little bit how projectification actually can serve for financing statutory events. Thank you.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): So first of thank you, Sofia, for your reaction, and I understand also the frustration. Because it is a funding we think we have very good chances for I understand what you mean about the methodology. I think what matters in the methodology also, it's not a disagreement. I'm just complementing it a bit. If we talk about the operating grant that there was no submission at the end as something that was sure, then we

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



have to be doing the same thing for the project applications for operating grant that we do now.

And since we're explaining to you, please, what we're doing right now is that we are saying we are doing project applications, and those are actually our plan B and C, and you see that we're now in the Plan E and F, we're already advancing. Also, what happens if those applications for an operating grant get rejected? I think it makes sense that for all grants, we always say, we apply when we know we have good chances. We apply when we know it's worth it, even if the chances aren't good, we don't apply for things that we don't have good chances of getting and have no added value. So whenever you apply for something, the criteria is, does it have extra value? Is it something that it's worth it to apply for. And secondly, is it something that we have good chances to apply for? I wish we had the secretariat of 25,000 people, and then we can be applying for anything. But now it's also a matter of opportunity costs. We always apply for things that are worth it and or we have good chances of getting but for all project applications, we have to be applied, taking into consideration that they are applications. It's not money that has been given to us and we rejected that didn't take it. We're very transparent with the fact that we thought we had very good chances. Last time we got an evaluation of 97/100. We were the best application, if I am not mistaken, and this is why we realistically always calculated that we would get it. And what I meant with the methodology is that we already had Plan B and Plan C for the case it gets rejected. And whatever we had planned as a Plan B or C, we are now doing it earlier and faster than the original plan.

Alex, thank you for your question. For the operating grants, we need a minimum of five people, as per rule, and this is something that we find challenging, but it is realistic. The number of people will depend on the number of projects, I would let Brigita take the floor, because she knows how our project management works internally a bit better. But practically, if you get the operating grant that says a minimum of five people, but then you also get eight projects. Five people are enough, even if eight projects are a lot of work. So we calculate how much money we have through the project. How much of the project money is given to salaries? Because not all projects have the same rule of how much money goes to salaries and how much goes to internal project management. It will currently depend on

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



how many people, how many projects get approved, but the minimum for the operating grants is five positions. And in the case where we have a lot of projects approved, a paid presence is covered. And in the case where we get practically from the scenario that you saw, only the pessimistic one would have a difficulty paying a paid president because you don't have project money and you don't have an operating grant. So where should the money come from? I believe the sections want money to go to the sections and not to pay the President.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): Thank you. I can also answer the question on the full time presidency: it's going to be included in the operating grant of the Erasmus+. It was also included in the CERV proposal. And then whatever the next president decides to do, and whatever the Congress decides, then that decides whether it's going to be full time or not, and then we just adjust the budget, but it's going to be included in that. On taxes: Alexandros is right. Technically, what happened in the past years is that our landlord asked us to pay tax on revenue, which, by Belgian law, he can transfer to us, even though it's a tax that he should pay. It was approximately 16,000 euros per year, which is a big part of our rent. And then when we got that tax, we said that,, well, if we have to pay this now, we are not able to pay our rent on time, because of the cash flow situation that we have at the end of the year. And then he told us that, okay, pay the tax, and then you can postpone the payment of the rent, because that is less serious, because if you don't. So we had to make a choice whether to pay the taxes or the rent. And this has happened every year since we moved to this office, and it will most likely happen again this year.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): And about the projectification of statutory events. This is not something completely new. We were doing this years ago when we did not have the operating grant. Even when we had an operating grant, we had to combine, sometimes our statutory events with a project to reduce travel costs.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): We already now have projectified some of our events. The EB-FC is completely projectified 100%. Now the Congress is going to be also projectified this year. So it is something that we have

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



done in the past as well. I know it's a bit difficult, but it's something that we are allowed to do, or it's something that is not impossible.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Practically, it has also good consequences, because we have people who come here to join the FC but they can also profit from an extra session of a training, for instance, or an extra event where they get to meet some experts, for instance. So actually, we have a positive experience with the projectification of statutory events. It makes them a bit more interesting for the participants, and it reduces the cost either way. Even when we have an operating grant, we did partial labor justification either way.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): You showed us tables of options that might happen, pessimistic scenarios, optimistic scenarios, and so on. I have a question because both said the Erasmus+ grants are structured in packages. Is the amount that was below it? Is that only from the operating grant? Or would it be a total budget with the potential projects, so one to two or three to eight projects included in that?

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): The answer is short, I can say it already. You get a pre approval that you are a partner, that you're getting a partnership, a plan for two years, and then you make a plan per year, and it's a lump sum. So for education, it is a fix 180,000 euros and for youth, it's 125,000 euros, we cannot go below it. We cannot go above it. We have to find a way to distribute it in the 12 months of a year, because it has to be exactly that amount. So it's pre approved per year by lump sums.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): Thank you. We also learned in the info session that when we apply for it, they're not going to ask for a budget immediately, so they're also just going to ask the budget when we do the reporting, and they are going to see if what we said is real. So for example, when we say that we do have a certain number of employees, they are not going to double check it now, but they will double check it when we do a reporting that we did not like.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Kalojan Hoffmeister (JEF Belgium, National Delegate): I mean, are you guys aware that the offices are also used by the European Movement in Belgium? For JEF Belgium, this is our primary location, where we meet, where we hold our statutory events and so forth. So have you considered or given consideration to repercussions, which is also known for small sections, which are indeed fundamental? Second question on the buffer. I haven't seen in the budget a finance buffer, if something ever goes wrong, it's always good to have a certain amount of buffering in the plan. Is there any thought from that? And third question, maybe thinking out of the box, that we open up a discussion on the form of reaching out to private individuals corporations, who are actually maybe also further they would like to cooperate with one of the biggest new organisations on the continent, what would you not major in Council's potential?

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): I believe JEF Belgium will stay with us, this would not be a problem whether. There will be enough space to hold meetings, maybe even small statutory events, something we will be able to confirm to you after we get proposals. We can gladly discuss it with JEF Belgium directly when we get the proposal. We can find a compromise. Currently, we have planned where we would like it to be, so we have set our goals in specific neighborhoods that are less expensive but well connected, and how much we would like the maximum budget to be. So you would not have a problem with your address. You can gladly stay with us. It's a pleasure to have you. We don't know what the office will look like. We don't have specific proposals.

I would speak about our equity. It's a good opportunity for me to talk about our equity. Our equity is positive, but it's very low for an organisation our size. People who were there in Online Congress 2024 also know that it was still five digit numbers, but a decreasing number. We already have some good news, because we had an audit, and we got 10,000 euros back. This is good news. We already proceeded with some of the savings just to create a buffer for the next year. In case we do have one of the pessimistic or moderate scenarios, and this means we will get an improvement of our equity this year, and a part of it works as a buffer.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): Thank you. I just want to add on the office that we already have had some discussions with the two organisations, the main, biggest organisations that share the office with us, and they were also willing to leave the office because, well, I have mentioned it before, the building management is quite awful, and we have had a lot of conflicts with them, not with the organisations that share their office with us, but the building management. They don't do what they should do, and we have very big issues: elevators that don't work, issues with doors, with not having proper keys, we have issues with everything. So it's a matter of also losing our staff time dealing with these kind of issues. So that was also one of the reasons why we wanted to leave the office, even before the situation with the operating land. And on the buffer, I just wanted to add that all projects that we apply for, they have a budget line for unexpected costs, but unfortunately, our operating grant means we do have a small amount there for unexpected costs. But to be fair, unexpected costs should also be covered by yourself if they happen, not necessarily through the operating grant. And that's why it's important to have a really sustainable equity.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Projects always have a small buffer. The operating grant doesn't have a buffer. But I think when we're having conversations one on one with private companies, Christelle has been super active on it as well.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): I told you about this climate democracy fund at one of the info sessions. We should know the call should be launched in September as it has been delayed. And then, of course, there are all the foundations I met at the Philea Forum last year that we are in contact with. And we have been applying for foundations before, we just didn't get the money we applied for. Like capacity building in Albania, for example, that we tried to. We didn't get it. So there are also some background things that you might not see because we don't get it. Foundations want something big and shiny. You can't just sell Europe at school. I mean, I would love that. But it is also about providing something new to them as project partners.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Well, it is more common question because I think what changes considerably here, also in comparison to this other operation plan perspective, is that whereas we always, of course, have this insecurity in terms of planning, it has now grown potentially exponentially because we have so many unknown variables, and we will have to be readapt constantly, which is really, I would say, a huge challenge in terms of management, because it will always depend on whether we get this project or not, then we will have this amount of staff or not. If you do not have this amount of staff, the operational funding risks being reduced, and we have to constantly adapt, to constantly be looking out for these projects. So it's a certain kind of a precarious situation. So I wanted to ask, how do you anticipate dealing with this, if already? Projectification, yes, it existed in the past, but it was a supplement. Now it has to be the basis of what we do. So it will also require a different kind of management, a different kind of governance of the organisation, which is making things more complicated. That's my first point. The second point is really about and I think this should be transferred to the strategy session, maybe this afternoon, or we have to find a moment for us, because we will have difficult questions to ask. I mean, I was a bit confused by the answers to the question about the full time presidency, by the two different answers. So we have to have this strategic discussion early enough. Brigita said we will include the time presidency in the operating grant. But you Aléxandros said that we might have to decide on how to spend that money within sections. So maybe we don't have time now, but it's really important to a point I wanted to emphasise.

Reinis Gils (JEF NETHERLANDS, National Delegate): Can I propose that we also do one minute for the answer? So it's one minute, one question, one answer, then.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): If the questions are complicated, the answers have to be complex too. We can vote on it, but I can tell you feel uncomfortable not being able to answer fully complex questions.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Is there any objection to this motion? Okay, one speech in favor and one speech against this motion.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Kalojan Hoffmeister (JEF Belgium, National Delegate): From my understanding: I think it's not very helpful to limit the answers, because they have to be founded. If they're not founded, then I will have to reask and this is going to take me much longer.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Maybe we could also gather some questions to save time.

Cecilia Jastrzemska (JEF UK, National Delegate): Thank you very much for the presentation. I've got two questions, one general and one logistic. Question one, what reasons are the Commission giving if they indeed had given conflicting instructions? Question two, on your proposed savings in an earlier slide, you mentioned the possibility of having a trainee from the European solidarity corps or civic service. Are you guaranteed to get that and thereby save the 13,000 you mentioned? I would make a further suggestion about private operations, which is something we actually discussed at the last FC, which I think would be a really good idea, which is the creation of the central stakeholder map of potential sponsors, which sections have already found successes, which could virtually be helpful.

Anna van de Moosdijk (Directly-elected FC member, TF Capacity Building co-chair): I have two questions that are quite technical. The first one is in all the projects, since we are speaking about projectification, how much of them are lump sum, this is also something that can help to us to assess how much wiggling room we have with them and how much it's based on results, rather than micromanaging how you spend it. So indirect costs for people that are not doing projects is 20% of everything you spend directly for the project. It is quite a consequence of the amount of money in every project, and we have a specific strategy for that also, because in the past, there has been the situation where funders were subtracting or asking for organisations to justify how they used their operating grants and their indirect costs so that they don't clash.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Firstly, Robin, thank you for your remark. I think that projectification does not complicate things more

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



because we are experienced in it. The problem with projectification is that they add a lot of reporting duties. This is extra work. Yes, of course, it's regrettable, but it is something that most youth organisations, or most organisations that are nonprofit have to deal with. You always combine funds to make things the cheapest possible or to get maximum added value. I think there is a misunderstanding about what I said, and thank you for the possibility to clarify it. I do not think that we need to have a conversation now about the presidency, because it is included in the budgets of the operating grants. In the worst case scenario where we have no operating grant and we have less than three projects, then when we need to have this conversation, to be honest, we already have two approved projects. Now it's really only for the worst case scenario.

About the civic service and the solidarity, we have a very good experience with it. We've done it a lot of times in the past. We did not do it the last times because we did want to set an example by providing a paid internship, because it is also for us, one of the things that we do advocacy for. We know how unfairly people in European affairs are paid when they do internships. We wanted to set a good example. We don't have a reason to be pessimistic about it. There are two different alternatives. We've done both of them in the past, and we have good experience with both of them.

Just to reply about why we got the rejection. Firstly, we never got a formal explanation. You just get a yes or a no. They concluded that there was no technical issue and disagreed with our view on it.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): Thank you, Anna, for your questions on the lump sum: currently, two of our biggest projects are lump sum projects, CompletEU and Ways of Europe. But as they are projects of many years, it doesn't mean that you have a lot of space to move in the budget. So even though it is lump sum, it does not mean that we have actually a lot of space to move in the budget, especially in CompletEU where we actually have many partners to which we need to give their share as well of the budget. I am not sure I understood the second question: could you please repeat it?

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Anna van de Moosdijk (Directly-elected FC member, TF Capacity Building co-chair): I meant, like, how do you use the indirect funds of the projects?

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): That really depends on the project call, and I cannot give a very general answer, but we always try to maximise the staff cost. We don't even apply for projects that don't have a big proportionate amount for staff cost, because it's unnecessary, it's also unfair, because you put in a lot of hours, and then we don't get much out. So we always try to see that it is fair for us as well. And if there's some benefit to get out of that, because there's a lot of money to be put in staff costs, that means that we can also hire new people, And we always put the budget line for indirect costs as well. But as I mentioned, in the operating grant, it's very small that you can put because it's already quite a tight budget for an organisation as ours, so there's not much room. But usually in our operating grant, we have been underspending in certain categories. So that means that you can shift that money to the indirect costs. For example, with Next Generation JEF, in both years, unfortunately, we have had underspending, which is something that we have been trying to emphasise to you, that please spend all of the money for Next Generation JEF, because that also means that then we have to redirect that. It may sound good for us, but actually, the Commission doesn't like the fact that we underspend, for example, in Next Generation JEF, because that's money that you're supposed to use, not us.

Armin Sumansky (JEF Czechia, National Delegate): My question is I don't really understand: a lot of you mentioned technical problems. I don't understand why this was done so last minute, right? This could not have been prevented beforehand, because these grants are not open for a week. They're open for many months ahead. So we have time to write these applications, and if this was done in time, if this was done weeks before, you could have emailed them and communicated with them properly.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): We have had a very broad discussion about how this affects us now and all of the details, and I'm happy, at least in the situation that we are facing right now, that there are contingencies and there are fiscal corrections, and we see some scenarios ahead

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



of us. So I want to follow up on the previous question. It is very apparent that what the situation we're facing now is a result of miscommunication, wrong allocation of the task that led to the result that we are facing right now. So I understand the situation we are facing now, how it affects us now, but I want to think of the future. What do we do now? What do you do to change your internal processes so that we do not face the situation again?

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): I had a question about the project that you're planning to do. That is something that me and my board don't understand is how can we cut 22,000 euros, which is 11,000 euros per FC, next year, and still function?

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Thank you. We really need more free venues. Especially in Madrid, in Tartu, we had to pay more than we have ever paid for any statutory event in the past, because almost all the venues were not free. So the big difference is more free venues. When you apply to organise an event, please take into consideration we need free venues or affordable venues. Paying 40 or 50,000 euros for FC was never done in the past. So actually, we are going back to the normal budget. The budget of the last FCs or Congress was much higher than the average. A part of it was unavoidable because of inflation. A part of it was because the venues were not free, or they were even very expensive. There's also the EB-FC meeting. So it is not only the two FCs per year. There are some smaller meetings throughout the year that are also formally obligatory and statutory events. So a part of it we also did through projectification. So when we say we save 20,000 euros, it does not mean that it will be cut. It means that it will be taken out of an occasional and eventually operating grant. But a part of it has to be cut, and the most important thing is more free venues.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): We also understand there are specific circumstances that led to this. We discussed this with the sections. We are not blaming anyone or anything. We are very grateful for all the work that was put in the FC and the Congress.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): It is really not an accusation. The organisers in Madrid, in Tartu, did an amazing job, in Budapest too. We are very thankful for how much our sections have done. It's just that the criteria, finding values for free, was not taken very strictly. Dimitrios' question: Firstly, you're completely right. It has to do with capacities and allocation of tasks. In absolute honesty, this is not a secret. We were very understaffed for a very long time, and we stopped being understaffed only a couple of months ago, just a few days before the deadline for this project. Brigita has had to work a lot of time with only one or two people, and one of them being an intern. So an intern also helps take some of the work, but also means extra work. We are no longer so understaffed. This is a big improvement, and we are very thankful of how it worked out to make our Secretariat staff complete again. The second thing is that we are now working with internal deadlines. We apply for everything much ahead of the deadline, and especially with operating grants. We have a small privilege, because we have already written a full application for an operating grant, and the big part of the other two operating grants that we are now applying for needs small adaptations, not to be written from scratch.

So the first thing is we should not stay understaffed again. It's once again tied with the big turnover that we had after Tartu. We stayed understaffed for a very long time, Brigita and Sophie had to do the work of five people, and this means mentally and time wise. So not being understaffed is important, and we are now working with internal deadlines as well. And it should not necessarily become the rule, but currently we, in the EB, support the Secretariat also directly in the work for Project applications, because we want to increase their capacities even more.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): Thank you, Aléxandros. I agree. I just wanted to add that, as I mentioned in the info session, we also had the deadline for the operating grant reporting at the same time, which is something that we flagged to the Commission and with Civil Society Europe that also forwarded this message to the Commission that this poses a very big administrative task for us, because we have to close the reporting for an operating grant while applying for an operating grant. We were not alone when we forwarded this feedback to the commission. A lot of other NGOs did it as well. A lot of NGOs also asked for extra time for the reporting, because it was impossible

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



to do both at the same time. So this was also a big challenge that we had. SWe take as a lesson that we need to communicate internally better on how we prioritise tasks and how we divide tasks between, for example, reporting and applying. Then I just wanted to say that of course, we were understaffed, which affected our capacity to work as efficiently as we could. We also worked together with the board, and I had the support of the board in writing of the project, application and the proposal. So I just want to add that I know that there's been some misinformation that I was left alone completely in writing the project, and I want to say that this was not the case. The board supported me with their input for the application.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): As said in the info session: I agree we should have done it earlier, if we had it earlier, we would have maybe not had these technical issues. We are not shying away from that fact. We are learning from this and offering to move forward together. And there is a political responsibility we take, but we want to work with you. I am confident we will have a good solution for JEF so we can continue to do great projects and support you to the best we can. It is very important for us, as we continue this discussion. We will also give regular updates so you are updated throughout the process, and you have a good vision of the finances of the organisation, also in between statutory events.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): As I mentioned in both of our info sessions: we did have our own internal deadlines. So the process was that we followed internal deadlines from the beginning and with those internal deadlines that we decided together, the aim was to apply earlier, of course, and to submit the proposal earlier, so it was not left to the same day intentionally. It was because of issues that arose in those five last days.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): If we had applied earlier, we would not even have the technical issue. The platform in the last two or three days starts having more technical issues because a lot of people connect to it. It had to do with instructions that we got because we had written a maximum allowed application of 45 pages, and we had to cut more than five pages, And

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



then we learned that the wrong instruction was on the website and the other instruction was correct. So we spent two days cutting it. Cutting a full text also takes a long time.

I just want to say that I understand this is an uncomfortable situation for everyone, and I am very sorry about what has happened, because it is very complicated and time consuming for us and for you. I think political accountability also comes with responsibility to find solutions. And finding solutions means, firstly, making sure that you mitigate the consequences, and secondly, making sure this doesn't happen again. And thirdly, whenever you had a plan B or a Plan C, you accelerated or you started even earlier. And this is what we're trying to do, because we want to be there for you. It is important in the future, whenever you have a question, reach out to your contact persons, because we understand this causes a lot of frustration, but also there were a lot of people just gossiping and speaking with each other informally. And some people got misinformed very badly, and it was harder to inform people correctly once they have been misinformed, than to give you information from scratch. We are always there for you. It is a pleasure and an honor to be there for you, and to see positive things and seeing how much engagement comes from the sections. And that's why we will focus on activities that allow you to be more directly engaged in JEF Europe.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary-General): Thank you very much for the discussion, and I want to say that I know as well that this is an uncomfortable situation, and I thank you all for participating. But I also want to add that I've been really personally disappointed on the amount of gossip that this topic has brought and to be honest, if the intention is to help us and support us, I don't know how the gossiping is doing that, because we have to spend our working hours trying to clear this information. And we are also human, and when you gossip about us, that also affects our ability to work. So I really urge you to think twice before you spread misinformation and lies. Thank you.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): I mean, I don't think anyone here wants to play these kind of games. The way I see personally, is that every challenge is an opportunity. Why I think the best strategy, also for you, is for

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



you to tell us how it can help you in the situations, and when you come into a position where you're under-staffed, then you need to let us know to be able to assist you. If there is something that you need help with, there are members who have the time to be able to come and teach them. So maybe this is better for any future interactions to really consider it. Set up concrete policies because you know any project manager and HR team has clear and concise policies on how they do these things. They don't just let a deadline dictate how things work, because a deadline is a very simple way of doing any task. You can just say, oh, I got an internal deadline. So do you have an active working group that will set up a concrete plan that you can present to us so we can also feel confident, because this is also about the confidence that sections have so that we know how we can help you, how we can teach them, and at the same time. Do you have a clear policy on how you will be able to work and how you will be able to handle situations like this. Thank you.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): That's what I meant when I talked before, sometimes political and personal get too mixed. I don't think it's very respectful that you say that political debate is lies and gossiping. It is a serious accusation to sections and if you are going to say that then you should give names. If you don't want to do that, then it is different. What we did, especially the sections, was a political debate on what the situation was. If you don't agree, that is fine, but then you have to specify.

Gergana Blazheva (FC Presidium): Now let's move to the next points.

4 year strategy discussions

Executive Board members Alexiane and Kati present the 4 year strategy and the discussions on it.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Line 13: *The advocacy activity is consistent in time and helps the federalist cause in achieving the movement's political objectives.*

So adding one more sentence to the objective parts. Does someone want to say the floor to comment on this?

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Federico Tosi (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): It is the same, but here we want to align that advocacy is not just methodology, but it also needs to achieve our goal, to achieve our political objectives. So like the point before was how we reach, and here, when the law importance to feel that the law received our political objectives.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Thank you. I don't think we have anything against, at least from my analysis side. If anyone else wants to speak against this? No. So I suppose we have unanimously accepted this one as well.

Then going on to line 14. So starting with the action points, there is a new amendment proposed by Robin to add a new action point, which says: *JEF Europe strikes a balance between grassroots activism and institutional lobbying to maximise advocacy effectiveness.* Does someone want to take a go?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): This is something that has been discussed in different contexts, and I think it is still challenging, because on the one hand, we experience a political setup where grassroots activism is getting more and more important, but on the other hand, there is also a strong tradition of institutional lobbying for JEF in general and JEF Europe in particular. So I would say we should not discard either in favor of the other. Therefore, we have formulated this sentence to stress that both aspects are salient and getting more important, and that any strategy needs to take them into account and always evaluate according to the given context. So I think it would be an important addition to the strategy at this point.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): We have nothing against this addition. Does anyone else want to take a flow regarding this? If not, then that one is also unanimously adopted.

Alexiane Terrochaire – – Barbançon (Executive Board): The next one is a wording suggestion by JEF Germany regarding what and how advocacy is done. So it's about the topic and the methods. We don't have anyone against or in favour. So we take this modification as granted.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Kati Systä (Executive Board): Does anyone else want to say anything about this? All right, then we add it. Then the next point is also adding a new point, a new action point proposed by Robin Mudry. It says *JEF Europe strengthens the ties with other civil society organisations by integrating intersectional perspectives in advocacy work and bringing a Federalist approach to those organisations.*

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): I think there are two important aspects here. We try to unite at one point. And one is, of course, that we think JEF Europe should work with other civil society stakeholders. But it is not just about us maybe dealing with their topics, but more so also us taking or bringing a federalist perspective to their work, which can actually help them. So it is a two way thing, and at first we had two points, but then we decided to reformulate it and to put it in one action point. I hope it makes sense like that.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): We have nothing against it. We actually welcome it, because it was described in the context and it was brought up very often in the discussion. But JEF Europe has an important network of partnerships, but how to translate that in the strategy? Thank you, Robin. I think you found the perfect combination of words.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Thank you. Does anyone else want to say something about this amendment? I don't see anyone. So I think we can agree on this one. Thank you. And then there's a couple more to the action points of the first part. Lets jump ahead to number 23 then, which is the mentioned amendment proposed by Moritz.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Just a quick note, we had a discussion with Moritz before presenting you with this version to make the phrasing clear, but I let Moritz explain the idea that this one is a result of at least a collaborative effort.

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): It's basically because we have a lot of resolutions. But then how do we check that we actually follow up on that? So what we envision is that after there are new resolutions, people, maybe from the



EB and from the FC and interested sections come together to cover what was in the resolutions, and then come up with a complete recommendation. For instance, if there is something on the environment for environment related grants.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Okay, any comments? No, so I'm assuming we can adopt it unanimously.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon(Executive Board): *JEF cooperates with sections by exchanging capacity building resources and monitoring practices* was suggested by Robin. I suggest we just take that for granted as it is just a rephrasing.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Robin, do you want to explain what these monitoring practices mean?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): So it's actually an input by the capacity-building people, so it is not just the different resources, but also how we monitor capacity-building and how it is going. And the rephrasing more in general had to do with the fact that it was supposed to sound more horizontal or more, again, bidirectional, both sections and the European level interacting. Supporting sounded more like, one level has to support the other, and this way it is more on an equal basis.

Anna van de Moosdijk (Directly-elected FC member, TF Capacity Building co-chair): The idea of adding monitoring was to have policy monitoring happening. I mean, while we might not stop the council as Federalists, it is still relevant to monitor many developments at member state level. And in that regard, the national sections can bring a lot in. That is why we go from a more top down situation where JEF Europe supports to JEF Europe cooperates with sections to not only build the capacity of it, but also to exchange monitoring practices, which is already done to a certain extent when we do things together on like, for instance, press releases and things like that. But it can be enhanced.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): We could put policy monitoring, because for future generations, it may not clear, for people that will read this in a few years.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): So the direct question was whether or not there's the intention to keep the words on political advocacy. Does someone know who drafted this?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): I think the idea was at a point that is quite clear, since all the points are on political advocacy, but we can as well keep it.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): So to summarise, your position is that you would like to have JEF Europe cooperate with sections by exchanging capacity building resources on political advocacy and monitoring policies. Am I right? Do you want to monitor the practices of how advocacy is done, or the content of it? The content? Okay. So the new amendment suggested as follows: *JEF Europe cooperates with sections by exchanging capacity building resources on political advocacy and conduct policy monitoring practices.*

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Can we accept this unanimously, or is someone opposing? Then we've accepted it, and then going on to the next one, which is the last one.

For this first part of this strategy, the new action point proposed by JEF Italy: *JEF Europe dedicates a part of human and financial resources to specifically improve and increase advocacy activities with the goal of influencing as much as possible the decision making process and at the same time, give its members the opportunity to put into practice the federalist ideology.*

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Thank you. So we just want to underline the importance of advocacy for the organisation and pay a bit of attention to this kind of activity specifically. Thank you.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board, JEF Europe): I have a direct question to you, would you accept changing federalist ideology by

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



federalist culture? Because ideology is a strong position. It's a strong statement. I'm not comfortable that we are promoting an ideology and extreme ideology. I think we try to portray mainstream federalism, or that is something that needs to become mainstream in public discussion. So ideology, for me, is a bit too much negatively connoted. So would you be open to changing it by culture?

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): It is a bit of a long debate. And I think now this time, I am on the opposite side. I must say ideology is exactly the reason why we are here, and it is the story of our movement as it was created in the 40s. But I understand also, seeing the last year's debates, that this is not something that anybody meets with, so I will put it to the vote.

Kati Systä (Executive Board, JEF Europe): All right, so we leave this for voting.

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): How about we kind of compromise, not say ideology, but also not culture, but maybe we say the federalist philosophy? mission?

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): I agree with the point to change. I agree with the amendments of JEF Italy, but I disagree as well about calling federalist ideology, and I would be more comfortable saying federalist culture.

Kati Systs (Executive Board, JEF Europe): Okay, I'm gonna give the floor to Sofia, but the proposals I've noted down now are to keep ideology, mission and culture.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): We need to accept the fact that we are a political movement and the culture word says that we are just a cultural association and we are not. I mean, we are part of the European and peace movements. But again, this is a discussion you have mentioned for so many years that there is no point in me trying to convince you, because I know we are on opposite sides. I would not put culture or mission. I do not think this is an opinion, it is just what we are as an organisation, ideological.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Nenad Busic (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): Would it be more suitable to say something like this: *our new working opportunity to put federalism into practice.*

Laure Niclot (JEF France, Observer): I think the word philosophy was also a good idea, because if we are talking about putting something into practice, that would suit it and I think philosophy is maybe more suitable.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): I will give the floor to Robin and Benedetta, and then I'm going to ask you to conclude this debate and find a way forward.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): As a side note, I find it very interesting. Of course, we don't have time to dive into it, but the term ideology is a perfect example of the different cultures or discourses that exist in Europe, because the term was connotated differently. So for instance, it originally meant just the history of an idea, but then it was first negatively used in France, actually by Napoleon, criticising the ideologues of the post revolutionary phase. Then in Germany, by Marx and Engels in the German ideology, criticising the ideologues of Neo Hegelianism. So this is why in German and French, it has acquired such negative connotations that last till today. But in Italian, not so much. It has been used as a more neutral term. I just wanted to make this as a side note to illustrate why we might have these different views. And I would agree with philosophy as well. Thanks.

Benedetta Veneruso (Coopted FC member, TF Capacity Building co-chair): Well, first off, I would like to thank you for this very interesting debate. I do personally agree with the use of the word ideology in this context. I think culture and philosophy is kind of adapting to what the Federalist product has been since the beginning, and what the people that came before us have been fighting for. Maybe the use of the word doctrine could be suitable because, in a way, we are promoting that. I think this actually shows how in need of having a discussion of our cause and for what actually we stand for because it is not clear to everyone and it is not a shared idea.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Thank you very much. We will just speed up a little bit on the other amendments. So congratulations on our first part. Our first section is over.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Did we accept it or not?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): We accepted, by acclamation, to put federalism into practice.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Anyone have anything against this amendment, to make sure? No, then it's accepted. And now we're done with the first and then going into the second. So for the first line to the context, there is a proposal to change the first phrase into: *while acknowledging different understandings of federalism, the organisation relies on core principles grounded in the foundational texts of the federalist movement.*

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): It looks like a diplomatic rephrasing. Then instead of also, it's the same idea to replace political culture by ideology, since we already had the debates, is it possible that we switch and rephrase by different political opinions? Federalist political identity?

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): It is actionable. We can also find some diplomatic terms, but the reality is that we consider ideology to mean different things, and we cannot shy away from that. But it is again, not the time.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Melanie has the last point for this discussion, and the proposal now is to call it the Federalist political project.

Melanie Thut (JEF Germany, Observer): I am very grateful for this debate here, because this is why we are here. And thank you for opening the space.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Thank you. I love these debates, but we have to move on, unfortunately. So federalist project it is. Going on to the next amendment. So second new addition to the objective, 392: *JEF Europe manages*

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



to have solid political base that unitedly supports his actions and historical purpose. So adding a new sentence at the end of the objective and referring to the first priority to action, if I understood correctly.

Anyone who wants to take the floor regarding this approach? I don't see anyone opposing. So I'm proposing to fasten up a bit to adopt this.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): For the action points, the proposal is to complement the sentence by adding *the importance of the movement's radical fight*. Anyone wishing to speak in favor?

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): I think we should not shy away from our past, and this is exactly what we are trying to do. We can pretend that federalism is not radical as much as we want, because we do not like radical as a word, that is fine. But it is not a relative fact, because we propose to completely revolutionise institutions. Getting rid of the Council is a revolution. I mean the term, you may not like it, but the fact that we propose these kinds of things, these reforms and federalism already right now, saying we want federalism is radical. Because sometimes we forget where we come from.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Radical in modern days is a word that I am scared of. And if we say that like we are teaching the youth about our radical movement, about our radical fight, I do not think the youth will be really inclined to join us anymore.

Anna van De Moosdijk (Directly-elected FC member, TF Capacity Building co-chair): I would like to speak in favor as well. Because Robin started semantics in this session, radicalism is going at the root of things, and that is how we question the world. As Federalists, we are going through the root of things and trying to find the best governing system to put things in place. So yes, it's radical. It is an internal document, and it is supposed to drive JEF and or movement forward for the next four years. I don't think it will be problematic, just a point as what was said in the beginning.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): It is not just an internal document. It will be published. And sometimes the strategy is asked as an annex by some funders, at least once by the Commission. So that is why we pay attention to the wording. And would like to thank you also for your creativity. Let's keep that in mind for future interventions. Thank you.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Actually, as we are running out of time, I'm proposing to pause the debate and do our trial votes. 16 against, 17 in favour.

Alexiane Terrochaire (Executive Board): All right, so we will then keep this amendment and it will be included in the document the term radical fight.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Thank you. And if you want to keep on working a compromise, for instance, until 8pm today, you're welcome, very welcome to do so. Then going on to line 46 proposal to the second added action point. Add a new ending, which goes as follows: *promoting the regular extensive debates within the federal committee, the political commissions and task forces as well as the broader membership.*

Someone asking to do the roll call for the voting on radical fight

Gergana Blazheva (FC Presidium): Roll call will be done tomorrow morning. This is also the reason why you should be on time, so you can be present.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): This vote was just a test, which was for us a means to understand if we have to change the amendment, we have a different wording, but it is not the case. As Kati said, if you want to offer an alternative, the amendments platform is open until 8pm tonight, which means that tomorrow we will vote on the remaining amendments.

So do you want to do a test vote again? Those in favor of having the radical movement, everyone can vote. 24 in favor, 32 against abstentions. It means that there will be another amendment.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Nenad Basic (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): Suggesting uncompromising, instead of radical.

Alexiane Terrochaire – – Barbançon (Executive Board): I have a second proposal to rephrase, so for those who oppose radical fight, I suggest the importance of the movement's history, objectives and projects, because we mentioned projects before.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): And after that, I would propose that we close the debate. So you have time until 8pm to try and find a compromise.

Nikos Chircop (Executive Board): Sort of as a compromise I think mission would work.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): I agree with this point. Or we can also just say historical fight, because that is also something like it is being done through the fight.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): I think we can try to come up with a different objective, maybe later. I just want to say that uncompromising is worse, in my opinion, than radical, because we are not uncompromising. I think it is a strength to find compromises but at the same time being radical. So these are like two very different things. So I guess we should really go back and maybe talk about semantics. So I just want to speak against uncompromising.

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): Yes, historical efforts. I think this is the most neutral, and also recognises the efforts through the years.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): The main problem is not with the word radical, it is with the word fight, because it could be interpreted differently in politics.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Kati Systä (Executive Board): I love this debate, but we have to really try to move on. Then on line 51: addition to the action point number three: *sections that violate the core values of the movement cannot be tolerated.*

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): This is just to clarify that there are certain boundaries that we as a movement do not want to cross, and we do not tolerate, as we unfortunately saw this year in JEF Lithuania, that there are certain boundaries that we cannot cross in our movement.

Laure Niclot (JEF France, Observer): I am wondering if it is really useful here. And I am also wondering if targeting sections as a body itself is the right way to do it. If you have a position where you have a president of a local section that violates these issues clearly, is it really useful to exclude the whole section?

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Again, I don't understand if one is not a Federalist, why would they have the membership with the Young European Federalists?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): So the next amendment is an addition from JEF Germany to new countries in order to pursue the political goals of JEF and grow as a movement. Is it something controversial that deserves a debate? Do we accept it?

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Then addition 58 by JEF Germany to increase the representation of a broad range of young Europeans, I don't think this is too controversial, either. I don't see any hands. I'm assuming we can adopt it. Thank you. Then on 61 there is an amendment proposed by JEF Germany to delete at European level. Does this need debating, comments, discussion?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): *JEF Europe's cooperation with national national sections should be further deepened.* A bit of rephrasing doesn't seem to be controversial, so I suggest we move on.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Kati Systä (Executive Board): For the next, I have nothing against adding the leadership. But coming back to the discussions we had last August, I know we have bigger and well established sections with well established onboarding structures, but this was also a request for by some sections who felt that they have completely new people coming into their boards who have no previous experience in NGO management, financial management and so on. And this was a request to be a focus to support this onboarding and capacity building.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): I think the end wording made more sense. Or maybe we can combine them in a way. What we usually have is improving the capacity in the practical aspects of governance, and that's why original writing made more sense when it comes to us providing capacities and transfer of knowledge.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Thank you. And then a longer amendment for line 94 being a federalist organisation itself, the division of task roles, as well as coordination between different levels of check from the executive board to national, regional local section should be implemented coherently, consistently and effectively in order to increase the political work of JEF and the functioning of the whole organisation.

Melanie Thut (JEF Germany, Observer): Since we are advocating for a federalist Europe, it is also a super advantage to lead our federalist organisation. And I would like us in the future to work more on this and to also divide a bit more the task, like when we look at the political goals we have, we can divide what should do the European level, what should do a local section, what should do a national section? And this is why I think it is important to mention it here. And as well, since we in Germany have our regional, local sections, it is also important for us to give them one space in this strategy, since they are very always asking us to be part of the work.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Can we accept this unanimously, or does someone oppose this? There's one opposition, so let's leave this for votes for tomorrow.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



And then there's a second proposed addition to the same point, the same line, 94, two. *JEF Europe often employs young professionals and dedicated JEFers, which results in periodic changes in the composition of the Secretariat. There is continuous need for JEF Europe to provide midterm career evolution perspectives and for the Secretary to be seen as an integral part of European level of the network.* And I am thinking, there might be a mistake in submitting the amendment as this is almost the same as the next paragraph. So I am assuming that this aims to replace the next paragraph and then change the second sentence of it.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Indeed, it is supposed to replace the next paragraph. We rephrase it because this is, of course, an extensive strategical debate we already had, and we think it is very important to have the best wording as possible here. So there are changes in both the first part and the second part, the first part, and we are in the context here of this, of course, the first part acknowledges that we both have young, professional and dedicated JEFers. So we had a discussion about this, and we thought it should be both, not just one or the other, because both bring different perspectives and skills to the organisation. And then the second part, we wanted to shift the focus a little bit from this, we just have to have a good image to we have to offer this midterm perspective for people to stay longer with us and also to develop certain skills and certain at gain certain experiences, and at the same time to be an integral part of the network. So I think it adds a few nuances that are not there in the original text that would improve the strategic context on the European Secretariat.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Thank you. Is anyone opposing the amendments I see?

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): I agree with the content. I feel we have to keep the phrase about, practices and images, because we did have trouble getting good candidates for some of our positions in the past. And it has to be part of our strategy, strategy that we have a good reputation. It is part of the strategy. When we want to attract, we must have a good image of the labour market, and it has been balanced to some extent. So to make sense for it



to be part of the family strategy, a good image as an employer. So I think we can find a way to put the phrase that we changed, but also keep this criteria today very important. It is essential

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Thank you. I would propose that we vote on this tomorrow, or alternatively, I am proposing Robin and Aléxandros try to come up with a compromise for tomorrow. Otherwise, then going to number hundred.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): It's a rephrasing instead of JEF Europe supports its national sections. Suggestion is to work that JEF Europe works together with national sections. Nothing controversial here. I suggest we move on to the next amendment. Same a suggestion in suppressing achieving a more federal Europe, at least achieving a federal Europe. Do you think that this is a controversial amendment that needs discussion? No to the next one. So rephrasing as well.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): So going on to financial area, or the priority area five, so on line, 228, the proposal is to replace the word is with has proven, and the word considered with the words to be so the new sentence, instead of the budget presented twice a year during statutory meeting, is not considered enough. Instead, say has proven to proven not to be enough. Does this need debating discussions?

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Budget has not been a problem. So we do think it should have been done more often, because we consider it not enough. And I know we have had a very loving conversation, but this is about the budget plan and the budget management. So I know there are cases where it has directly done is about, specifically about, the budget.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): It's not necessarily about the budget and what you mean, because it is just a consequence of communication. But it's not about the budget strategy. So don't remove it

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Kati Systä (Executive Board): I see Christelle is asking the floor, and during Christelle's turn, I'm taking the last request for the floor, then I'm closing the debate about the financial updates that should be more frequent.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): Then we can also add that financial updates that should be more frequent as we also believe that clear communication is important.

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): from a personal experience, the meetings that we had on the budget, and also all the documents provided to the network, really brought the network together. And I thought it was nice to see that so many people participated. And I think this reflects the spirits who also collectively engage in their commitment or finances. So I support this.

Kati Systä (Executive Board) Financial updates. Okay, I would welcome, I'm assuming that this goes into vote tomorrow, and I would welcome JEF Italy to make the additional needed amendments, if you should feel, or anyone else should feel that there are those are necessary, then going on to last four. 131: proposal to remove, especially those coming from non EU sections. We discuss this together with 132, as it is connected to the same place. And it proposes to add students and unemployed activists.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium) : So they have to go together? Indeed, because if we add students and unemployed activists. It sounds a little odd to say, especially people from non EU Sections, because it would seem like they are put into a one bag with unemployed people and students like it just gives you a wrong feeling of the sentence. But of course, if the second part is not added, then the first specification makes more sense to remain so we have to consider them together.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Thank you. Quickly before that, just to give some background, the point of non EU sections here was something that was raised in the thematic workshops last autumn, and was a request from some non EU sections.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): I understand your point, Robin, in making this. Personally, I would argue to keeping it, especially those coming from the non EU section, because I personally, having a lot of friends in non EU sections, can tell that they really do struggle to reach our events, not just financially, but also because of legal hurdles or just infrastructure, the fact that certain flight paths are not available.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): it, just to clarify the amendment is indeed to keep it, but just to add students and unemployed activists. So exactly as it shown on the screen.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): expanding on the great future. So there is a proposal now from Robin that there would be a new amendment integrating both.

Xesc Mainzer (Executive Board, VP): Thank you. The issue, which I see is that students are in many cases in same positions with financial constraints as many activists. So I think the main issue is not about being a student or not, but about the financial situation. I was going to offer to make myself an amendment, also to put that there.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Hence, maybe Robin and you, you can sit down to discuss the compromise.

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): those that have less financial needs. The one thing that I was still thinking is that non EU Sections would also be referred to Norway or Switzerland, which is my understanding. I am not that more countries with the least financial means.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Last word from Reinis and then I'm proposing that we close this discussion. So Robin, I'm guessing JEF, Italy as well, and all the other relevant people who want to be included in drafting a new proposal, and we vote on that tomorrow.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): I would drop the part about those coming from non EU sections, because even in the UK, they are quite rich

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



countries, you know. And I will say that also the people coming from other non EU countries, like maybe they have financial stability. So I would not say that this should be a factor in this. A factor should be financial constraints, students and unemployed activists.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): doing both amendments and approving both amendments. Thank you. Let's close the debate.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): We have closed the debate, but the options are now that if there is a third amendment coming tomorrow, then we will have three amendments go into votes. Otherwise, we will have these two that go into votes tomorrow. And I'm in welcoming everyone who is participating in this debate to coordinate, for instance, with Robin to find a suitable amendment that would address all your concerns that you've raised here. Thank you. And then we go on to 135 to the objective. So the proposal is to delete: *facilitate the participation in statutory events in collaboration with member sections while pursuing its political goals*.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): It is of course, not speaking against statutory events, because that is already mentioned in the context and also the action points. It is just what is the objective? It is that the budget that exists should be used to pursue its political goals. In the original reading, it sounded as if the main objective would be to facilitate participation in statutory events, which cannot be the main objective of our strategy in terms of finances.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): I see the point that you want to make here. But I think in order to proceed to pursue political goals, we need to have, like as much as the people from sections present in statutory events. So I think we should keep parts of it that have "give more spaces"

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): an alternative could be that JEF Europe's goal is to increase his financial and non financial support means within the limits of the budget and towards sections in order to pursue its political

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



by ensuring the participation of national sections in the statutory events. So I will suggest this. Thank you. Good news. The last one, Robin, if I am not mistaken, is rather just a clarification so JEF Europe and the section support each other in terms of capacity building for financial management and literacy as well as project management. The original phrasing meant that only JEF Europe would support sections, but here we add also the horizontality that Robin was referring to earlier. Is it controversial? Do you want to discuss it? No, with that being said, thank you very much. We have had a look at all the amendments. We welcome yours until 8pm. And I have a very special thank you to Kati. She took this subject very at heart. She trained the EB in terms of designing a strategy, and then she inspired all of you to make these contributions. So it was an amazing opportunity for me to learn what a strategy is. So if you don't see anything against it, I would suggest we clap.

Kati Systä (Executive Board): Thank you, everyone, and as mentioned earlier, all of the points that we discussed are still left open. So feel free to try to come up with compromises that address all the concerns that you have expressed here, and hopefully we can come up with the best possible strategy that will serve our network for the next four years, and JEF will be better, shinier and all together, the best possible Network, also in 2028, thanks everyone!

Executive Board report

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): So first of all, a bit of a political introduction. So we are now in a moment where a lot of movement in the world, in Europe, there are a lot of negative developments in the US, we see the extreme right rise a lot. We have been a bit about this in the introduction to the four year strategy. But basically this is also a moment of momentum, a moment where we can have an alternative, this radical project we discussed on the topic. So this is a big moment for us to be there, to be allowed to advocate for ideas, and it is also a bit about opportunities. We have our own priorities. But then there is what is hot in the press, hot topics, and that we need to pursue as a movement, opportunities to push for, maybe parts of federalism. We were not advocating so much for

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



common defense 10 years ago, but it was not a big topic. There was not a lot of popularity for a common army before. So it is a bit go with the flow, and a lot of people can change ideas at this moment where there is uncertainty and then support this small or big steps towards federalism. So it is also about picking the right debate and finding federal solutions to what bothers and anguishes people at the moment.

So of course, we have been working on treaty change. We discussed last time that treaty change is something that's a bit long term background, because in Brussels, there is this idea that it needs to happen, but please not now, because it is complicated, this unanimity, etc. It is in the manifesto of all main political parties, but it is not necessarily at the front and among the hot topics to be discussed. It is still blocked at the European Council. So we continue to do background work on this, because this is how we would solve so many issues. So that is why we are working a lot with the US. So the Action Committee for the United States of Europe, which is with the Spinelli Group, the Union of European Federalists, and the association Jean Monnet with the idea to bring more personalities, more people, to advocate for federalism in general. One of the streams we have done defense on this with a paper to try to influence the white paper on defense. And it is also the type of circle where we are not just alone, and we try to find friends who advocate with us. We also worked a lot with Civil Society Europe (CSE), for example, on the multi financial framework, because it sounds very technical, but it is very key to define how and what will be the main priorities of the European Union. So it is very key for JEF as well to advocate for fabulous ideas, for making sure it is not just national projects, that there is also subsidiarity there, and that all main priorities also get funded through own resources. So there are a lot of things to push forward, and we are way stronger when we manage to convince a network like Civil Society Europe, which includes dozens of organisations, to advocate for this with us. So we have been working on a common briefing paper that was distributed to decision makers, it will also be published at some point. And then finally, we also also in Civil Society Europe, in the dedicated working group. So there are a lot of streams, and Julian, our policy officer, has been of great support there, because we have a lot of work to be done. The CSE State of the Union is something regular that we do, where we analyse what needs to change and also what are the Conference on the future of Europe,

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



recommendations still pending, including treaty change. Another big topic is enlargement. I'll let Hanna tell us more on that.

Hanna Lein-Mathisen (Executive Board): So you all know that you know what a campaign, if not, I hope you can speak to later. It's mostly for non EU sections or E sections that lack EU freedoms. And we have done a lot for this project, and the year that has been and we have some other nice plans as well. We have been at the Youth Policy dialog on enlargement of Commissioner Kos with Commissioner Micallef as well. And we will be on the policy advisory group for the next year. We're also working on the report for that. So it's going to be interesting. Your COVID is also under the complete EU question that we're doing. So it's going to do that and quite connected. So we have been working with our partners in Eastern Partnership and Western Balkan countries, for youth manifesto for a united and large union, and we are cooperating with them on next up towards integration and enlargement, as well as, Oh yeah, we have different partners in western Balkan than the Eastern partnerships. And we're publicating this in early April. It's going to be really interesting. It's going to be all over social media. So I hope you will follow it. We also it's a nice size, well, please. We also have two capacity building weeks with a lot of interesting seminars we work with coming up in May, as well as a consortium meeting in June, in Denali and a simulation in October. No, you

Martin Penov (Executive Board, VP): But funny, I'm saying this today since the 21st anniversary of Bulgaria during NATO. So yeah, but ironic that we'll be covering the French right now because in the state of everything, so I've written quite a few things there, but they're mostly there for the aesthetics. So you know my kids, right? Democracy. So over the past six months you will take we've probably seen them. We've been talking quite a bit about these topics, particularly with the recent developments in many countries in our neighborhood, from the protests so students in Serbia, so in December to the past year in Georgia, more or less the war in Ukraine. The protests now happening in Turkey. The protests are happening in Romania and Hungary. So the entire region has mostly been facing someone today made a Wikipedia page called the Balkan spring. Please do not use that too, but that is kind of where we are at. And I want to highlight that because civil

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



society organisations in particular are in a really bad spot when all of this happening. So just over the past few weeks, we had quite a few organizations, which I personally knew in Georgia, for instance, all of them have had their legal entities that protected all of them have had closed down activities, some of them in October, some more recently, and many of them have had legal cases brought against them for taking part in the protests, have had their funding and accounts frozen, or have been forced to go on foreign agents registers, and we've seen similar laws coming up in multiple countries now in Europe, as JEF, we are taking part in for the FRA Fundamental Rights agency of the EU, where we hear updates from different partners in the region and also in Western Europe. And the picture is, I'm sorry to say, but I don't have anything positive to keep you guys right now. It is multiple attacks happening on NGOs and activists all over the continent. This is sort of a combination of what I say, commodification, of policies, opportunism, and just in general, the pressure we've been seeing mounting from from Russia. What I mean by commodification is that in 2022 we saw with the start of the war in Ukraine was shifting policies from slashing quite a lot of projects, initiatives, funding from green policies in order to make up for the inflation caused by the war. And now we are also seeing, because of the Renew focus on defense, that many of the initiatives surrounding civil society are simply on the chopping block because money needs to go outside. This is also important for them to mention, because this can affect in the future, a lot of the grants might be going for because this applies to service to life. Many of the products, like the EU and just in general, we've also. Seen on the national level, as well, any parties using the opportunity raised by all of this to actually advocate for cessation of funding for civil society. JEF was targeted by this by ECR and European Parliament, if you, or the Germans here are probably well aware of where the story started, initially, with elections in Germany, and as you say, not very amicable relations between the candidate, the Christian Democrats and the some activists. And this spiraled all the way to Brussels, eventually with now the com committee, where some neps, again from the Christian Democrats, proposed a report, which the ECR just simply jumped at the opportunity to promote even more national funding for civil society. It is my opinion, just foresight in this on the parts of DPP, but ECR, ESN, and many under these groups and the left are happily using this opportunity, because right now we are discussing the multi year financial framework, so all funding is

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



basically being reviewed. So when that's that's kind of where we are at in terms of it's not a big spot to be in, but we are possibly in talks with our partners from civil society Europe, from different organisations which are part of the civil society platform, fundamentals, agency at raise awareness of these issues, lobby policy makers. And I do encourage us sections to be doing this work, especially on the national level, because that's where a lot of these things actually start from, the grassroots. So before they make the race to Brussels, so please do more actual like in boxing, campaigning on these topics specifically. So after we just finished democracy under pressure. But you know, this isn't me, where we stopped and talking about these things. Use these things that we discussed with many of the activists we had Welcome to the discussions. Use the things we discussed last night with our speakers, misinformation and, you know, push for more protecting spike to this because, like I mentioned, the priorities now in Brussels are completely shifting. We are going towards a bit more of a wartime mentality. And, yeah, youth Fauci in general are simply not really a priority for most major parties. You can see this also in many other fields, including terms of approach to Russia, in relations there, in terms of enlargements, in terms of development aid, because now the situation of USAID, also, many of the organisations in Eastern Europe, including even organisations are part of have been severely hit financially because many of them relied on this funding, because the commission does not give such funding in many cases, but USA that American but Asian foundations did, especially to pre media, and this is gone now, and we also seeing similar things happen with radio pre Europe decision initiatives, and This will have a devastating impact on the region's democracy. So this is where most of we as movement solidated NGOs have us support them. This is also a kind of call to support your JEFers from those countries with that said it was still on that slide. Yeah. So with next steps, we are continuing, obviously, on these topics, of course, and after the ending of this, FC, Katya and I will be heading to Ukraine at the middle of next week to be meeting with partner organisations with the opening of Levi's European Youth capital and the opening tournament there. So hopefully we'll be able to get even some more personal insights from activists on the ground, and hopefully you might get eventually to yeah, yes, under pressure. Okay, I already told you just about everything last night, but amazing campaign. Thank you so much again for taking part in it. Love to see how How excited

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



everyone was for this and all the contributions. And as a big takeaway, because I've already spoken about a lot, we spoke to many activists from our network, but also from Russia and Belarus, and I do recommend you guys to go and listen to those discussions, because the main takeaway was being listen. Just listen, because activists from these countries have solutions to the problems they're facing. They just don't really have any opportunities to voice them. So that's completely okay. Thanks.

Kati Systä (Executive Board)

So talking about communications, we've been keeping busy. Martin already presented the Democracy under pressure -campaign, and thank you once again, everyone who contributed. I've been so happy to see messages about the state of democracy communicated by exceptions across Europe. So you've done amazing job. In the meantime, we've been COVID busy. It's 11 different statements and years that we've done since beginning of November, many of them together with year sections, some of them by UEF and other civil society partners, which we have co signed. One of them is actually missing because it came out last Friday, and I did this slide on Thursday. So to add on to this, together with the European Youth Forum and the political party youth organisations on European level, we made a common statement regarding the recent attack against civil society organisations funding by the ECR group in the European Parliament, which I'm sure you've heard of already. So all of these you can find on our website and short summaries of them also on our Instagram, if you don't have time to go and read the full statement. But yeah, we've covered topics to from situations and ongoing protests in different countries to, for instance, the ongoing developments of the US policy in relation to Europe, European countries and in general, against the world. So very happy to also get any insights or ideas from you guys. If there is a national situation or any other topic that you wish that we would highlight, feel free to reach out to anyone of us from the EV you can see our policy areas on the website, but you can always reach out to your EB contact person, or really just any one of us, and we'd be very happy to work together with you to create new common statements, common posts on Instagram and so on, whatever you wish. But going on to the next slide, yes, starting with some of our social media channels. So last time I was reporting that Twitter had a decline of 100 in following.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Now I'm reporting minus 500 I am assuming that it is due to the current ownership of Twitter, slash x and a lot of people leaving the platform, but we still have fairly good numbers in terms of followers, but it is a platform that we are not currently using super actively either. Then on Facebook, it only shows past 28 days, and our following numbers have grown slightly, very, very, very little. We've done a couple of posts there, but we can clearly see that the audience there are older, older JEFers who are not using the platform either so actively, so the engagements in those posts are quite low, which also kind of describes why it is not our core platform in the same way that it has been in previous times. Our current Tiktok follower number is 250 so not too many, but we've got a bit more than 50 more, 54 new followers since last time. But we could ideally have more. So if you have friends who are using Tiktok, invite them to follow us. If you have any good ideas on what to post there, feel free to reach out and yeah, happy to collaborate. And then finally, on this slide, going into our newsletters, we have almost 10,000 members in Europe, but all together, both our newsletters are subscribed to by around 5000 so now I'm inviting all of you to bring up your phones if you're not getting our newsletters yet, you can subscribe to them by using the QR code, so this way you can always get at least once a month information about all our trainings, all our seminars, all our events, straight to your mailboxes, and that way you never miss any news from us. Okay, then going on to find our slide so Instagram, and here I'm happy to report said growth in terms of followers. Last time I was reporting that our follower numbers had grown 3.7% and now we have seen growth since beginning of November, when the last FC was now it is around 10% growth in terms of follower numbers. So we are very happy to do that...

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): Thank you very much. It is an honour to present our application for hosting the FC, especially having in mind that we joined JEF Europe as a full member just in Madrid. So if we could go to the next slide. Thank you. So why do we believe it's important for Jef to come to Serbia? So first of all, we can see that trends in Serbia, especially among our peers, are leaning towards Euroscepticism and the European Commission especially is not contributing to those trends. What we believe is that a clear message needs to be sent from the youth from all over Europe that youth in Serbia is not left alone on an isolated island, waiting for someone to look it over

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



because if it happens, it's going to be too late. And the support for any kind of integration within Europe, we believe it will be lost within a generation. I believe you all have followed the protests happening in Belgrade, but also all of Serbia and we can see that people there are fighting for fundamental European values as a respect of rule of law and democracy. The plenaries and faculties have created participative direct democracy, which is something far different from what we've ever seen in Serbia. And they have engaged so much people that we have seen more than 400,000 people in the streets of Belgrade on the 15th of March. If we could go to the next slide. So, you might be wondering how are we going to do it, especially having in mind that JEF Europe most probably will not be able to fund an event outside of the European Union. If we could go to the next slide. We have created a list of our options for accommodation, venue, and travels, which we will talk about it later, but we see it as far important. And if you were to go on a member area of JEF Europe, you can actually see that we have, it's a quite complicated table, so we have created like an infographic of how to read it. But we also have a budget estimated. So, there are two proposals for travels. And we really want to be able to have a participative event.

If we could go to the next slide. So, when it comes to accommodation, venue, and meals, they would all be in one place if we get the first accommodation that's our first choice. If not, they would be very close by and in the city centre. This one that we really love is like 15 minutes from the city centre, and it is actually, like everything would be in one place. We would not have to go anywhere for this. And actually, it would, we believe, would be much easier because during the breaks you could go to a room if you need to rest a bit, which we also see as important to have everything in one place. And also, it would be easier to organise the group. If we could go to the next slide. So, as I mentioned, we have comprised new idea of travel. Because JEF Europe would not be able to cover our costs of this FC, we have been looking at and creating estimates of how we could fund travels. The first proposal that you can see on the left is if we were to use a solidarity fund for like 10 people. And on the right side, you can see our estimate of either covering a full price of the tickets or a part of the price for delegates from every national section. If we could go to the next slide. When it comes to social programme, we have started to comprise a list. There is a part near the city centre where you can find a bit of an alternative cafes and clubs, which are also close to the

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



accommodation, around 20 minutes walking distance or 10 minutes by bus. And there are many options. I don't know if you knew this, but Belgrade is one of the party capitals among the top 10s in all of Europe. So, we will also be providing a list of clubs that you might want to go on privately, but we will also be organising like a one evening for everyone to join.

So, because JEF Europe might not be able to cover the costs, we have comprised a list of potential donors. Our first instance would be foundations.

As some of you might know, but for those that don't, JEF Serbia is a part of the European movement in Serbia. That's our legal entity. And they have extensive cooperation with Friedrich Hebert Stiftung. And we believe that they would be willing to cover, if not all, then most of the costs for the FC. But we would also strive to contact Henry Paul and the European Youth Foundation for co-funding. Moreover, the European movement in Serbia has for three decades now cooperation with embassies of Germany, France, and the United Kingdom, which could be our second option for finding finances as they have already supported the movement both in the 90s, where it was even harder to work, and after the fall of Slobodan Milosevic's regime. The third option would be to find a project funding where we are not very keen on this option because we don't really want to projectify a statutory event. But if we can find a project funding that can fit this event without changing its core and its purpose and values, we believe that we would look for options to apply. And lastly, the European movement in Serbia has a lot of liquidity.

It has been strengthening its position within the NGOs in Serbia, and would be able to cover costs of the federal committee happening in Serbia next year. Thank you very much. Do we take questions, all of us?.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): First of all, thank you for the wonderful presentation. It sounds really awesome. I really hope that hopefully next year we will meet in Belgrade, actually. But I have just a quick question. Because, as you said yourself, Europe cannot provide finance for the FC in Belgrade because it's not an EU member country yet. And you presented a lot of funding opportunities, but how much of these funding opportunities are you 100% sure, or at least 95% sure, that you are gonna get? And of these financing, funding



possibilities, is it also gonna allow us to hold the FC in its current form without making it a part of some kind of a project, or?

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): Yes, so this is why we have comprised four different options for holding an FC in Belgrade. For the first option of the foundations, we are about 80% sure that we can expect funding for the FC because for the Friedrich-Ebert-System, we cooperate every year. And even outside of the projects, they donate a lot of money. And after, because we had a meeting with them, they actually said that they would consider funding this opportunity, the federal committee.

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): Thanks a lot, thank you for the amazing presentation. Just need to clarify, it's correct that we have funded without funding from EGEP Europe, but if we get one of the two operating grants, they are Erasmus Trust, and Serbia participates in Erasmus Trust.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate):

So it is correct to fund without it, but the rule that everything that is outside the EU is relevant to that of the other operating grant. So it actually improves the chances, you talked about it very extensively. But just so you know, it's not as a big value, but in all fairness, there are very good chances that you will be able to get an Erasmus opportunity.

At the time of applying, we were not aware that the Erasmus could be one of the options. But I would say that that even makes it easier, because we would need to fundraise a smaller amount of money. And it is different to EGEP.

Anna van de Moosdijk (Directly-elected FC member, TF Capacity Building co-chair): Regarding funding, also, I was wondering because we have this complete EU project and that there's supposed to be a formal simulation in November, I think, so around the dates, I guess, of the autumn. I've seen, oh, that's the Spring FC, okay, sorry. So I was wondering if also as one of the participants, maybe they could have a part of it redirected to the organisation of the FC, like it could be a track meeting there or something like that, related to the project.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): I would not say that I am the most competent to answer this question, so maybe someone from the EB or the Secretariat can answer you.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary-General): It is true that we are going to have the simulation, but unfortunately, even the budget for the simulation is quite tight, so I don't think that we are going to be able to get anything from that for this year, though I think it would be a good idea. On our list next is Alex, and we have Luca, Nia, and Greg.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): Yes, I think, I'm not exceeding what I've said earlier. Yes, thank you, Nia, for the presentation. It was very insightful and also very thought-provoking. I want to enquire in regards to the foundations. We have some experience working with them. Are you, apart from to what extent you are certain that they would be willing to provide funding, are you certain they would be willing to not require some extent of projectification of the FC, since in our experience, civic education foundations do usually require some type of justification for events, be it cultural exchange, political education, democratic promotion, so on and so forth?

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): Yes, but I believe that, and after talking also to the Secretary General of the European Movement in Serbia, because she has much more experience with them, we have talked about it, and we think that having young people from all around Europe would send a message across Serbia, and therefore, we believe that they would fund it, because it would be a really clear message that youth in Serbia is not alone, and also of, in some way, an exchange between different views coming from different countries.

Luca Preller (JEF Denmark, Observer): I just wanted to also follow up on that particular question, because from also my personal experience, foundations do not fund a general event without a specific, yeah, cooperation agreement, or something like in written terms, and also, like events of organisations, I have not experienced foundations to fund that beforehand, so that's why I'm a little bit



surprised that especially the German foundations would be likely to fund that kind of event. So that was just a comment, maybe, from my side.

And then my follow-up question would be, what part of your budget would the foundations be willing to fund? Would it be the travel costs? Would it be the accommodation? Would it be maybe the membership or the participation fee that usually the participants need to pay? Could you explain that a little bit more in detail? It would be nice, thank you.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): Yes, I will just ask the President if we could go back to the slide with, yes. So we are not sure what part of the budget they would be willing to pay, but we think that they would be willing to pay most of the part. If not, we also have an option to ask embassies about co-financing. We believe that, from our experience, German embassy would actually be very willing to fund this kind of event. And why I asked for us to go back to this slide is because we would still keep the participation fees as they are, but we would strive to cover travel expense. Because it is usually the bigger cost for most people coming, especially in Serbia, that is not as well connected as some of the Western European countries. But also because if we were to, we want to make a bit of a change when it comes to the events, because we have had problems participating. To be more exact, we could not participate in Tartu because we were unable to fund a trip that cost more than 450 euros. And therefore, either covering a part of the trip or all of the trip. And by the way, we have created country limits which you can read in our budget. So, that is why we would still keep the participation fee, but we would look forward to cover travels for every delegate.

Nea-Maria Törmänen (Coopted FC member, PC 2 co-chair): I wanted to thank you for the presentation and I wanted to ask since I gathered that you have some venue in mind for the FC, so I wanted to ask how have you taken into account the accessibility of the FC that you are proposing? Thanks.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): This is a private dorm, our least, our most favourite option, the first one. It is like a private student dorm that is open from Friday to Sunday for having events. And to my knowledge, it does provide

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



accessibility in all of its corridors. However, we would still strive to ensure accessibility. So, if this accommodation, and we would look more detailed into it when the date becomes closer, we would strive to have the accommodation that can accompany accessibility requirements, but also other parts of our idea for the F.C. are accessible and we are sure of that.

Erik Rosljajev (JEF Estonia, National Delegate): Thank you. I just wanted to know, in the interest of contingency planning, worst case scenario, is there a debt that if you don't have enough funding, that it has to move to a different location?

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): We have not thought about not providing a budget or enough money for this event, because we have a long list, and especially because the European movement could fund a part of it. But if the federal committee would want that, we could decide on a certain deadline if people feel like it is needed. So we would be open to establish a date.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you, just a quick comment. Basically, because you are going to vote on this, and if things change, we cannot change the location anymore. If you decide on having it in Belgrade, then it is Belgrade. So we cannot change the location if something changes. We just have to adjust the situation. Thank you very much, JEF Serbia, for this presentation. We will now leave the floor to JEF Greece for their candidacy.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer): So, hello from us to the Greek delegation. I would like to start the presentation about the proposal of JEF Greece of hosting the Spring FC in Athens in 2026. I would like to welcome you to Athens and kindly request you to bring FC and JEF Europe back to the birthplace of democracy in Athens. JEF, in our country, has 40 years of history with the first section in Athens launched in 1987 and two years later in Thessaloniki. And besides the ups and downs, we have been reorganised after COVID with the past president of Achilles, for those who know him. And we are right now reopening the local sections in Thessaloniki and Athens. And right now we are expanding, two years later, three years later, of 2022 when Achilles took over, and planning to start two more sections in Komotini and Rhodes. So, by bringing the next FC and JEF

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Europe in our country, in Athens, it would be an amazing possibility for our members to boost their confidence, as they did in last December with the EP meeting in Athens. And thank you guys very much for that. It would be great for our members. So, I will give the floor to Dimitrios to present to you some more technical information. And then I'll hand it back to Christos for the budget, for the boring part, let's say, the technicalities.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): So, we said again, Athens is going to be on the 27th and 29th of March. Now, in terms of accessibility, Athens is a very accessible city. We have a very big international airport that has very cheap fares. Part of the EU, part of the Schengen, that means easy access to Athens. But you can also choose or opt in to come with boat or train. We're going to present you now the venues we have selected. We have three choices, but we aim to get the first. And the same, we have a mix of hotels that we will also highlight to you for your reference. The first is the Armed Officers Club. This is the primary venue that we're going to do all the proceedings. These are two pictures just to get a little bit of a glimpse of how the space looks like. The second space is the Seraphio City of Athens. It's a new space, a sustainable space that has also a conference space that can fit the needs of the FC. This is the main hall, let's say. And then the third option, which we think is really difficult to actually get, and it's actually expensive, is that there is actually a hall under the Museum of Acropolis. I have to say, I wouldn't pin the hopes up. We are aiming for the first option, but as part of our obligations with the proposal that we submitted, we had to submit three venues, and that is the third option. So, moving on to accommodations, where we would like you to stay.

And we have chosen three great options. The first one is Atalos. The second is the Athens Hub Hostel, and then it's the Athens 21 Hotel. For the case of the two other accommodations, it cannot fit all of you, unfortunately, so you will be split in two groups. But the good thing is that both are very close to each other, one minute away walking distance. These are some pics from the Atalos Hotel, just to get some reference. Also, spoiler alert, all of the hotels have a rooftop access that sees the Acropolis. Then they are all based in Monastiraki, which is the main, let's say the heart of Athens, where all of the nightlife and all of the archaeological sites are. So, if you want to roam around the city after the activities of the FC, it will

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



be very, very easy. And it's also where the pedestrian route is, so there are no cars in that area, so you can enjoy the views and the parks that are nearby. This is the Athens Hub Hostel, also a very great choice. As I said, all of the venues that we have selected are between one to two minutes walking distance with each other in order to make things easy. And this is the Athens 21 Hotel. The two latter, as I said, cannot fit all of you, so you will be split in the two. And now let's see a little bit of a map. So, we have made sure that for the entirety of the FC, that you will be able to commute around using public transport. We want to do it in the sustainable way, and Athens' extensive public transport.

Allows us to do things very easily and quickly. With the red dots are basically where the venues are, while the pink dot is where all of the hotels are. All of them, as you can see, are connected within the same line, which is the port to airport line.

This means that if you arrive by plane or port, you will be able to directly come to the hotel and check in for a seamless entry to Athens. Now, let's talk a little bit about what we have thought about socials. We have two categories, two that are to be confirmed. We're working on them, and we will be able to confirm them within the next few months. And then we have the planned activities. So, let us begin with the planned activities. For the planned activities, we have done something really traditional in Greek, which is a souvlaki and syrtaki night. So, it will be a mix of traditional Greek food and dance. You will be able to learn a little bit of syrtaki, the Greek dance, and try to attempt it yourself. And for those who are vegan or vegetarian, we can confirm that they are vegan and vegetarian souvlakis as well. As for the other two options that we have also thought of is an Acropolis Hill Tour. This means that we will use one of the evenings, one of the afternoons, as an opportunity to take you up the hill and take a very nice picture and check the view of Athens. The last, which is a very classical activity when it comes to youth gatherings, is a Eurofeast, which means that this requires your input. This means that every one of you will be required to bring something local and do a little bit of an intercultural exchange with food and drinks. And now about the ones that we are thinking of, we're planning, the one is an EU defence debate. This is something that we are planning to do it in the first venue to bring some representatives from the Greek military to give a little bit of their perspective about the ever-changing landscape when it comes to defence, especially about

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



what's happening right now in the Mediterranean. And the optional one, which is self-funded, we have considered the option of doing an activity, a day trip, that's going to be planned outside of the remit of the FC. That means that it's going to be planned either a day before it begins or a day after, which means that we will take you with a boat to one of the islands of Argos Saronikos, which is only an hour away from Athens and also easily accessible by the metro. The planned cost per person that we have for this activity is around 30 euros and we will try to integrate it with an educational format as well to do also an activity in the island about a GNN island policy with local politicians. Now, we also think a little bit about sustainability and how we can make our FCs greener. Our vision is, since Athens is one of the, Athens, Greece generally, is one of the countries plagued by climate change, is to try to consider some solutions to make the FC a little bit greener. We see the impact that climate change has had in our country in recent years and we only see this incidence growing more and more. So this means that we need to do our little bit as youth to improve the environmental, to reduce the environmental impact of our gatherings, our FCs. So we're gonna have two action plans. One targeting in mobility. This means, because mobility is basically the largest amount of emissions that are caused because of your mobility to Athens. Of course, there's not much we can do about it because we cannot just simply suck the emissions away, but what we're planning to do is we're calling this initiative Green Mobility Notifications.

This means that participants that live outside of the remit of two hours flying distance from Athens will be notified through email to opt in for green means to come to Greece, whether that is bus, whether that is train, whether that is with boat, to reduce their impact. And that is because short-haul flights emit more. Long-haul flights are considered to be, well, we cannot really avoid that, to be frank. So we are planning that on the part of the mobility, while when it comes to the logistics, we have committed to choose greener spaces. This means that all of the venues we have opted have some energy efficiency plans in place. This means that the, this means basically that they either have some energy reduction policies or measures to ensure that there is low energy consumption during our venues, or there are newer spaces. For an example, like the Seraphio, which is a sustainable space, and its whole remit and idea was on sustainability. That also

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



applies on how you move around. For the entirety of the FC, we're gonna be using the metro network. So this means there are gonna be no emissions when it comes to moving around. And last but not least, for food. This means that the caterers we choose are gonna be choosing local produce. We're not gonna be opting for solutions that basically emit more. That means that they're using sustainable methods of moving the food around. And also that means that we will partner with local charities for any excess food that is going to be left out from our FCs to be given away and not thrown away.

And now for the serious part. And I will hand back the floor back to Christos.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer): So, just a little bit about budget. As you can see here, we have three proposals regarding the hotels. All the estimated costs done in mind of 100 people. We have the income we also calculated is regarding the participation fees from the national delegates and the observers. Again, with the amount of 100 people. And we made some scenarios here that include accommodation and the meals. As you can see, in the first scenario, we are going to accommodate in the first hotel, the Atlas Hotel, which is a place that, as you said before in the photos, and also it's a place with 100 capacity that can easily host, so it is affordable option. The second scenario is to split to the second and the third option, the Athens Hub Hostel and the Athos 21 Hotel. And the third and fourth scenario is to split between first and second or first and third option. So, let's move to the next slide to see a little bit about catering, about the lunches on Saturday and Sunday, dinners and coffee breaks. And to move also to the next one. Generally, we can calculate an income of fees of some, an amount from our donations fund and our grants fund from JEF Greece. That is the grants that we received since last year. We have started to apply for grants to Stavros Niarchos Foundation, Votosaki Foundation, Onassis Foundation. There are Greek foundations and we can reallocate some funds if we got selected to host the FC. The expenses include the socials, the venues, the accommodation and the meals. And you see the minimum and the maximum total amount of the expenses and the deviation that it occurs. So, before we end, just one remark. I want you to have in mind that Athens is very excited. Our members are very excited. This all was a team effort of almost eight people. We are an accessible option regarding the airport, the venues and the hotels, and sustainable, we have sustainable

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



transportation and we have great weather and food. So, we can't wait to host you in Athens next year. Thank you very much. Then we're taking questions.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): Firstly, thank you for the wonderful presentation. What looks like it would be an amazing time. My question is regarding the finances. If you'd rather go back to the slide that shows your, exactly this one. This one, okay. Unless my math is off, which could be. My math grade was not that good. There's still a gap of between 10 and 12,000 euros in regards to what is covered and what is not covered. Have you established plans in regards to where you want to go organise 12,000 euros for the FC? So, do you have certain sponsors, organisations, partners that would really succeed the bike company? This is gonna be, thank you first of all for the question.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer): The deviation that occurs, it's regarding the amount that we're gonna need from JEF Europe to finance, to help us finance the event. So, we have some income. We have some donations and grants aside. Of course, during the next year, a lot may occur, some more income, but at this time of presenting the proposal, this is the deviation, so this is the amount, the minimum and the maximum amount that we're going to need from JEF Europe. Thank you. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): I'll ask a general question. Could I just get a clarification about that? If it's flight over two hours, what was your, what do you mean by that? Basically, the whole idea is we will try to encourage you to limit short-haul flights. This is not gonna be mandatory.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer): Of course, you can opt out to come with any way to Athens, but we have the ability and it doesn't really require a lot of logistical effort from us to make a little bit of an effort and then ask participants kindly to choose greener means if they're within the remit, within the field of one to two hours of travel time to Athens, because there are trains, there are boats, there are buses. It is a shame because short-haul flights emit more than long-haul flights. So, if we can try to at least minimise that because we cannot do carbon



capture, we cannot pay for that, we cannot come up with other innovative schemes, this is the least we can do to basically incentivise you.

Luca Preller (JEF Denmark, Observer): First of all, thanks again for your wonderful presentation and I think we all got a really nice impression of Athens. I also wanted to follow up on the question regarding funding again. So, first, my question would be maybe also in regards to the deviation you calculated. Did you contact the executive board or the secretariat about this and maybe they could also comment on that regarding the financial planning for the upcoming year, if that is a realistic number which F-Europe would cover? So, that would be one question and then my other question would be regarding the grants because you talked about you could reallocate some of those grants. I didn't get that, but could you explain that once again for the audience? Thank you very much.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): Of course, thank you for the question. Starting from the second part of your question, we have a fund in our, as JEF Greece, and we have these grants. We have received in the past some grants and we have planned to do some activities for the next two years, but we can allocate this 1,000 euros to support the hosting of FC the next year if we got selected. Regarding the first part, no, we haven't actually gotten contact because regarding the recent unsure uncertainty regarding the finances, we just calculated the deviation to have in mind that this is the amount, the minimum and the maximum possible amount that we may need. And after that, we can see along the way with the Board of Europe, when they also know the future of our finances, how can we plan to cover this? Have I answered your question? Yeah, Alexandra is next on the line. Yeah. So maybe she can.

Alexandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Thank you for the presentation indeed. To mention about this question, I think in both cases, for both presentations, they're both in the budget. What the normal FC should cost. So both are realistic. The question is how much can we cover with it? It's like we know that we can provide and we know we can provide the minimum required for both of them. So do not look for that for Belgrade or for Athens. We have to devote both our candidates because they did a lot of preparation. My question would be,

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



if you mentioned the Stavros Niarchos Foundation and Budo Shanti Foundation, I find the amount of the grants for those two very big foundations quite small. And I wanted to ask you how you would contribute them. What part of the co-funding is assured? What part of it is missing? What part of it is realistic? And what part of it is off-limits? How much of it is something we can rely on? Something we can help you with? Or we can really push for? Something that is very optimistic.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer): Thank you very much, Alexandros. Actually, this is the amount from our fund, from previous grants. Budo Shanti and Stavros Niarchos are the grants that we received in the previous years. So, I also mentioned Onassis because this year, in 2025, we're planning to reapply for this year for, again, grants from these foundations. So, probably, this is the hopeful scenario, this amount would be more in order to co-fund the budget. But I couldn't write that down because it's not certain, it's not sure yet. So, I just wrote down the amount that it is possible to have. Okay.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): We have three people on the list because otherwise we are running out of time and we are very very late.

Nea-Maria Törmänen (Coopted FC member, PC2 co-chair): Thank you for the lovely presentation. I have the same question that before. I would like to ask, how have you taken into account accessibility needs in your FC planning? Thank you.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer) Yes. That means for the venues, the hotel, or just in general? Just in general. All right. Well, the good thing is that all the venues are accessible. So, they all have ramps. There won't be any mobility limitations when it comes to that. The metro network has also an extensive accessibility infrastructure in place. So, I do not expect any hiccups whatsoever. I think everyone will be able to attend properly and enjoy themselves. Now, when it comes to the optional trip, the AENA trip, maybe some minor adjustments might be required because of course that requires a boat trip. But of course, as I said, this is an optional, that needs to be confirmed activity. And even if something comes up, we can try and work around the solution for sure.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Thank you very much. So, on the question of green transportations, I think it is a lovely idea. Maybe as a step, you could also make some research for support participants in finding their routes. Because recommending or urging them is different than also guiding them, especially for new jetters. So, that would be a suggestion on my end. The second thing is, I understand the deviation. Maybe an additional thing Jetra could do is not just supply you with money, but support your team in developing or strengthening fundraising capacities. And we can also add a team of capacity building, because I know it's a topic they would like to work on. So, I think if I may, I'd still encourage you, should you be chosen, to look for potential funders and then get support from other surrounding sections or in the August presentation, you saw some plans for the embassies. So, just to check the embassies, because the deviation you're asking from Jetra might be too much. We don't know that yet. The last thing I'd suggest to you, if you allow me, is also food and venues. Do you have ways to optimise them? And that's my direct to you.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): Thank you very, very much for your suggestions and the help. Regarding the first part, yes, actually it is, we are aimed to seek for more funding, but at the moment we're one year prior year. So, it's not that we have very certain answers to provide from the possible donors. So, we just put down the amount that there are actually, sorry, to put here, the amount that there are possible. And for example, in the venues, the 5,000 is the maximum we can, and it is a possibility, it is actually the plan to have a free venue. It is possible to have a free venue. But we put the maximum expense that may appear in order to have all in mind and to present to you the maximum expenses. Of course, the deviation could be minimised. Actually, also, the commutation of the meals could be cut more. But this is too early to ask for. Actually, these are made by contacting persons and hotels and caterers that we have already cooperated in the past. So, we know them, they know us, and there is an understanding. But, of course, there are more that we do in the future regarding the funding. Thank you, thank you again. And if I can make a short addition when it comes to the emissions, when it comes to travelling for the FC, one very good idea that we could try, and it would be a really nice statistic also to highlight to see how much we emit for doing our gatherings, is that there are a lot



of calculators that basically you can see through the distance that you travel to see how many emissions you cause through your mobility. So, we could also look into getting a final figure of how much do we emit just to move around for an FC. I mean, it would be an interesting figure, but it would be also an interesting statistic to try towards improving and reducing it. It is a little bit unfortunate for Greece that, I mean, it's unfortunate in the sense that because it's in a very peculiar place of Europe, there are not that many transit links, and usually the easiest way to get into Athens is through plane. But if you're in the, let's say, immediate neighbourhood of Greece, then yes, you can use a train, you can use a bus, you can use a boat, and you can reduce your emissions, and you do your little bit for the environment. We have also thought for ideas of reducing paper use to the absolute minimum. One good idea would be paperless voting cards, having them all virtually, and trying to use a form of that, or completely reducing plastic, which we have right now, let's say. So, there are many ways. This is just an initial vision, an initial idea, and I think we can openly work with you, and you can give us more ideas on how we can try to implement them, if it's, of course, fiscally possible. Thank you all for the attention.

30.03.2025

Gergana Blazheva (FC Presidium): We are welcoming everyone to the very last day of this FC. I mean, everyone is invited to work. And we will finish around noon time. But until this time comes, we have to vote. We have more voting. And we have time for updates. So today we're starting with a code of conduct reminder, then followed by a gender watch. So we'll do the gender watch. Then we have a presentation by the monitoring committee. We have announcements of days for Congress. Then we have a presentation of the 15-year-old politics election. Then we'll have the roll call, for which everyone who is noted here should be here if they want their roll call to be passed in. And then we'll do the voting on the resolutions, the internal resolutions, the forward strategy, the monitoring committees, the location requests, spring FC. Then we'll have the Congress's preceding presentation, suggestion, updated budget for this year, and rectification of the internal budget. Then sections update, annual business, and we close for the moment for European day.



Xesc Mainzer Cardell (Executive Board, VP): Morning, everyone. I don't think I have to remind you what gender watch is. Was anyone not here neither of the two times I explained what gender watch is? No? Okay.

Then I consider you all know what it is. So the results of the gender watch of yesterday are the following. Intervention time by people identifying as non-binary amounted to 29.63%. Intervention time of people identifying as male amounted to 29.86%. And intervention time of people identifying as female amounted to 40.51%. Thank you so much, and thank you for being so diverse in the intervention times.

Gergana Blazheva (FC Presidium): Thank you, Xesc. Moving on to the monitoring procedures. I will leave the floor to the President, Christelle Savall.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): Good morning. So at the moment we have two monitoring procedures open. A monitoring procedure is a procedure where we start with a committee to look at the situation of a section. We do that sometimes when a section has completely disappeared. And then the goal is to just see if we can find people to restart it, and if not, to remove it from the membership. Or we do it because there was a particular problem and we want to specifically support the section into restoring its full capacity and working well with Jef EU.

So at the moment we have two monitoring procedures, one on Poland and one on Austria. So here you can see the members of the monitoring committee.

So for Poland it's Karolina from Denmark and Anna from FC. And for Austria it is Mirko and Robin from FC together with me each time. If we can go to the next slide.

So those are the recommendations of the monitoring committee and I will go over it in more detail afterwards. But basically for Poland the situation is improving. So we also hope to be able to close it at Congress because there's a lot of positive updates.

And then sadly for Austria the recommendation is expansion to be recommended to the Congress for decision in Strasbourg. Okay, good. Thank you. So in Poland there's a few new people. There's a lot of activity also from the board. They have

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



applied for money, they're fully registered. They also even applied with other sections and even offered to join in. So that's quite good. We put them in touch with the National Youth Council so they can also help them. There's still a bit of diversity in the membership, not many women. But there's great progress in understanding the organisation. So it's quite good to see improvements there. If we can go to the next slide. Yes, Austria there's like five slides so brace yourself. So once upon a time there used to be a monitoring procedure in Austria that we closed in like 2020. And now we restarted a new monitoring procedure because of several issues that are detailed here. And basically we have tried to get in touch with them multiple times since starting the procedure in Tartu with the monitoring committee to meet. And they usually just ignored the emails. And then one time they said that they wanted more time. And then one time they sent a very angry email that is also reflected in the slides at some point. Because we thought it was a good read for you to understand the current tone and situation of the relationship between JEF Austria and JEF Europe. There is no JEF activity per se. From JEF Austria they have their own activities. But there is no JEF activity or their local section left. So JEF as we know it necessarily doesn't reflect anymore. It's also we were not invited to any of the elections. We are not in touch because they don't talk to us. I have yet to be put in touch with the new president because despite many reminders. I think maybe it's on the next slide. Yeah, that's the list of reminders. So every 15 or 30 days we send an email without any reply except the last one. They also threaten legal repercussions to us for initiating the monitoring procedures. They had said in tact that they would leave if we were to discuss the monitoring procedure. But they haven't sent any follow up on the question of leaving JEF Europe. So maybe we can go to the next slide. Yeah, so that's the latest email we received.

Except from the written response of JEF Austria that you could find in the internal area. I will give you a moment to read. When you're done let me know and we will move to the following slides.

Are we good? Yeah, next slide. It's also in the internal area. Okay, final slide.

Yeah, so that's a bit of a recap of the situation. That explains why we would recommend the next EB. So before the Congress we have shortly an outgoing FC. And that FC would recommend to the Congress the expulsion of JEF Austria.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Because we want JEF activity, we want federalism in Austria. But sadly I think we can just say that our ways have parted.

And I accept this to be able to restart something in the country. There are people in the country, people from the local sections that are interested to work with us. And we need to finalise the situation at some point. Because it's a problem that was given from board to board to board. And we have many times tried to improve it and never managed. Now, I will leave the floor for the questions.

Katarina Kosjak (JEF Austria, Observer): I am a representative from JEF Austria for the local section. I don't represent the national section, we are the local section. First I want to say thank you, especially to the staff and also the whole monitoring committee for the work and the effort you put in. So I speak on behalf of the local JEF sections in Austria. So we fully support the monitoring procedure and also with JEF just presented. And also for the other JEF sections to know. We work closely together in Austria, so the remaining local JEF sections.

We've also been quite active and busy in Austria with our JEF activities. So for example, we just finished our partnership project actually this week. It was a two-year project.

We are also organising an international training programme in May and international youth exchange. We also have monthly European Mondays and we have very good relationships with other JEF sections across Europe. So the JEFs still there and we really hope that we can become a proper part of the JEF Europe network for the functioning national section again very soon.

Hannah Spitzer (JEF Austria, Observer): I can support what everyone has been saying so far. I know this is a really complex topic and especially if you have not been to Budapest, please reach out at any time to any of us if you have any further questions. We know it's not that easy, especially considering their statements. But we hope we can count on your support again. So we, as the work group for national sections, can make a full membership status and make the JEF spirit alive again.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): I think it is just important for those who don't know what a monitoring procedure is. It is really always about helping people during punishment. So when they usually want to punish or measure something, it's a monitoring procedure. This is a very weird way to see it, because most sections are usually thankful for the monitoring procedure. There is a very regular communication. We had people from other sections who had similar problems. So when you face a monitoring procedure as a punishment, this is not a healthy rationale. Because you don't trust not only the European level, but the other countries at national level either, that have always faced a monitoring procedure, either with openness or even as a support as a help. And because we made the membership statements yesterday, I just have to say we did receive the membership fees. Those membership fees were a very round number, which is not very normal. We don't usually have exactly 50, exactly 100 members or things like that. I don't know how reliable their members are in general. And this makes also for us a very big difference, because we are always relying on the membership statements. We trust them completely. And we have to say that we don't have any insight into the membership fees of Austria at the national level. And this is not good for our internal trust, because we always trust them. And the membership statements mean a lot to us, because we also have no correspondence. And you give us a lot of information. And just looking at the bank transfer, refusing to send anything for a year is not a healthy way to say we're still active. And we need to take our working rights away, because we paid. We paid and never received a membership statement. I never received a national statement. I didn't even receive a reply to my emails. So I think, just to clarify, they did not use their working rights because we transferred the membership fee. At first, it was very weird that they never received a hand. And today, we got no correspondence and no statement. Thank you.

Armin Sumansky (JEF Czechia, National Delegate): I don't know a lot about the monitoring system in Austria. But I wanted to ask, doesn't the expulsion of Austria also mean that they lose their local section status? And maybe it's possible somehow to transfer this membership status from this organisation that now exists to maybe a new organisation that the local sections can make? Yeah. So

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



basically, because the section of Jef Austria left, Jef Austria, technically, they're not a member of Jef anymore.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): But we love them, so we include them. Because I don't think we're here about status and legal, you know. I think we are here about the community we are. So it's not possible to transfer the status from one organisation to another. So what we need is to remove the old organisation and then take back the new umbrella organisation that they created or took over. And that would be the way to reintegrate them. And then I think it's also interesting to know the steps. So should we vote the recommendation today? We will send a recommended letter to Jef Austria saying that this is what we voted. And then they will have the possibility to react to that. And then we will ask the arbitration board for an opinion. Because those are the things we need to do before doing the same recommendation to the Congress. Going back to the culture, what about corporate identity? So if we lose the umbrella organisation, JEF Austria, there's a name attachment. I mean, they will not dissolve. The legal entity will retain it. Meaning, the name is still there, the logo is still there.

Are we just going to create a new section with the same logo or the same logo as corporate identity? It's also the same kind of a contract. What's the plan there? So basically, currently, Jef Austria uses the logo of JEF that was before 2013. Not the current logo. And currently, the local section of JEF Austria were granted by the board the right to use the new logo in the meantime. Yes, they can keep the name, but they also have stopped using green as their colour. Even though the past logo was green. They have moved JEF as an acronym for their social media. So I would also believe they would drop the JEF from their name. Because their name in German is not Jef, like the acronym or the full name. So they could keep that one and just say... Because in their statute it says Billy AJ is a member of Jef and can be referred to as Jef Austria. And not that it's called JEF Austria as a name. It's not as an object, so I understand. That's okay. So, thanks a lot.

Would that mean if we create a local organisation, we would be able to use the current logo and JEF Austria as a name? So basically, we as Jef have our own name. Because we have registered it in UK and EU. So it's about renewing this registration. Then there's a possibility that JEF Austria takes the local sections to court over the name. But they're also in financial difficulties, so I don't know if they

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



would really do that. They've threatened to do it. But they have threatened us to court. You know, they threatened everyone to court. So it's... Yeah.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): So then this one is closed. And we continue with the next. So, if you're wondering when you should mark your calendars for our next statutory meeting, meaning Congress in Strasbourg, I will do a drumroll and tell you that in November, from the 14th till the 16th, we will be meeting in Strasbourg. There will be elections and a lot, a lot of history. So, we have a video connected to that.

Okay, yes. First, regarding the agenda points. So we're now moving on to the presentation of a candidate that was selected for complementing or being added to the auditors' committee, since we are down to one active person there. And that has proven to be an unsustainable solution. Also, there has been a ruling by the arbitration board in this regard. So I don't know if maybe someone from the EB would like to briefly explain what the steps were that were taken, how this process of selection worked. And then we can move on to the video, since the person cannot be here this weekend. And then later in the voting period, we will confirm the person, hopefully.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President) So basically, JEF France wrote to the arbitration board to ask what to do, because the two auditors, two other auditors that were elected are no longer members. So if you're no longer a member of JEF, you lose any elected role you have in JEF, so far so good. And if you have questions about the ruling, Ignacio can comment. And the ruling of the arbitration board says, because the statutes foresee two to three members in the auditors' committee, the auditors' committee only needs one more member to be functional. Hence, only one member should be ratified into the auditors' committee. So we were in a selection process. And as per the EB ruling, the board is to put one name forward to ratification to the FC. So that's the step we're at now. We received three applications, two within the deadline. And we selected Pierre, who used to be the Finance Officer of JEF until some point last year.

Video of Pierre Louwerse:

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Hello everyone, I hope you are well and everything is going well for you, it's Pierre. You know me probably because I am the former finance and administration officer of JEF Europe. And today, if you are watching me, it's for a good reason. It's because I'd like to continue helping JeFEurope my own way by joining the European Committee for this year. So, to introduce myself, I am 34, I live in Brussels, and in more than 7 years, that kind of story with Microsoft Excel connected me to follow a career in finance. Currently, I am holding a position of accountant in a European political party here in Brussels. At the moment, I am in charge here of some holding the accounts, of course, monitoring the budget of the party and also to advise the Secretary General on every finance-related topics in the organisation. Before that, between 2022 and 2024, I spent one year at JeFEurope as finance and admin officer, as you know, where I was in charge of all finance and admin topics in the secretariat. So, I know quite in-depth the issues and problematics of the organisation and I'm also very aware of the challenges for the future, especially concerning fundings to sustain the operation and to consolidate the equity of the organisation. So, I think in general, it was often quite intense, but we really share together this vision for a more united Europe, and if you agree with that, I'd like to help Patrick for the opportunity this year.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Thank you. We were very thankful for all three people who applied and all three applications that we got were very good applications.

There was, of course, the topic of the deadline. Some applications were not within the deadline. We are proposing Pierre for various reasons.

One of them is indeed that his background is in finances. So, both his studies and his professional background concern tasks that are very related to the tasks of a member of the auditor community. And the second thing is, of course, for us it is a very big pleasure and honour for somebody who has worked in our secretariat in the past, as a member decides to engage at the European level again. We really want to welcome people to engage themselves in any way possible at the European level. We have had a very positive experience also on the professional level, when Pierre was there in the secretariat a year ago, when did we know what a competent and reliable person Pierre is. Indeed, we have had conversations about the fact that Pierre used to be part of the Secretariat last year and we

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



consulted with our auditor Patrick about it, and our idea is firstly that there is even a benefit from it from the fact that we really need our auditor reports the soonest possible and having a person there who has working experience from last year from the Secretariat can be helpful to make the audits more efficient and easier to find things and in this sense we even see some positive aspects for it. We understand that this also creates the complication that he was there for a part of the month that the audit report will be about but we have also Patrick joining our auditors committee and Patrick has been doing our auditor reports for a lot of years now and we're very happy to have his competence and his talents in the auditors committee and we think they will make a great team together. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Just a very quick note so of course we very much welcome this. We all have a big interest in having the auditors committee functional and I just want to make this quick comment on procedural grounds that unfortunately the ruling by the arbitration board never reached the FC so this is also why there may have been some in clarity as to why only one candidate was selected in the end because as we understand it that was part of the ruling by the arbitration board and of course as per our statutes these rulings in order to be able to go into effect have to reach the FC as well so we do have no intention of obstructing this but just as a quick reminder that we should keep this in mind and respect it for the future. Apart from that we are looking very much forward to complementing the auditors committee. Thank you.

Ignacio Esteban Avendano (Arbitration Board): I just wanted to clarify because I heard that there's some opinions of the arbitration board that has not reached the FC so I apologise for that. We have been issued very few opinions, this was one of the last ones, so I apologise for that. We will resent all the opinions of at least the last three that we issued about like was the auditors committee procedure, it was another one about the suspension of members and another one about the voluntary cessation of a membership so we will resend those to you so you can have them just in case. We had some problems with the emails actually, we have

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



been working with the secretary general for that so I apologise if those were not reached. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): I would now ask Brigita to help us with the declaration of votes and for this all of you will be attentive when you're coming if you haven't. Taking your voting card.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): Morning everyone, I hope you have had fun last night and actually I just wanted to say Eid Mubarak to all of us celebrating today, it's Eid and I hope that everyone who had a nice Ramadan can enjoy today even though we are here. Let's start the roll call.

JEF Albania, not present, proxy to JEF Bulgaria.

JEF Austria, not present, no proxy.

JEF Belgium, present,.

JEF Bulgaria, present.

JEF Croatia, not present, no proxy.

JEF Czechia, present.

JEF Denmark, present.

JEF Estonia, not present, no proxy.

JEF Finland, present.

JEF France, present.

JEF Germany, present.

JEF Greece, present.

JEF Hungary, present.

JEF Ireland, not present, no proxy.

JEF Italy, present.

JEF Kosovo, not present, proxy to JEF Germany.

JEF Latvia, present.

JEF Luxembourg, present.

JEF Montenegro, not present, no proxy.

JEF Netherlands, present.

JEF North Macedonia, not present, no proxy.

JEF Norway, present,.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



JEF Poland, not present proxy to JEF Netherlands.

JEF Portugal, present.

JEF Romania, present.

JEF Serbia, present.

JEF Slovakia, not present, proxy to JEF Czechia.

JEF Slovenia, present.

JEF Spain, present.

JEF Sweden, not present, and no proxy.

JEF Switzerland, not present, no proxy.

JEF UK, not present.

Executive board:

Christelle Savall, present.

Xesc Mainzer Cardell, present.

Martin Penov, present.

Aléxandros Apostolidis, present.

Hanna Lein-Mathisen, present.

Nikos Chircop , present.

Kati Systä, present.

Alexiane Terrochaire – – Barbançon, present.

Directly FC members

Gergana Blazheva, present.

Jana Gleim, proxy to Gergana.

Robin Mudry, present.

Antoine Chabal, not present, proxy to Elise.

Elise Magne, present.

Anna van de Moosdijk, present.

Julianne Vella, proxy to Mirko.

María Martínez López, proxy to Samuel.

Samuel Tammekann, present.

Federico Tosi, present.

Mădălin-Cătălin Blidaru, not present, proxy to, no proxy.

Melanie Thut, present but proxy to Robin

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Chiara Bertolli, not present, proxy to Federico Tosi.

Mirko Ondras, present,

Benedikte Svendsen, not present, proxy to Anna.

Sofie Rebekka Schlüter Knauer, not present, no proxy.

So we have 45 to reach quorum and this is at the moment to say that if you are leaving this room, you need to put your voting card on this desk and try not to go out while we do the voting so we can avoid additional hazards. Moving on to the voting, we will present the results by the political commissions. Okay, we are switching to the panel again.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): So, as always, we are starting with PCI and we would like to ask PCI chair Mirko to come and to always first talk to the resolution as a whole and then we will go and see the different amendments that are still pending and go to them one by one and then we will always vote the entire resolution. So let's start with PCI. Resolution A1 for the Federal European Union ensuring a democratic treaty change and constitutional amendment process.

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PCI co-chair): Okay, this is a completely new resolution. We spent most of our time yesterday working on this one. The PCI group recommends that it be adopted. It is, as the title suggests, about the way we would like treaty change to happen and the way we would like constitutional amendments to happen once we have a constitution for the European Union. We went through a lot of amendments in the working group yesterday. There are three new amendments since yesterday that we will go through.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Here we go. So let's move down to amendments O22, which is very nice. I like it like this. Proposed by Mirko.

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PC 1 co-chair): So I will briefly tell you what it is about. This is fairly similar to one that was proposed by Kalojan yesterday and not adopted by PCI.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



I propose a modified version of this. We did rather like these arguments. However, there has been a disagreement about whether it has its place in the resolution or not. PCI resolutions are often very light on examples, tend to be very theoretical. And this is essentially a list of examples to support the various recommendations that this resolution has. So the question here is, do we want to, not so much whether we agree with it, but whether we think it merits being inside or whether we think it distracts from the purpose of the resolution, whether it goes too much in detail, et cetera. So yeah, this is my pitch for it. Does someone want to talk against?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Someone wants to talk against? Or are there any further questions? Need for clarification? Yes, two actually, no end words. Michael is on the way.

Kalojan Hoffmeister: I would actually say that it's a good idea to keep it, because this is a hot topic, often debated topic, and I feel like if we add the historical facts, it will prove us even more right that we need some kind of different system for accepting treaty change. So I would advise everyone to vote for it. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. Further interventions? That's not the case. So we can move to the vote.. So in favour of introducing this amendment. So we have,

27 in favour. Against. 13 abstentions? With a couple of abstentions, the amendment was carried. Thank you very much. We move on to the next amendment, which is L44-2.

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PC 1 co-chair): Thank you. This follows up an amendment that we passed during the PCI meeting yesterday, where we replaced qualified majority requirement in this line by enhanced qualified majority. However, enhanced qualified majority is not well defined, so I thought it would be helpful if we could define what we mean by it.

Some people did feel yesterday that we don't need that, that resolutions don't need to be this precise, and it can be reasonably vague on such details. However, this is a resolution that is very precise elsewhere about exactly what kind of

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



supermajority or simple majority do we want at which point. For me, this was an outlier, the one thing that wasn't precise enough, so I worked on the wording a little bit and tried to make it a bit less of a mouthful, although I agree that the more precise we are, of course, the less easy it becomes to read. However, I do recommend that we go with the more precise proposal that is here.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. Anyone who would like to speak against? I don't see anyone, so we can move to the vote.

Who's in favour of this amendment? Okay, three against. Okay, so any abstentions? Okay, that clearly has it. Maybe with such controversial amendments, you can just ask for the against, as we wrote, and then we'll see if we need to count or not. But the amendment was carried as well.

33 in favour. Against, I don't know if we counted, but it was much less. Do we need it? No? Okay. So we move on to the next amendment, introduced by Carlos and JEF Latvia, 047.

Carlos Lopes (JEF Portugal, National Delegate): This is more of a practical amendment, because Article 1, oops, it's 2, sub-articles, lays out of procedure of adopting treaty change and later EU constitutional change. And it lays out two tracks. In original version, it works like that. There's first track, which requires supermajority and enhanced by majority. I don't propose to change that. And then there's second track, which in original works if voting for changes but not reaching enough of majority, then there is a referendum, which means when voting for change, there could be a situation that there is like accidental triggering of EU-wide referendum. So my proposal is to change sub-article 2, so that EU Parliament and Council knowingly and purposely vote for referendum. So either they try to achieve supermajority or they on purpose vote for referendum. So there is no situation of like lacking one vote for supermajority and having EU-wide referendum without intention to have it. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. Anybody would like to speak against this amendment?

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): We already discussed it yesterday in the PC work, but just to say that our position is against in general to do any kind of EU-wide referendum that requires, that carries about, let's say, constitutional change and treaty change. We are in favour of referendum for other topics, but not regarding treaty change.

Karlis Zikmanis (JEF Latvia, Observer): I would suggest to vote for this amendment, which I applaud for, because the only way how we can ensure that the treaty change is democratic and it follows the needs and the will of the people instead of the member states. We need either two-thirds majority in both, let's say, houses or a simple majority in the referendum. I think that's the same rule that they have in different other countries, so I wouldn't say why we shouldn't introduce it in Europe as well. Thank you.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Well, first of all, not every country has a referendum. Italy, Germany didn't have that. Second thing, democracy doesn't mean direct democracy, it's a different kind of democracy, representative democracy is democracy, so we want the parliament to have more power. A referendum is a form of democracy and we choose another form, which is representative democracy for treaty change. For other topics, it's different for treaty change. So, every referendum doesn't necessarily mean the process is more democratic than other forms of democracy. Like, this is not the correct association. But, again, we always go against what will be changed in this era.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Okay, now we have three more responses. These are the last ones we will take.

Karlis Zikmanis (JEF Latvia, Observer): So, actually, I believe this is even a better option, even when you don't believe in EU referendums for treaty change, because in the original version, you see, it's automatic, it just happens. In this version, the legislature has to intentionally vote for a referendum, so this actually creates an opportunity to choose whether to have or not, because in the original version, it just happens, it will have a big majority.



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. Now we are going to Xesc, with a point of order, if I understood that correctly.

Xesc Mainzer (Executive Board, VP): I would like to propose to the Presidium to adopt as a format for the debate, just a presentation of the amendment, one in favour, one against, and voting, because I am starting one hour late, and we have a lot of documents, so it's not to cut the debate, but for efficiency, it will have to be for the debate.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): I think we can agree with this. Nonetheless, since we already mentioned speakers for this, we will grant them to speak, if they still want, and we will apply this from the next amendment onwards.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): Thank you. This is something that we discussed quite extensively yesterday, it's not that we do not believe in it as a concept, but it's the fact that technically it's a little bit unfeasible given European political systems are not really that used to referendums, we can see how divisive they can be, and how they can be basically weaponised and then ultimately achieving populist goals. So, we do not support it. Even in its revised version, we are not supporting it, and there was a consensus also in the discussions yesterday that this is not really the way to go.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you, and also Mirko told me that he wants to say something, but from the next amendment onwards, you will have one in favour, one against, and then proceed to vote.

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PC 1 co-chair): I will quickly point out that both the original version and the amended version do make way for a referendum, so this is not what we're voting on now, it's really do we support referendums or not. I will also point out that referendums as a part of EU decision making is already something that is provided for within our political platform, and as I understand, many people in the PC1 group were very much against this possibility, and I would encourage you to bring this debate for when we amend

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



the political platform, which will probably happen in Strasbourg in the next Congress. So I'm very much looking forward to that debate.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. Then we proceed to vote on this amendment, and we will take every round. Who is against? There are just a few. Then votes in favour of the amendment?

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PCI co-chair): Abstentions?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): But it was still carried. So thank you. We move on to the next amendment.

There is no other amendment in this resolution, therefore we will move on to the vote on the entire resolution. Is there anybody who would like to say a last word, any last question, comment? That's not the case, we move to the vote on the entire resolution. Who is in favour of adopting this resolution? Votes against?

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Abstentions?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): With two abstentions, the resolution was adopted for the first time. Thank you very much for the great work. And we move on to the next resolution, PC 1, second resolution, which is calling for a European constituent assembly.

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PCI co-chair): This is a resolution where we put the details about how we would like to transition from a treaty for the European Union to a constitution for the European Union, and that is by calling for a constituent assembly that would be elected especially for the task. And after it proposes a constitution, this constitution would be voted for in a EU referendum by a majority of voters and a majority of states. We have discussed this in the PCI meeting yesterday. We went through a lot of amendments. There are four new amendments since yesterday, so we will have to go through those. And the PCI working group recommended yesterday that we adopt this resolution, even though there has been some discussion, as with the previous resolution, that many people are not comfortable with the idea of referendums. But once again,

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



that's something that stems from our political platform and will have to be discussed.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. So, without further ado, we move to the first amendment, which is 046, submitted by JEF Serbia.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): We proposed actually a different wording here. Originally, we wanted to use panEuropean, but I really want to thank Matt for actually pointing out that pan-European might not be the best because of the connotations. Therefore, we submitted a different wording stating wider European politics, because we believe that if we want to create a true federation, we have to talk about involving everyone on the continent. Thank you very much.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Anyone who would like to speak against this amendment? If that's not the case, then we proceed to the vote. Anyone who is against this amendment?

Two votes. Four votes against. Any favour? Abstentions? One abstention, so it is carried. Next amendment, 017, submitted by JEF Greece.

Would you like to speak to it? The mic, over there, JEF Greece.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer): The thought behind this amendment is to rephrase in a way to be more clear that direct elected citizens and representatives are not already enemies, but could be through transnationalists, whose transnational list is a historical demand of federalists many years now, so we thought that is a good addition.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. Is there anyone who would like to speak against? I see here.

Karlis Zikmanis (JEF Latvia, Observer): My concern is with the process of formation of these lists, because in Constituent Assembly, well, we could guess that those would be all the existing European parties, but there would be lots of new debates that they haven't had inside them, and there is really a risk of them just falling apart, so there is a question whether transnational lists wouldn't require

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



many years of process of actually forming these lists. Wouldn't it be hard to create transnational lists? So, yeah.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. So we'll move to the vote. Anyone against this amendment?

I think there's five votes against. In favour? That's the majority of abstentions.

Therefore, the amendment is carried. Thank you. Next one, 085-3, submitted by JEF Serbia.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): So, when talking about European Constituent Assembly, we believe that it is important to point out that with the current treaty, the 2009 of the complete economic, social, fiscal, defence, and political union cannot be achieved within the current framework, and that is why we submitted this amendment.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Thank you. I agree, but I think we can only say that the economic union hasn't been achieved. It's just the economic union. Are there things I understand? Economic union, I think we can say that, so. Economic union, I don't know. I don't think it's correct, but as a political stance, I see a point, let's say.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Just to clarify, it says complete economic, social, fiscal, defence, and political union in the sentence. So it's not just economic union. I know. I don't trust the economic union because it's not complete. That's what it says. Okay. Well, then we will proceed to the vote. Is anybody against adopting this amendment? I see four votes against.

In favour? Five. In favour? Abstentions? The amendment is carried. Thank you.

We go to the last one, 087. This is proposed by JEF Greece.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate):

I just wanted to add this point because basically this is one of the historical issues we have with the institutions, the fact that they don't really have an effective common strategy. And if we're talking about creating something new, that



requires its own communication department that is effective, that is not just, you know, plastering a new logo everywhere, which is what historically has been the EU strategy. So basically this calls for a concrete commitment on what they will do to highlight this new body's work and to combat misinformation about what it's actually doing. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Anybody would like to speak against this amendment? I don't see anybody, so we can move to the vote. Is anybody against this amendment?

Okay. I see a few against. In favour? Abstentions? So a few against and a few abstentions. The amendment is carried.

Thank you. So we can move to the vote on the entire resolution unless there are any last comments or questions, which is not the case. Therefore, we move to the vote on the resolution called for a European decision assembly.

Is anybody against re-adopting it? In favour? Abstentions?

With one abstention, it is re-adopted. Congratulations. And we move on to the next resolution: PCI, on the institutional design and governance of the Eurozone.

Miko, please, a very brief introduction.

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PCI co-chair): As the title suggests, this is about how we would like the Eurozone to function and how the function of the Eurozone should integrate within the functioning of the EU as a whole. The PCI group yesterday recommends that we re-adopt this resolution, but did not have time to go through the amendments, and there are several more amendments since yesterday, so we will go through them now.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): All right. Thank you very much. We move on to the first amendment, O38, submitted by JEF Luxembourg. JEF Luxenberg, would you like to speak in favour? Yes? The mic is on your way. Up there. Thank you very much.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Andrea Gulizia (JEF Luxembourg, National Delegate): Thus, we have achieved this legalisation through the Comandante, non-fiscal register, let's say, non-fiscal rules.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Sorry. I think we already had many discussions on the fiscal union, so it's just the language of Eurozone has been updated. That's it.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Then we can move to the vote. So, if you're in favour of deleting this passage of the vote, in favour, if you are against, so keeping it, you have voted against.

So, who would like to vote against this, please raise your votes. And we will need the tellers for this. So, against means we keep the passage of the clause.

So, please decide. I think it's 25. So, 25 against.

In favour of this amendment? Okay. The amendment is here, the amendment is not carried, and therefore the clause is kept. Thank you. We move on to the next one. O68, again, submitted by JEF Luxembourg.

Andrea Gulizia (JEF Luxembourg, National Delegate): Banking Union is formed by three pillars. The first one is a single supervisory mechanism. The second one is a single resolution mechanism. The third one is the European depository regulatory scheme. In the previous version of this resolution, the passage was perfect. I don't know why, but in the end it was, like, cancelled.

So, I would like to keep the previous version of this resolution, where this passage was perfectly defined.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium):

Okay. So, Hence, would you like to speak against, or maybe explain why it was removed from the PC?

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PCI co-chair): We have simply found it no longer necessary, but I hear your arguments, and I see that maybe there are people who would like to keep it in.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



We do not have an objection to it. Simply, there are a lot of things that we took out as being somewhat repetitive with what's in other resolutions. Notably, there is a resolution specifically on the Banking Union, and where something very similar is already said, and therefore we thought it doesn't need to be also said in the Eurozone resolution. That's why we removed it.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Okay, so we'll move to the vote. Is anybody against this resolution? Nobody against.

So, it is carried. Great. The next one, O94, submitted by JEF Greece.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): Thank you. We just found that this provision is unnecessary. Again, the two points are quite clear. And also, it would be really, really difficult to implement, because different Member States have different provisions, they have different levels on how they enforce their employment programmes, and this level of complexity is truly unnecessary, other than the public investment or the other provision of our financial stability. Thank you.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): So, two things. One, on the method, there are many things that are very hard to achieve, but it's basically everything. So, it's very difficult just to carry on the battle, so I don't think it works for us. For political parties, it works. Saying it's too hard for us, we say it's too hard, and we shouldn't do anything. And the other thing is, again, this is something that's been discussed for years, the other two points have nothing to do with the social pillar. So, this is really different, and there's nothing wrong with it, also. It's already in the Treaty, the basis for this. So, member of the parliament and also council have already discussed it in the last years, so it's not even that hard, but also it's not in the principle of the agreement.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Okay. We sent two more aggravated amendments so far, so we'll go to the vote. We'll quickly go to the vote. If you are for keeping it, you have to vote against. If you are for removing this passage, you have to vote in favour. So, obviously, we start with those against this amendment. In favour? So, it is not carried. I think that was clear.



We move on to the next one, item 96. Equally introduced by JEF Greece.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): Thank you. This is basically complementary provision. It's just to clarify it a little bit, because by itself it looks a little bit more generic, and the ESM itself already does some great work, so it would also be, as part of it, to scale up its capabilities.

Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. And would you like to speak against this amendment? I can see JEF Luxembourg up there.

Andrea Gulizia (JEF Luxembourg, National Delegate): European Solidarity Mechanism is not a first-line of defence institution. It should be changed in this way. If we want, we can create another one. It can incorporate the European Investment Bank, but not the ESM.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. So, we move to the vote. Anyone against this amendment?

In favour? Abstentions? So, with a majority of abstentions, the amendment is not carried. We move to the next one, 112. Introduced by Christelle.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): I think it's just a typo, because under the resolution it says, EMI for the European Monetary Fund is to be created, and therefore the government's structure cannot be reformed, because it doesn't exist. I think it's just a typo, and there was no time to discuss it in the PC meeting yesterday.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Anyone against it? No? Therefore, we move to the vote. Anyone against this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? With one abstention, the amendment is carried. Thank you. Next one, 1126. So, it's actually very long. I will go into it. JEF Greece. Please speak in favour, and maybe you will need some time to read it on the screen as well.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): I would just like to start by apologising. We just didn't have time to submit all the amendments, and we were kind of panicked, so we just put all of them together. But I will give the floor to Christos to make it clearer a little bit more about those.

Thank you.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer): These are some proposals that we have to make this resolution a little bit better. Generally, and that is regarding when we proceed with amendments, JEF Greece proposes to probe the other delegations, and all of our proposals, as you will see here and maybe later, based on a more realistic way of thinking. We are all veterans, we all want to go forward, but we believe that small steps are needed sometimes. And this is more... I think we should have in mind that this is a better way for the public to receive what we propose.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Yes, please speak to the amendments. We cannot have a general debate about how we approach policy-making or resolution-fighting. Okay.

So please very quickly speak to the amendments. I'm going to come back to my hand in that case. Okay. Then I saw a hand against it. Okay. This hand is gone.

Let me give it to JEF Luxembourg. Speaking against.

Andrea Gulizia (JEF Luxembourg, National Delegate): From a technical point of view, I'm sorry, but it's wrong. The Single Resolution Mechanism exists. It prevents bailouts. I mainly work on this. So it's really just in the SED, Single Resolution Board. It's insufficient. It doesn't take into account taxpayers' money. So in theory, if you look at the previous crisis, when there was SED, Credit Suisse, etc., European Union even collapsed. Tax is part of this recovery plan that is part of the Single Resolution Mechanism. So the first point is wrong. Clear separation between monetary policy and financial supervision. We have an amendment after. In ECB, at the moment, there is an operational separation between the monetary policy activity and the supervision activity. So I would say we don't need another institution. We don't need to pay more managers. It just



exists. And if there is no conflict of interest, I would say it's enough, since the rest is more or less enough.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Okay, thank you. Just a general comment. This is a situation that is unfortunate because it's very difficult to debate such a big number of new clauses in this setting. So I would like to encourage you to bring them earlier and in a separated fashion for the future. Since you said one favour, one against, you will now vote to move to the vote. And you encouraged us to bring it back in another context if this will be rejected. So who is against this very long amendment? In favour? Abstentions?

Therefore, the amendment is not carried. And we move to the last amendment, 137, introduced by JEF Luxembourg.

Andrea Gulizia (JEF Luxembourg, National Delegate): As the previous one, there is operational separation inside the ECB. We don't need to have another institution doing something that is done. Good. And if you look at Bank of Italy, it's not separated. If you look at Central Bank of Ireland, it's not separated. Bank of France, the same. I think it's fine.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium):

Anybody would like to speak against this amendment? That's not the case. So we can move to the vote. Anybody against adopting this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? Therefore, the amendment is carried. Thank you very much. Since that was the last amendment, we will now move to a vote on the entire resolution, unless there is a last comment or question.

That's not the case. So who is in favour of re-adopting this resolution? Against? Abstentions? With three abstentions, it is thus re-adopted. Congratulations, PCI. And we move to the last resolution by PCI, Strengthening the Economic and Political Union within the Lisbon Treaty. Please, a very brief introduction.

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PCI co-chair): We have discussed this resolution, as in whether we want to propose for it to be re-adopted or whether we want to propose for it to lapse. There have been arguments for both possibilities. We have found that all the suggestions there are also present in

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



other resolutions. However, in the end, the majority of PCI has found that combining them in this way, around the concept of Lisbon Treaty, is something that is still useful, and that there should be a resolution that combines all these suggestions together. And therefore, the PCI does suggest in the end that we re-adopt this resolution. There are only three small amendments. We did not have time to go through them, so we will go through them now.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. So we move to the first amendment of 15, introduced by Xesc.

Xesc Mainzer (Executive Board, VP) Thank you. Basically, it's just to update the list of documents that outline the need for economic, fiscal, and political union membership in the United Nations report. So I just wanted to add the document that I just read yesterday.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. And would you like to speak against? It's not the case. You move to the vote. Is there anything against this amendment? Any favour? Abstentions? With 3 abstentions and 5 abstentions, it's carried. We move on to the next amendment, 088, submitted by Christelle. Would you like to speak to it? Yes.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): There was an institutional agreement concluded between the European Commission, the European Parliament, and also the Council, so it was signed in 2020. It's valid until 2027, so it's important to just let you know. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. So would you like to speak against? No? So we move to the vote. Anything against this amendment? Any favour? Abstentions? 4 abstentions, it is thus carried. No? Okay. So please do not wave with your votes. Okay.

Okay, all right. Let's keep focused. We go to the next amendment, OAT8. Again, submitted by Christelle, please.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Yes, the European Parliament came up with a proposal that I made in an amendment a few periods, so now it's about the need to take it forward.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium) All right, anybody speaking against this amendment? That's not the case, so we move to the vote. Is anybody against the vote in this amendment? Any favour? Abstentions? It is thus unanimously adopted.

Okay, so we now move to the vote on the entire resolution, unless there is a last comment. That's not the case. So, who is in favour of re-adopting and strengthening the Economic, Political, Human and Legalism Treaty? Against re-adopting it? Abstentions? With three-abstention, it is thus re-adopted. Congratulations. Thank you. Thank you very much, PC1. We do move to PC2. I can see PC2 chairing us on her way, and we go in with the first resolution towards the real federal budget. Please briefly introduce it to us.

Nea-Maria Törmänen (Coopted FC member, PC 2 co-chair): The resolution advocates for a stronger and more independent EU budget by reforming the multiannual financial framework and a lot of other points that you can see in the resolution, and it emphasises targeted investments in public goods, social policies and other factors also on the resolution.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. Since there are no amendments left, I can open the floor, if there is anyone who would like to comment or speak against it. Unless that's the case, we move to the vote.

Anna? Yes? The mic is coming towards you.

Anna van de Moosdijk (Directly-elected FC member, TF Capacity Building co-chair): It's a positive comment, just to prepare you all. This resolution will be key, because soon we are entering the negotiation about the next NFF, so also a big heads up to the advocacy TF, but also to all member sections, to prepare yourself, because as any NFF negotiation, it will be a lot of tears, blood and hard work. But in this case, especially for your fund, you must really be prepared. There are no amendments, but let's all adopt it and fight for what we put in here.



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. With this being said, we can move to the vote. Who would like to adopt or re-adopt this resolution, please raise your voting cards.

Against? Abstentions? With two abstentions, it is re-adopted.

Congratulations. We move to the next one, which is a completely new resolution. Shaping Europe's cultural field for a stronger future.

Nea, the floor is yours.

Nea-Maria Törmänen (Coopted FC member, PC 2 co-chair): So the resolution highlights the economic, social and democratic .of culture in the EU and advocating for increased investment, stronger regulatory frameworks and fair compensations in the creative industries. And since they are talking I will just say that it calls also for enhanced cultural exchange and balanced funding distribution among other things.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): All right, thank you very much for this introduction. There are still a few amendments left and since I submitted them I can present them unless somebody else would like to do that. So there was definitely one point that we discussed in the PC and that we felt is still missing and would further enhance this resolution and it is, as you can read, acknowledging that in several European countries especially culture has come under attack. Also especially when it comes to minority representation or artistic representations that are deemed inadequate by the regimes in those countries. So we wanted to acknowledge that and also the second amendment in the operational clauses which refers to this introductory amendment where we urge the EU to step in with funding in such cases. Is there anybody who would like to speak against this amendment?

That's not the case so we can move to a vote. Is there a second amendment? The amendment is carried.

Thank you. So we move to the next amendment which is what I already mentioned. It's the operational clause that is related to this introductory one where we urge the EU to specifically step in to support cultural sectors or projects when the funding was discontinued or blocked by member states and especially

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



when they did it for targeted minorities or what they mean to be progressive content. Is there anybody who would like to speak against this amendment? No? So we can move to a vote.

Anybody against adopting this amendment? In favour? Abstentions?

With three abstentions the amendment is carried. Thank you. And we have another one.

Moritz from Germany would like to speak to the amendment. The mic is coming your way.

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): Basically the version before was a bit tougher but because we don't have a clear understanding of what local and marginalised content is, that there's no clear definition, it's maybe a bit difficult to mandate what we should do. So this is just to say that the co-legislators should come up with a proposal to better regulate the digital platforms, have actual diverse content and better local and marginalised content as well.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you, Moritz. Anybody who would like to speak against this amendment? That's not the case. We can move to the vote. Is there anybody against adopting this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? It is thus carried. Thank you.

And these are all the amendments that were left. So we can move to a vote on the entire resolution unless there are lots of comments or questions. That's not the case. That's the case. Alexiane?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): So very quickly, I think it is important for JEF to pronounce himself on culture and arts. It's not per se a skill or competence in the treaty yet for us as federalists to ensure that federalism will not erase culture, arts and education by arts. I think it is a strong statement to also reassure that federalism is not about scraping culture but protecting it.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. It also says a lot about education, which might be relevant for a possible future OGE. Okay, there are no other interventions. We will therefore move to the vote. Is there anybody against, for the first time, adopting this

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



resolution? One vote against. In favour? The majority abstentions.
The resolution is thus adopted. Congratulations. We move to the next one.
Comment for a fully-fledged health union for the European Union.

Nea-Maria Törmänen (Coopted FC member, PC 2 co-chair):

First of all, I forgot to say at the beginning, so we went through all the amendments that we had at the time of the PC session, so that's why I didn't specify with each different resolution. But this resolution is about advocating for a stronger European Health Union to ensure universal access to high-quality healthcare, improving crisis preparedness and enhancing EU coordination in public health through institutional reforms and increased funding.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): There is an amendment left, submitted by Reinis.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): After the PC meeting, we already discussed that this existing point is phrased a bit weird, let's say, especially with the wording better recognised and, yeah, look forward to the recent advancement. So, that's why we decided to paraphrase it a bit, so it makes sense, I guess.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. Anybody would like to speak against this amendment? That's not the case, so we can move to vote. Is there anybody against adopting this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? That's two abstentions, it is carried. And that was the only amendment? Great, so we can move to the vote, unless there's last intervention. That's not the case, so we move to the vote on this resolution calling for a fully fledged health union. Is there anybody against re-adopting it? In favour? Abstentions? With one abstention, it is re-adopted. Congratulations.

And we swiftly move on to the next resolution. Environment doesn't stop at borders towards sustainable Europe and sustainable global climate policy. This is jointly introduced by PC1 and PC2, but it was debated in PC2 at this FC, therefore we have it here.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Nea-Maria Törmänen (Coopted FC member, PC 2 co-chair): The resolution calls for urgent and ambitious action at both the European and global levels to combat climate change through strengthened EU institutions, policies and regulations.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. And there is one amendment left, so it's by Jef Netherlands.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Thank you very much, I know this is a hotly debated topic in Jef, but we in Jef does not fit in this resolution on sustainability. There is no reason for us to add anything about world parliament, world government or world federative state when we're talking about sustainability. That's why I propose to replace it by asking for these multilateral institutions like UN to have accountability mechanisms which they don't have right now. And that would also fit in this resolution on sustainability, meaning that the member states of UN in this case would have some kind of accountability to enforce laws or decisions made on protecting the environment and to enforce the margin of law and human rights exceptions. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. I see now two hands speaking against three, so I think actually Dimitris was the fastest, so we'll go with him.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): Thank you. Even though I really find commendable this amendment and I can really understand the reasoning behind it, I have a little bit of a concern how you can actually reinforce it, because let us be honest, the multilateral institutions are dictated by states, so how would this accountability mechanism apply to them if their behaviour is basically mandated by its member states? So I get the notion of it, but the United Nations has its own inefficiencies. How would you be able to do the accountability? How do you penalise them? How do you say to them, okay, now you have to reform? Let's say there is an EU resolution on you have to reform, but then again there also are more than 100 countries in the UN who probably do not share this opinion or do not want to have any form of reform from the United

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Nations. So it's just that the notion behind it is correct, but I don't know how it's feasible. It's not just that it's not a matter of realism, it's just that I don't see how it would be implemented. Thank you. Thank you very much. It was a question that I asked.

The thing about accountability is that as we see in the UN, one member state, if they go rogue, for example, the rest of the UN can vote to enforce that country to do something for it. So that could be one example that's ten seconds. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): We cannot enter into a debate now, I'm sorry.

Dvir Ezra (TNF): Point of order. Since the statement was quite nuanced and ambivalent towards the resolution, so I was just wondering whether that counts as a speaker against the proposal and would say that maybe in such a case you should obtain an additional speaker against that amendment.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): We will allow an additional speaker, so please also for future people speaking against, really speak against it. But be brief.

Dvir Ezra (TNF): I just think that there is a growing consensus between both Europe regarding the needs for more innovation as we have seen the increased majority for the resolution of the topic and I think that this clause really fits between this overall consensus that's been in the public and that's why we should retain it the way it is.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. Thank you very much. So we will begin for the vote.

Just to clarify, if you want the original passage to be left as it is, so the red one, you have to vote against. If you want the new version, the green one, you have to vote in favour. Therefore we start with the votes against adopting this amendment. In favour? Abstentions? It is not carried. Thank you. That was the only amendment. So we move to the vote on the entire resolution unless there is a last intervention, which In favour? Abstentions? With three abstentions, it is re-adopted. Congratulations. And we move to the last resolution, EC2, better integrated and more sustainable mobility infrastructure for an ever closer union.



Nea-Maria Törmänen (Coopted FC member, PC 2 co-chair): So the resolution calls for more sustainable and integrated urban transport system, emphasising the need for accessible and affordable public transport, improved cross-border rail connectivity and reduced emissions in line with the EU climate targets.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. There are no amendments left. Therefore, if there is no last intervention or question, we can move to the vote, which is the case.

Is there anybody against re-adopting this resolution? In favour? Abstentions?

So it is unanimously re-adopted. Congratulations. PC2 and also PC1 again for the shared resolution for this fantastic work.

And we move to EC3, where we start with the first resolution towards a strong future orientated relationship with Africa. And I would like to ask the EC chairs to briefly introduce it.

Federico Tosi (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): This resolution is an overview on our relation with Africa. It starts with regressing and acknowledging our colonial past. We think it's the right starting point for shaping the new relation with Africa. Then we call for a new strategic partnership based on fair terms. So basically, as all our resolutions, we ask for a single European voice, so a common foreign policy toward the African continent. And then to deep cooperation in many fields, such as youth exchange, human mobility, economic and humanitarian field.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much, Federico. Many people are going to the bathroom and not all of them have given the vote. So please, if you leave, give your vote to the praesidium and take it only once you get back.

I will see if any of these people come back. We now move to the first amendment, 004, introduced by JEF Greece.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): Just to clarify, the first and the second are all put together, because in the system it just appeared that they were separate for a reason.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer): We propose to keep the first line of this paragraph and the rest of it to replace it with this new paragraph in order to be more precise on what we want to achieve in the future and our future aspirations between EU-Africa relations and not just to stay in the past. Thank you very much.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. Sofia was the first, but I see many hands who want to speak against it, so we will give it to Reinis.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Dear JEF Greece, I just want to clearly state that I don't really agree with the history of the European Union and Africa. It has always been very close. In my understanding, the origin of the African Union idea came much more from ideas of the third world, where we do not engage with Western society, like Banda Conference, these kind of ideas. We would like to see this fact-checked and supported because I don't feel comfortable with this European sanctification. I'm sorry.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): This was not, I'm sorry, we're not speaking against the amendment because this is the part that's kept and also the part that is contextualised by what is supposed to be deleted in this amendment, so we will not give it to Sofia. So, speak.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): Yes, thank you. Great. I would argue that to adopt this amendment would be to do a great disservice and injustice towards our historical responsibility, because even if some parts of the analysis that JEFrey provides are geopolitically accurate, they are no excuse to erase the fact that Europe for centuries has colonised our southern continental neighbour to the point that during the entirety of World War II, for example, there were only two independent African states and the rest were colonial territories, which is why this past needs to be recognised and not whitewashed. Thank you.



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. That was a very clear speech against. We will now move to the vote. Who is against carrying this amendment introduced by the priest? Against? In favour? In favour? Abstentions? It does not carry. We will go back and we have the next amendment again by JEF Greece. Would you please briefly introduce it? 014.

Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer): Regarding this amendment, as long as it's two separate amendments and we need to vote on that, we would like to state again that we agree and understand the recognition of our past, but if you see the whole proposal, the whole resolution, we do not believe we need to repeat again and again our past behaviour towards our neighbours, but we can keep the first paragraph that's closed in the preamble of the clauses and focus more on our future relations with our neighbours.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Okay, so we have it in our hands, speaking against, and I'm not sure who was first. Anybody want to read it? JEF Serbia?

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): I see what you are trying to make here, but these are two completely different things, because the first one was about history and this one is about the EU's foreign policy, which I believe must be here, because we are talking about today's situation. I believe this must stay in the resolution, because it recognises that the EU is self oriented and caring only about the migrants coming into Europe, but not about Africa itself.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. We cannot take further interventions, we have to stick to the rule, and I just remind, since now I think everybody has come back from the bathroom, leave your votes at the praesidium when you go. So we move to the vote on this amendment. Who is against adopting it? In favour? Abstentions?

It is thus not carried. We move on to the next amendment, which is again brought up by JEF Greece, would you be so kind to speak to the migrants on this way to the EU?



Christos Tsertsenes (JEF Greece, Observer) Thank you. Regarding this clause, this paragraph, we propose a rephrasing here of moving away from traditional democracy in 1999, same grace, real democracy, which I believe is what we think and we try to do. Thank you very much.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you so much. This is just something that you told me, I would like to speak against it, so I will give the floor to Samuel.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): In accordance with the other resolutions and our goals in the resolutions, I would like to underline the thing that if we want to put these past injustices and colonial practises into past in the resolution, we need to put the actual practises also in the past with our relations to Africa. We are in a moment, we are in dire need of allies defending human rights, defending values, defending rule of law, and we need to be clear to the world that we actually stand behind those values in our policy. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Well, we cannot take further points. You said one in favour, one against, unless you change it. Point of order.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): I recommend opening actual debates without particularly also smaller sections to get the word in regards to these events.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. So we will open it for this question, but the rule is not abolished for the rest of the debate. So who would like to make a brief contribution?

Now raise your hand. It will be written under the praesidium and we close the speakers, so the speakers cannot make endless contributions. I see four hands. Martin, Reinis, Sofia, and JEF Romania. Point of order.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Point of order. I don't understand. Do you mean like opening it right now for like discussing this?



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Discussing this amendment.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Can I propose that we put it to vote, the proposal to open it for discussions? You can propose that. So we will also work with the vote.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Who is in favour of opening the discussion for this amendment only? Against? We need the tellers who think in the position.

So again, who is in favour? Please raise your cards very clearly.

Fourteen. Who is against? Seventeen.

Therefore, it will not happen and we will move to the vote. Point of order. Point of order. No, we just said that we will not open this meeting unless this was rejected.

So we move to the vote on this amendment. Now, the vote.

Is there anyone against adopting this amendment? In favour? Abstentions?

The amendment thus is not carried. We move on to the next one.

Dimitrios Athanasiadis (JEF Greece, National Delegate): This is just a change of wording here, which is very not crazy.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Sofia was the first.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): So, it's always the same thing. I mean, to be fair, I'm a bit surprised we're having this conversation. Like, it's a bit boring that we have the conversation in the first place. But, we have to have it. Because, I don't understand how anyone can argue that different countries committed less migrants than the European Commission. I mean, it's data. It's not opinions. So, I'm just a bit concerned that we've reached a point where we have to discuss this.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Is that one folder?

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): Yes, because when you click on the amendment, it removes part of the text. I don't know if it's on purpose, or if it's...



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Oh, yeah, it has two parts. I'm sorry.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): It happens because of the new version of the resolution. If it's just a new version of the resolution, that's fine, because that happens in the amendment platform sometimes. But if it's an amendment, then I think it should also be disclosed.

I think maybe... I mean, on Africa, there was no new version of the resolution, so I assume this is...

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): No, it's not the new version of the resolution. Thank you very much for pointing this out, Christelle. So, two things. It is not due to the new version. It really also calls for deleting the paragraph that you can see here, in the lower part. It's the same amendment. So please make sure to, in the future, submit amendments separately, because otherwise it's very difficult after debating to also vote. It might not be... It also might be accidentally deleted. But maybe this was also accidentally done, so I don't know. Just... Was this an accident? Is this intended? It is intended. But it is intended to be deleted. Yes, but in another way. Well, okay, so it was not a mistake, but we have it here. We cannot separate now amendments.

Good. Then, I think we can simply move to the vote. Who is against this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? The amendment is thus not carried.

Okay, we have amendment 140 by JEF Malta. Please.

Isaar Rizzo (JEF Malta, National Delegate): The aim of this amendment, first of all, to clarify, it's not to propose that we should not give aid to African states, but rather that our relations with Africa are solely based on giving aid. That's the narrative that Africa is not here, we are up here. That obviously doesn't go together with African states. Furthermore, rather than emphasising also trade with African states, also sharing of expertise. This can be, for example, when it comes to water purification, which certain African countries are not as developed maybe as, for example, the case for Malta, which is something that is a country that is surrounded by sea water, and having our natural, our table water not being pure enough to drink. That's something that we specialise on as a country. So, I have this kind of goal told amongst a lot of other sectors.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. Anyone who would like to speak against this amendment? I see none, so we move to the vote. Is there anybody against this amendment? In favor? Abstentions? With a few abstentions, it is carried. Thank you. There is no one who can't. Okay, so there are no other amendments left. Therefore, we move to the vote of the entire solution, unless there is a last intervention. Yes, JEF Romania.

Tiberia Cercea (JEF Romania, National Delegate): The European Colonialism is something awful in history and now, but I think we need to discuss more about the actual Russian imperialists in Africa on the public good, and his interference in the cyber war, in their political internal affairs of the countries.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. So, just to point out, there is a mention of this in the resolution as well. Yes, if you want to have it changed, it will be reopened in two and a half years. But we can also work separately on that in the PC3, if there is a desire to do so. I see other interventions. Alex and then Aléxandros.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): Yes, just to keep it very short. Emphasising our colonial past and the colonial practices doesn't mean that other states also don't do it. But you can make one thing and thereby not eliminate everything else that has been done. So, I don't really understand the argument here.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): I wanted to say that I find it a pity that whenever we make amendments that have to be more future-oriented, the decisions, instead of adding things, deleting things that have to do with how we see our past and how we repair what we have been doing. So, I think that for future references, when we have to do conversations, when it's both what have we done and how are we working to repair it, and what would we like to do in the future, I don't think there is any contrast with that and that it's necessary to be deleting the references about what happened in the past or what is the current data in order to put references about future-oriented approaches. Those are some of the points I made. It is a process in which we are deleting the work of



art in which we want to modify things. Please, I encourage everyone in the future to consider adding, not only deleting. We lost some very important points that we have to reject because we disagreed with what was getting deleted instead. And I think this is important.

Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you for this last comment and also thank you for the good debate. It just shows how relevant these discussions are. We therefore now move to the vote.

Is there anybody against re-adopting this resolution? In favour? Abstentions?

One vote against and three abstentions. It is clearly re-adopted. Congratulations.

We move to the next PC3 resolution towards the accession of the Western Balkan countries. Please.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): This resolution was one of the resolutions we actually had time to go through in the PC3 yesterday. This is about EU's responsibility to integrate the Western Balkans while it also criticises current enlargement methodology that lets national political actions and cross-veto style progress. Also, it calls for a transparent federalist approach that empowers EU institutions, especially the parliament, to oversee more democratic access and process. There are a couple of amendments that were submitted after the PC session, so we are going through them now.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. And it is time for the first amendment submitted by JEF Serbia.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): In this point, we are emphasising the concerns. We firmly believe that it is important to emphasise who is the actor that supports the public of Serbia in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is the Serbian government and not the Serbian people. There are many people that are against providing this support, including us, and we feel that it is unjust to put that all of Serbia supports it while it is the government.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): I can also just give context, because this was also discussed within the PC3 discussion, and I wish we could have had a larger discussion, but the consensus was, or the agreement that we came to, was the fact that whilst, yes, it is problematic to create a catch-all statement, because obviously not every single Serbian in the community supports these actions as the protests have shown, and for which we are very thankful for everyone that is going on the streets and protesting, the reality also is that it is not just the government alone that is institutionalising these systems. There is, at the very least, a certain degree of popular support for a number of these problematic things, which I, for example, always recognise, be it when it comes to the struggle of recognising war crimes committed during the Yugoslavian wars, amongst not just the Serbian government, but also the Serbian people, which is why I would argue it is just as reductionist to only focus on the government, and therefore completely ignore the population that stands behind them. Thank you.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): Thank you, Alex, for saying, reminding that this was already discussed in PC3. The result was 8 to 7 against this amendment, but it was so close, it makes sense to put this into vote again.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): So we will therefore move to the vote now. Who is against having this amendment? Please raise your voting cards.

Who is in favour? Abstentions? The amendment is thus carried.

Thank you. We move on to the second amendment, also by JEF Serbia. Please.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): So originally we submitted an amendment that said that it should be a simultaneous joining of countries of the Western Balkans into the European Union. And after talking to people that were on PC3, because I was one of the people on PC1, we saw why that problem happened. We also want to bring the perspective that we have in the Balkans, that if we really have to ensure that no state will block others for political reasons, that's why we suggest adding this into the sentence.



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. Anyone who would like to speak against? I don't see that.

Therefore, we can move to the vote. Is there anyone against this amendment? Two against in favour.

Abstentions? Therefore, the amendment is carried. Thank you.

I believe these are the only ones, indeed. So we will move to a vote of the entire resolution. Is there anybody against re-adopting this resolution?

In favour? Abstentions? With one abstention, it is thus re-adopted.

Congratulations. We move on to the next resolution on future UK-EU relations. PCS, please introduce it.

Federico Tosi (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): In this resolution, we start, of course, by regretting Brexit and all the consequences it brought to our relation and to the population, both in UK and EU. We start underlining the common values and history that we have together with the UK. Then we divide the resolution into three sub-chapters, we can say. The first one is focused on foreign policy and defence cooperation. The second one is economic, financial and market integration. And the third one is civil society, education and mobility. So, of course, we wanted to have the UK with us during the process, so they attended the meeting, and we would like to thank them for attending. But they still wanted to add some amendments, and we didn't have time yesterday to vote them informally in the PC meeting.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much for this introduction. We just move to the amendments, and we have the first one A8-026 from Christelle.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): I just think it's worth it to see that there was improvement in the relations, that there is a possibility for the UK to join things they left, and it goes well with our asks.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. Is there anyone who would like to speak against this amendment? Well, that is not the case. We will thus move to the vote. Anyone against the amendment? In favour? Abstentions? That is as carried.



Now the next one. Item 037. Submitted by the National delegate of JEF UK. Not present.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair) Thank you. These amendments by Cecilia from the UK were put forward into the PC meeting, and we had a look to the amendments, and there was the sense that we could accept the amendments if they were rewritten in a more logical way to the resolution. So these are put forward as a response to that.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. Is there anyone who would like to speak against this amendment?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Out of respect for JEF UK, this is completely out of context. It could have consequences for our external credibility, and they are doing an amazing job, except that this is not the place to mention it.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. We will thus move to a vote on the amendment. Who is against this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? The amendment does not carry. We move on to the next amendment by Christelle.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): Just for language accessibility to spell out acronyms.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): All right. Is there anybody you would like to speak against? So we move to a vote. Is there anybody against this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? It is thus carried.

Next one, again, by JEF UK. Does anybody like to speak against it? It is actually in the same logic as the one we had before, as the explanation in my PC chairs. Anybody would like to speak against it? We already have this, so we move to a vote. Is there anybody against this amendment? In favour? Not carried. And then there is another amendment, also by JEF UK. I believe it is again the same logic.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



So I assume we are speaking neither in favour nor against it. We move, therefore we can move to the vote. Who is against having this amendment? In favour? Not carried. We move on to the next one by Christelle.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): It is actually one of the two. It is the same as in all our resolutions. We refer to our section as JEF country. For consistency, we would like to do it there as well.

Alexiane Terrochaire – – Barbançon (Executive Board): Unfortunately, it has not been communicated, but it poses severe issues to the section of the UK, to be called JEF. Administrative and legal hurdles, so I would leave them for the benefit of the doubt. If it can make the situation easier for them to move on, I would leave that to them.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): So we move to a vote. Who is against this amendment? Against the change. In favour? Abstentions? It is thus carried. We are through with the amendments. We will therefore vote on the entire resolution.

Is there anybody against adopting this resolution? In favour? Abstentions?
With one abstention, it is adopted. Congratulations.

Ignacio Esteban Avendano (Arbitration Board): My point of order is that I have a flight, and there is a resolution that has an opinion on the arbitration board, so it is a question whether I can do it by email and then it can be read out afterwards. If that is possible.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): That is okay. Send it to the Presidium and it will be read out. Thank you. As for the coffee break – sorry, toilet break – we have to make a deal on this. You can go, but you leave your voting cards all here and you come aligned with the position, and you come back to pick them up. So you don't have to redo the roll call. That is very important – otherwise you have to redo the roll call if that goes wrong. So we now have a toilet break of five minutes. We will resume at 12:35.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): All right, we are now continuing. Are there no more voting cards, or are there voting cards left here with the Presidium that are not picked up? No? So we are all back in the room. Thank you for keeping the agreement.

We go now to the PC 3 resolution 89 for the common European response to the invasion of Ukraine and the future of Ukraine. Very, very brief introduction, please.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair) I think it's quite clear what this resolution is about. Long-term commitment, ongoing and robust commitment to back Ukraine's transformation and its European future and support against Russian aggression.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. We just moved to the first amendment. Alex from Germany.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair) I would actually want to also propose a technical point here for what it's called.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): Point of order. We have lots of amendments by Alex here that are very critical language washing, just adding spaces into places that should have spaces. But I'd like to propose that we vote on these together just to get your acceptance on handling all this language washing.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Well, actually, language washing, I don't even think that we have to vote since there is no change to the meaning, the semantics of the resolution. I guess this one is on language washing. So let me go to the next one. Alex, this is not on language washing. No, so please introduce it. The mic is here, but it's on your way.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): Yes, thank you. Right, so when I was going through this resolution, firstly, I was very satisfied that the reality of the situation was named directly, acknowledging the fact that we are witnessing a genocide in Ukraine and for calling it out as such. However, the thing that is missing, in my opinion, is recognising and characterising Russia for what it really is. And that is

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



the way that I see it. And that's the way I phrase it here, as nothing less than a revisionist, colonialist state that commits genocide consistently, eradicates culture, and is an inherent threat to our security. And I believe that with any resolution that tackles the topic of Ukraine, Russia would see it for what it really is.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Would anyone like to speak against this? If not, I'm going to pass the issue to my PC chair.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): This similar wording was accepted by the PC in another resolution, so this would go in accordance to that.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): All right, then we can move to the vote. Is there anybody against this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? With a few abstentions, it's carried. Thank you. This is a language question. This as well, as well. This is a bigger one. Alex, please.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): This is mainly, in my opinion, a correction, considering that I'm guessing when this was written, the situation in the US had not become as precarious as it now is. So therefore, it was all phrased in hypothetically. I simply changed it to acknowledging the current reality by underscoring what Trump has done and what he is continuing to do.

non identified Section: I'm not exactly against, but as far as I know, aid was restored. So I'm just wondering, how does this work with the opposite?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Alex, very quickly, because we cannot go into discussion.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): Yes, it was restored currently, but the reality that Trump unilaterally withdrew it for some egoistic self-interest shows that where his real long-term interest is. And USAID aid has not been restored, just so you know.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Okay, so then we will move to the vote. Is there anybody against this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? It is thus carried. There are no other amendments. We will thus move to the vote of the entire

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



resolution. Is there anybody against adopting this resolution? In favour? Abstentions? It is thus, with one abstention, adopted.

Congratulations. We now move on to the last resolution in PC3.

Samuel Tammekann (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair) This is a paired resolution with the previous one about Russia, what is our policy towards Russia and its active erosion of democracy in Europe. Also supporting Russian dissidents, conscientious objectors and democratic forces.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. We move to the first amendment. Another similar amendment by Alex.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): A similar logic with this one, as with the amendment that was just last discussed. Simply naming the examples of things that have happened thus far with U.S. policy to underscore the severity of the situation.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you very much. Anybody would like to speak against it? That's not the case. And we move to the vote. Anybody against this amendment? In favour? Abstentions? It is thus carried.

So we move to the vote of the entire resolution.

Is there anybody against re-adopting it in the current form? In favour? Abstentions? It is thus unanimously adopted. Thank you very much.

With this, we are through with the PCs. And just as a clarification, we have no lapsing resolutions that need to be re-adopted because all of them have been worked through in PCs. We are just moving forward to the internal resolutions.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): First we have the first internal resolution on JEF Europe strategy for the next few years. we all had the discussion so May I make some introductory remarks? As far as I see we have one, the first open amendment is A5-043.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Can I just clarify, so there are actually three, since this was a big debate yesterday, it said radical fight, I think, originally, so there are now three proposals which came in. Maybe we can have a look at them together. So the first one is this one, importance of the movement's revolutionary struggle.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Then there's another one, the importance of the movement including its current and historical actions. And the third alternative, the importance of the movement's historical fight.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Yeah, I mean, I wasn't aware of this previous thing. It's good for you, because it was one of the things.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): To be honest, this was a compromise reached in the resolutions committee, so maybe Xesc wants to speak to it.

Xesc Mainzer (Executive Board, VP): Because the original by JEF Italy, it said radical fight, but I don't know why this appears as the JEF Italy amendment originally, but with the wording we came up with. But this is the proposal of the resolutions committee, not Chess Italy's proposal, just for clarification.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Point of order.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Just one question. So we're not looking for my amendment then? Like it's just erased? for the radical fight. So we just want a compromise of the committee?

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Currently we have three different options, and that's the option that we will vote on.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): So do you plan on voting the three separately?

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): I would propose we're going to do one vote for the three of the options, because if the first vote is adopted, if the first suggestion is adopted, then we understand that this is the will of the EFC. Okay. I think there were points of... Reinis first

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Thank you very much. Can I propose that we vote not for or against abstaining, but we vote... Okay. Who votes for the first? Who votes for the second? Who votes for the third?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): If I may express myself, I don't see an issue with having to consider the radical fight, out of fairness, for JEF

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Italy, who put some work into it, and we discussed it yesterday. So, I suggest that we vote out of affirmation on four proposals.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): So, a point of order, because there are quite similar suggestions to avoid spoiler effect, but we maybe should vote one by one, and then just, you know, accept previously.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): It's exactly what we said, but we will consider, and we will vote only if you want option one, two, three, or four. It's what you said. Yes, we will collect, since it is similar, we will vote on them by bundles. Okay? One last point, maybe?

Okay, so we have four options.

Radical fight is included. Revolutionary struggle, the movement's current and historical actions, and the importance of the movement's historical fight. We will show them on the screen one by one. As per what the Praesidium requests, you vote only for the option that you support. There is no against or abstention.

Valentin Petri (FC Praesidium): You only have one vote for the four votes that you take. So, if you choose your favourite, that is the proposition that we make.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): I suggest that, out of the time constraint, we proceed with this one. You said yourself, but it is the same thing we are voting on.

Valentin Petri (FC Praesidium): Okay, so we are not going to have a discussion like this. This is a formal objection to this point of order that was made by the Praesidium, so we are going to take a vote on this. So, we are going to take a vote on this point of order as suggested by the Praesidium. So, who is in favour of doing the vote as suggested by the Praesidium? All in favour? Okay, yes. Only one vote for all the four options. Who is against? Who abstains?

So, this is the way we proceed. Sorry.

Option one. Okay, so we start with option one.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): No, Alex. It is over. I am sorry.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer) What if you are against all the amendments?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): No, but Alex, it is just because the amendment always adds on something. So, if you vote against, you need to suggest a proposal. We do not have time for that, so you just do not vote. If I may suggest this out of simplicity, but I understand the concern.

Alexandros Apostodilis (The Executive Board, Treasurer): I think that for practical reasons, it has to be given the possibility to reject all amendments because of all the options.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Should we take a vote on that?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Let us just have five votes.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): So, we can also pick favourite amendment and then do the vote on the favourite amendment against no text?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Okay. Does that alternative suit you? We choose the formulating and then we choose if we vote for, against, abstention.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Okay, so first amendment of radical fight. Is there anything you want to introduce?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Let's not discuss it.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Who is in favour of this amendment?

The second is the importance of the movement's revolutionary struggle.

Who is in favour of adopting this option?

Who is in favour of the third option adding and the importance of the movement including its current and historic actions?

And who is in favour of the last option and the importance of the movement's historical fight?

So the first has it with nineteen.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Alexiane Terrochaire -- Barbançon (Executive Board): First it's whether we take this or we reject the amendment. It's fine. So basically what we are doing now is voting on the amendment.

So the suggestion was the radical fight. Now we will proceed with voting against, in favour, abstention.

First amendment? Nineteen.

Second? Eight.

Ten for the third.

And three for the fourth.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): So now we take the vote on adopting the radical fight one, the one that had the most votes in the previous one. Or you can vote yes, no or abstain.

The amendment is adopted.

Alexiane Terrochaire -- Barbançon (Executive Board): Thank you so much for bearing with us. I know we are all tired, but thank you for adopting the specific methodology that reflects also the debate we have about the vision of federalism.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): The next one is amendment A5051. And we have the same situation here. So we are going to have two different propositions.

So we are going to take the vote on either, if you want, the first, submitted by JEF Germany, and in the sentence, sections that violate the core values of the movement can be tolerated. Yeah, that's the point of order. And now the second...

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): So this second amendment that you can see, A5055, thank you, I add it as a compromise, hopefully, because I remember yesterday we were talking about JEF Germany's proposal and that it can affect a lot of sections, especially, for example, JEF Norway, who don't follow the full-fledged federalism values.

So that's why I propose to change the amendment to the former, which states fundamental values that we all stand for, and that, for example, if I can mention JEF Lithuania, the ex-JEF Lithuania, did not follow through with, and that's why I think this clause should still not allow any other section to do what JEF Lithuania did. So move it.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): Thank you, Reinis, compromise amendment. This is why I'm taking back the A551.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Okay, so JEF Germany withdraws their amendment, so we only have one amendment, as shown here. And so now we're going to vote on this amendment.

Who votes in favour of adopting this amendment? Against? Abstains?

So with one vote against and some abstentions, this is adopted.

Next, we have the amendment A5094-2.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Well, I mean, actually, it's more or less what we had yesterday. So we tried to reformulate this a little bit to take into account everything in the resolutions committee. It's about formulating what JEF Europe should look like as an employer and how, ideally, the secretaries should be strategically approached in the planning.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Anyone who is against? No? Then we're going to take the vote.

Who votes in favour? Who votes against? Abstains?

Then the amendment is carried with a few abstentions.

The next one is A128, introduced by JEF Italy.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): We would like to withdraw this amendment. Is it possible?

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): This amendment is withdrawn. Then we continue with amendment 3B, A125, introduced, I guess, by the committee.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): It was also discussed yesterday. And it was the compromise that was found. So, you know, changing the order and adding the suggestion.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): So we're not going to discuss it now because we discussed it yesterday.

And this is like a compromise. So we're going to vote directly. Who is in favour of the amendment? Who votes against? Who abstains? Then the amendment is

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



carried with one abstention. The next one is A146, proposed by the Auditor Committee or by someone, by Patrick?

Patrick L. von Wildenradt (Auditors Committee): I would just like to add these things to my emphasis on also improve our financial management.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Does anyone want to speak against it? Okay, then we're going to have the vote. Who votes in favour of the amendment? Who votes against? Who abstains? Then the amendment is carried unanimously. Then the next one is also an amendment by Patrick. Do you want to explain, give any additional information?

Patrick L. von Wildenradt (Auditors Committee): I thought it would also be nice to have a strategy that, of course, we strive to follow the recommendations made by the auditors. Because that's why we have the auditors, I suppose. So, yeah.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Thank you. Does anyone want to speak against it? No? Then we're going to take the vote. Who votes in favour of the amendment? Who votes against? Who abstains? Then the amendment is carried. This was the last amendment for the strategy. Do you want to make any further remarks?

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): I think that it stirred up some debates. I'm happy that we will have this guiding document. But I would welcome that these debates be pursued during the political platform discussions. And in the future, for any document that includes strategic guidance, may I advise you to always have a look at this one.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): I just wanted to thank you, the two chairs, for all the big work on the portfolio strategy. We did a lot of hard work to participate in most of them. And sometimes it was a bit of a struggle. So, I don't have the energy that it takes to do that. So, thank you very much. And I'm very happy. Thank you very much.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Then we come to the final vote on the EU strategy for the next four years. Who votes in favour of the proposed strategy resolution? Who votes against? Who abstains? The strategy is adopted unanimously.



Alexiane Terrochaire – – Barbançon (Executive Board): Thank you. Good news. So, for a fun fact, this strategy is going to be sent by Brigita on Tuesday for an application. So, thank you for voting it.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Now we have the next resolution. A16 for a more sustainable project. There are no amendments there. I'm sorry, there is one amendment. Who wants to introduce first the resolution?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): So, very briefly, to introduce it, this should have already been re-adopted in Budapest. But you may remember that there was a formal or procedural mistake and it was not submitted on time or there was a technical error or whatever. So, we promised to let it lapse there and to bring it back at this FC. It is actually the internal resolution which says a lot about sustainability, how we strive for it and how JEF needs to become more greener and more sustainable. So, it's a good thing to have. Therefore, it is here again to be voted upon. And there is one amendment.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): We cannot become sustainable and have a just transition or even achieve net zero in JEF if we don't work together with organisations and networks who specialise in this. Because JEF does not specialise in climate action, we specialise more in European affairs, which of course includes sustainability and climate action. I would still propose to add this paragraph in, which would advise all member organisations, member sections to also build partnerships with their national or local climate action organisations to learn from them and work together with them. Thank you.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Thank you. Is there anyone who wants to speak against the amendment? Then we come to the vote. We vote in favour of the amendment. Who votes against the amendment? Who abstains? Then the amendment is carried. And now we have the final vote on this resolution. Who votes? Or do you want to add anything? No. Okay. Then who votes in favour of adopting the resolution? Who votes against? Who abstains? Then this resolution is as well carried. You can amend it. You know what I mean.

Resolution on the full time President

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Then we come to the last internal resolution and the last one for today. The 18th continuation of the JEF Europe President role availability as a full-time position. I would ask someone to introduce the resolution, please.

Xesc Mainzer (Executive Board, VP): Hi, everyone. Basically, this resolution is, on the one hand, our proposal to continue having the option to have a full-time president, because, as you know, we have the situation about the financial uncertainty from the next year. However, we feel that we should be ready for the moment when we can have the option to sustain the full-time presidency. As you know, we already did a recommendation by the Executive Board in Budapest, where we basically gave the justifications of what we are presenting today. And I think there isn't much else to add, so that should be it.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): As much as I understand some of these amendments, I would still propose for us, of course, after we go through these amendments, to vote for it, because the current state of the EB and the current situation with the financial problems that we may have shouldn't impact the next board and the next president. If we have financial stability, why shouldn't we allow a full-time opportunity for the president? Because the president does do a lot for JEF Europe. That's my general remark. Thank you.

Melanie Thut (JEF Germany, Observer): Point of order to ask if you think this resolution can open up the debates rather than just vote for it.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Is there an objection to this point of order? I don't see an objection. So the motion of order is carried. Then we come to the first amendment. It's JEF Italy, it's amendment 12.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): So this amendment, just as a practice, the motivation behind the amendment is not to undermine the foundation of the current presidency. I'll make it clear. It's just a matter of form in the sense that we don't think it fits in the resolution to evaluate the current presidency. We don't think it makes any sense in the text. And it just is incongruent with the rest of the resolution. It sounds bizarre that we are evaluating ourselves in a positive way like this. Even though anyone can have, you know, of course, their

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



own motivation for the presidency. It's not a matter of evaluating the presidency. It's a matter of form.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): And so are there examples?

Xesc Mainzer (Executive Board, VP): There is that the resolution, even though it includes the full-time presidency, it also opens the way for the presidency to be a volunteer-based position. And we thought that actually the current performance of the presidency, this mandate, as we presented in Budapest in the recent recommendation with factual data of the level of activity, justifies that the option of it also being volunteer is not something perfect, that it can be done. That's why it is there. Because basically this is a bit of the justification of what we propose after. So that's why we see that as something that concerns us.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): No, I understand this, but this is a positive, super positive evaluation of something that we are going to debate on. So, I mean, you're talking about data, but for me this is an opinion. You know? I'm not stating my opinion here, but I'm just saying this is a positive evaluation on data. And data can be interpreted. So I think, again, that it's a bit bizarre, and I haven't seen any political movement or party, someone that, you know, gives himself like a political evaluation of a document that refers to a structure. For me it doesn't fit in the document. And if we want to have a discussion on that political point, then we have it, but I don't think this is about that. Also for the future, I mean.

Laure Niclot (JEF France, Observer): I am not sure I agree with you. It might be interesting to look at it. I think it is also giving context on what the network's position on should we have a full-time presidency opportunity or not, whether it is possible, and also reflecting on the fact that we need to give opportunities to people who might consider these decisions later on.

And I think on that point it's interesting to reflect that we have had this experiment for two years, and that there were activity reports that showed that it worked on that side. And of course then there's the political debate, but I think it's still something that is relevant to say in context and informing the future network's activities. I would say that removing it is also sending a signal I would say that removing it is also sending a signal that I think is not very positive on our network

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



and reflecting also on the fact that, I don't know, I think rejecting it is also rejecting the fact that it is a fact that there was a high level of activity and that there were reports that were produced on that.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Okay, well now I have three other people on the speakers list. Alex, Sofia and Robin. And I will ask anyone who wants to speak to add them. Okay, I saw Reinis as well, to add them to the speakers list. Aléxandros. And now the speakers list will be closed.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): So I would argue in line with the justification provided by JEF Italy in the fact that, yes, this presidency has been, it has been a very high level of activity, something for which the sections are all very proud of and for which we thank the Executive board and the President in the way that she has fulfilled her role. Nevertheless, this is still something that, as has been mentioned, that has been made clear in the FCs, be it in calls or even be it in local debates, that high activity is not automatically synonymous with a perfect performance. And therefore there is a debate to what extent everyone is satisfied with or to what extent people are satisfied with, which is why in order to avoid said discussion in arguing to what extent do we recognise, to what extent do we praise, I would argue it's better to therefore just remove the text and then leave discussions on, for example, the activity in reports or in other documents that we have that tackle the activities of the President, the EB, and other statutory entities.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): I would also support the amendment brought forward by JEF Italy for different reasons. First, we also have to think about this resolution as being something that is going to be re-adopted in the future. So, of course, it can then be dropped, but why wouldn't the same logic hold there? So this kind of evaluation should always happen then. So I see this as a little problematic. Then the point that was made that we need to point out the fact that we have this openness, either on a voluntary basis or a full-time president. That point is made in other sections of the resolution very clearly. There is even one clause stating that either choice is legitimate and cannot be used to discredit or disadvantage any candidate. So that point is made.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



And third point, I am personally very thankful to Christelle for her great work. Also as FC, we see how the money that was not used on her salary was used to refund and reimburse FC members. It was also used to support sections and other things. And I think that actually this recognition should happen, but elsewhere where it is more visible than in an internal resolution which will end up in a drawer. I don't think that's the moment for it.

I think we will have moments to express that, and it should be expressed. So for all of these reasons, I think this is not the right place. It's not where it is supposed to be. And therefore, I would support deleting it without having any resentment or negative ideas in my head.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Okay, I completely agree with what Robin has just said, so I'm just going to add just one thing on the promotion points you mentioned. It's not, for me and for us, it's not about being positive or negative. And I think sometimes I have mentioned these things, I think it just requires some negative discussions we have, explicitly or implicitly.

We are a political movement, we are not a country club. So it's not about saying being positive or being negative. I mean, this is a political point. It's politics, it's not personal. And as Robin said, I want to agree with that as well, explicitly, so we are all clear. I agree as well with what Robin said and I am grateful to Christelle for what she did, and that's why I'm not talking about Christelle's performance. I'm talking about a political point, I'm including a lot of points about the presidency as a structure of my organisation, which is a political movement. So it's not about being negative or positive, because these are moral evaluations. I'm not talking about morality, like I said. I'm talking about a political point. And I think it's important for all of us, and this is what I wish for the political movement, to make a clear distinction between the two, because then it's very hard to have political discussions if you keep mixing the two things.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Actually, just real quick, answering JEF Italy, in the comment of the amendment you actually added, that, like, I can read it as well, "the President is responsible for contributing to the organisation, it is their role, and the reason they hold that position". It kind of feels

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



like a personal attack, to be honest. But I would actually say that this point should stay, or also if it goes, I think it's still fine, but I would vote for leaving it, because it's also important to outline our reasons why we want a full-time presidency, and I feel like if we leave it in, it is not going to make it worse, you know, so to say. But if we remove it, then, also nothing good changes, but there is a big discussion on this, and,, I think it is kind of personal, to be honest, from a few people who want to propose this motion. So, that's mine.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): I think it is funny you read the comment of the amendment for this one and not for the others. This is exactly what I said before. So, the role of the president, not Christelle, the role of the president is this. This is exactly the motivation I explained in my first speech. So, I don't see the contradiction. I don't know why you read that. But, again, I don't know what to do to make it less personal. It's not the same four times. It's not personal. Like, I don't know how to explain it more than this. It's a political point. It's not personal. I appreciate what Christelle has been doing. I have no opinion on full presidency or half-time presidency. I mean, really, I don't care. Like, both things work. I mean, like, more than this, I don't know what to say. If we want to keep going with the personal, I mean, at this point, I just give up. Because there's no way I can convince you. Fine, focus politics. And I think it's very, I don't understand that we keep going like this. But also, I appreciate, I mean, we can have a conversation about it. If it's personal, we can have a personal conversation. But this is politics.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): We're not opening the discussion again. I think the views have been exchanged. And so, the last one on the list is Aléxandros.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Thank you. I just want to go back to the historic evolution of the paid and non-paid presidency. Because JEF never had a paid presidency before 2018. I was there, and we had very intense discussions about establishing a paid presidency. Because we were realising how hard it is for people to abandon their jobs if they wanted to do it full time. This kind of evaluations, not about whether it's positive or negative, but whether it is high or low level of activity, was expected by us at the time. And me, when I voted in February of 2018, I expected to be having this face there every time. We never voted that we approve of the presidency without constantly comparing the data.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Because if we had noticed now that an unpaid president is not able to deliver an equally high level of activity, we would have wanted it in the resolution. So not wanting it when it is there makes no sense. And when I voted in 2018 about it, I did not expect to not be having questions about it in our resolution about it.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Now we're coming to the vote. So who votes in favour of the amendment, which means deleting the paragraph? 13 in favour. Who votes against the amendment? 18 against. Who abstains? 7 abstentions. So the amendment is not carried.

Mirko Ondras (Directly-elected FC member, PC 1 co-chair): I propose a slightly different procedure for assigning speaking time for now, that after the amendment is presented, people who wish to speak show their hands and at that moment the speaking list is closed so it doesn't go back and forth from one person to the other and so that we don't go on forever.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): If there is a point of order, we have to go on immediately.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): I would actually propose to go back to the system that we had before. So presents, one argument for, one argument against and then we will... Because we are already 30 minutes over the schedule and actually we will probably finish way longer than I understand the secretary needs to leave by 2pm. How are we going to proceed without the secretary? So I would actually say that we... I know that that's not the best option, but we want through the amendment.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): So we have two points of order here right now. The first one is by Mirko. Is anyone objecting the point of order that the suggestion that Mirko made? Yes. So there is an objection, formal, or do you want to explain? No. Okay. Then we're going to have a vote on the proposal by Mirko so that we will... In the beginning, after the amendment was presented, everyone who wants to speak to the amendment shows up and then we close the speakers list immediately. Who votes in favour of this point of order? I see five votes. Who votes against? Who abstains? Okay. The proposal is rejected.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Then we have the second point of order. Is there an objection to the point? That is formal. So we're going to have a vote on this. So who is in favour of limiting the speakers list for every amendment to one in favour and one against?

Who is in favour of this? Who is against? Who abstains?

That is a majority. So we are back to the old system, one in favour, one against.

So now we come to the amendments introduced by the committee as well.

So here, Collector, does anyone want to introduce the amendments? Case 16.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): It is, again, the same motivation as before. It's about form and not evaluating, and especially not opening a discussion on evaluation. I think it doesn't encourage anyone to do the job.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Does anyone want to speak against this? I see no one. Then we proceed with the vote. So who votes in favour of the amendment? Deleting the paragraph. Who votes against the amendment? Ten against. Who abstains? Okay. So the amendment is carried.

We proceed to amendment 18 introduced by Robin. Do you want to say anything?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Just to clarify this, I rephrased it in the resolutions committee, but it was originally introduced by Germany.

Alex Weber (JEF Germany, Observer): It's basically just a clarification because the FC can be like this FC, but then there's also the direct elective FC.

Melanie Thut (JEF Germany, Observer): And just to add a section, since we are talking about structure, we just wanted to empower a little bit more our body as FC, and this is why this amendment wants to stress also the role. It is the motivation from our side to be more represented also in the future through the FC.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Does someone want to speak against the amendment? No. Then we proceed to the rest of them. We have information from the arbitration board. And before we are having information from the arbitration board, I'm just going to read it out or explain it.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Well, I'm not going to read it out because it's very long. It will take ten minutes, I guess. But you should have received it. So there was

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



a question. So I'm going to say what's in there, and then maybe I'll take a step back because I want also to comment it. So it says that the question was asked if this is in line with the statutes, and then the arbitration board, especially since there's a reference later in this course to Article 22B, and the arbitration board sets out the different responsibilities and powers of the FC, including the ongoing controlling power, but then it also goes into the composition of the FC and the fact that it gathers statutorily twice a year and says that according to this specific article, it means that the FC in the narrow sense is when it meets, according to this article, twice a year, which then the question is answered, apparently this is not in line with the statutes. But I don't know if I have the right to comment.

I wouldn't see this as a narrow reading, because as Mel said, it is about empowering the directly elected members of the FC who in the past experienced a hard time fulfilling their role, which is a role of ongoing political control. This is how it is introduced. And then, of course, it goes on. This is early Article 22. We can read it if you want. And then it specifies when it gathers and what are the different powers it holds during those gatherings. I personally would consider these being two different things. I don't think it was intended in such a way. But, of course, the mention to Article 22B might appear as misleading here.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Thank you. So, it's another point of order. Given that the last part of the paragraph asks for control of Article 22B and particularly its President, as said in that, since the arbitration board clearly said that it's not in line with the statutes, is it possible to make an amendment and to erase that incorrect sentence?

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Since this was a question to the Praesidium, we think you could introduce the amendment, deleting the mentioned article. So, as I understand, you would suggest to delete...

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Just to follow the arbitration board ruling.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Does the arbitration board make any amendment or suggestion?

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): It's a question to get the information. The first one is that the hearing for the amendments was last night at 10 o'clock. Can we really still make new amendments now? And secondly, I think that we could make an amendment which would be about deleting the article that makes it incompatible with the statutes, but finding which article makes it compatible with the statutes. Thank you.

Carolin Robert (JEF Germany, Observer): Yes, I just want to comment that I wasn't aware that the amendment is not compatible with the article. I'm sorry, maybe I shouldn't mention this specification about a part of the resolution. It's more about the symbol itself, but I was not comparing it with this article. So, if we have a solution to find the right one, it would be great. Then we can specify a little bit more the role of this.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): I think that actually, I just re-read it closely. It says both when convening, during the statutory events, and in between, according to Article 22b. And Article 22b clearly says what the powers are. When convening, as opposed to in between. So, if this is read benevolently, I do not see a problem. Because if you read the sentence closely, it does not contradict Article 22.

Article 22 specifies what the powers are, also in relation to other articles, for when the FC convenes during statutory events, which is distinct from when it acts during the mandate. So, I think if this really were to be used in the future, and the conflict would arise, then we have already a decision by the arbitration board, which says how this is to be interpreted and how not. Therefore, I do not strictly, upon re-reading it several times now, I do not strictly see this exacerbating the statutes. But we can have different opinions, I guess.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): Thank you for giving your perspective. I'd like just to summarise the thing. We've had disagreements over past mandates, over this mandate. We do not interpret and read the sentences in the statutes. And everyone does not agree with the same meaning. I see it as a problem, because it means that it will always be opposed. Today, we don't have time to either do a quiz in the statutes, or to agree on a single interpretation, but you see how harmful it is for our organisation, because it will always lead to power

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



struggles. So, to avoid that today, because we don't have time to debate, can I urge you, please, to erase that sentence, so we can peacefully debate later on, online, in person, whatever. We can hold a consultation. But here, in this resolution, since we do not disagree on the meaning of words, that is not harmful to our work.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): There were two other points, but we have to come to a decision now, so let me start taking those two, and then we make a proposition out of this.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): I just have a question, procedural one. So, if we adopt this, and it is not in line with the statutes, does that mean that at some point this resolution can be put out of order, because some points in it are not in line with the statutes?

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): The statutes supersede the resolution, but they also supersede the points that are in contradiction. So, if the statutes contradict this, then this point would be void, because the statutes are higher ranking and are out of order of law.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): I want to clarify that it is not a decision by the arbitration board, but an opinion. The decision would be binding, so if anyone feels that the statutes would be violated, they could call upon the arbitration board to make a decision. So, we would now proceed with the vote on this amendment. So, who votes in favour of this amendment? Fifteen in favour, who votes against? Nine against, who abstains? So, the amendment is carried. We proceed with the next amendment, submitted by JEF Italy, amendment number 36. Who votes for 36?

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): phrasing to make it more neutral and just stating it better and making it more clear as a resolution? Again, not personal.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Does anyone want to speak against the amendment? Then we take the vote. Who votes in favour of the amendment? Who votes against? Who abstains? Then the amendment is carried with some abstention.

So, we proceed with amendment in line 51, introduced by JEF Germany.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Carolyn Robert (JEF Germany, Observer): It is a very crucial point for us. We were in the financial debates in the past weeks, always reiterating our question whether, with the new funding possibilities, we will be possibly able to have a full-time capacity. And if you read the sentence, it says that only, like in principle, okay, out of the operation grant. But for us, it was not strong enough, since we don't know if we will get the operation grant. So, this is why we say, if no, then we also want other possibilities to be explored. This is very crucial at this point. And I know that projectification is not possible for a president, but there are also other ways. So, we have to commit that we will do everything in theory to be able to finance a full-time president.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Is there anyone who wants to speak against the amendment? Then we proceed with the vote. Who votes in favour of the amendment? Who votes against? Who abstains? Then the amendment is carried. So, the next amendment is also introduced by Germany, an amendment in line 55.

Carolyn Robert (JEF Germany, Observer): So, here we are talking about the role of the president in general. And since we have now in the past weeks all these debates, and we had some discussions around the process of the communication, I just thought it's very important to include that the financial health of our organisation in the future should also be a priority for the task of the president to have an eye on, to be in close contact. I know it's already happening, but still it's like an extra commitment, if we put it here, based on the experiences we had. This is why we thought it's very crucial for this one.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): I am not against it per se. I think that there is a missing element. It's that if we write this, the roles, the distinction between the role of an SG and president is blurred. So, I think it would have been better to say, including the financial health of the organisation in collaboration with the SG through its primary role. Let's not forget that. So, I'm sorry I missed that. But that would be my proposal to keep it in mind.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Now we proceed to the vote. Vote in favour of the amendment. 29 in favour. Votes against. Six against. Votes against. So, the

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



amendment is carried. And we come to the last amendment introduced by Frederico.

Federico Tosi (Directly-elected FC member, PC3 co-chair): Basically, I think, since the start, we saw that the flow of information and the communication between the EB, the FC, and the section should be a priority. So, it was just to underline this part of this document.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): I do agree that the flow should be the first point. But to me, it's problematic here that we are mixing two perspectives of the role of the president, one is the procedural one, the second one is the political one. And you, in your amendment, suggest that we delete the implementation of JEF Europe's activities. For me, that's problematic, because I think we need both sides here, in the sense that we need the procedural one, it's very important, and we also need to have that political component.

Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): So, we have a speech against it, so we have to vote. 25 in favour, 3 against. Who abstains? Then the last amendment is carried. Do you want to say anything, Xesc?

Xesc Mainzer (Executive Board, VP) I would like to thank you on behalf of the board for the very constructive amendments, honestly. I think we had a very healthy debate, and I would actually like to congratulate you all for keeping the forums, even though we always get a bit tense sometimes. But really, thank you all for the... This was not a criticism of anyone, just to remark. It was an honest assessment that we were civil, and I appreciate that, and I think that is the kind of example that we have to continue to set in this organisation. Thank you so much, and please let's continue working together.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Yes, just to say that I agree with what has just been said, and again, if we submit the amendments, once again, not personal but political, so it's just as much due to the organisation that we spent so much time for. Thank you.



Valentin Petri (FC Presidium): Who votes in favour of adopting the resolution? Who votes against the resolution? Who abstains? So we adopted the resolution unanimously.

Gergana Blazheva (FC Presidium): We're now going to vote on the monitoring committee's proposal.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): Just to clarify, because I think it is useful now because we don't remember maybe, that there's a few things we need to vote on, and maybe we can do a block, but just, we need to vote on, do we agree with the conclusion of each of the two monitoring committees, and do we agree to continue with the monitoring committees each, once? So it's like, for those that take my book, I leave that to you, but I think it's just important that people understand what are the votes coming up, because a monitoring committee needs to be renewed with each absentee, until the next statutory event.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you for the clarification. So I propose that we do it on block. First, the conclusions of the two monitoring committees. You remember it was Poland and Austria, and then a continuation. Is there any objection to this procedure? I don't see any, so we will proceed first with the vote on both, there is?

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): I didn't really understand, so are we voting for separate votes? We're voting for two votes. Okay, I disagree with voting for continuation about Austria and Poland. I would like to vote on them separately.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): So you object to the second part being the Oslo's own vote, not the conclusion, but the continuation? Okay. Then we will do it separately. Okay, so we do now vote on the two conclusions that were earlier on presented by Christelle, both Poland and Austria. Is there anybody against adopting those conclusions? Any favour? Abstentions? They are thus unanimously adopted.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Now we move on to the second part, which is about the continuation of those two procedures. And so since there are different opinions, I don't know if... so we will first do Poland. If it was presented, I think, in favour. If there's anybody speaking against this continuation?

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Yes, so I vote Poland as I am a proxy, so I object Poland, and I object Poland asking that they appreciate the contribution, but they themselves said that they would be okay with either a continuation or stopping it right now, so that's why I would like to propose that we vote separately, and I myself would vote against the continuation.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Would you like to specify why?

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Well, JEF Poland said to me to do that, so that's why. Yeah, he's a representative of Poland, that's why. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): All right, so we will start now with Poland, continuation of the monitoring committee. Who is against the continuation? Who is in favour? Abstentions? The monitoring committee will thus continue, and thank you for taking your proxy responsibility so seriously.

So we now go on to the second monitoring committee of Austria, and this continuation, is there anybody against continuing this monitoring committee? In favour? Abstentions? It is thus also continued. One more question to Christelle. Do we also need to vote on this, that it will be transferred with recommendation to the Congress, or is that already included in the conclusion?

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): Just what happens if they will vote again at the outgoing FC, which was then sent to the Congress.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): All right, thank you for your clarification. We thus move on to the next voting point, which is voting on the location of the spring FC 2026. Here the person has already received a request to hold this vote as a secret vote. Therefore, I would like to ask Birgitta to very quickly explain to us how this is going to happen, and there's also Christelle on this.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): Yeah, I was thinking, because the auditor is a person, like a personal vote, should we also do the secret votes for this, and combine them with the official votes, so that they're like the same?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): We can shortly do it, but I really urge you not to write things on the paper that are not supposed to be there. So, we'll explain this now. Birgitta, please explain the procedure, and then we will make clear what should be on the paper, and what shouldn't be there.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): Number one is the name of a city, it's either Belgrade or Athens, for the location of the Spring FC 2026. And number two is a classical vote: yes, no, or abstention, for the auditor, Pierre, whose presentation you have seen earlier today.

We will do the same, but we cannot have everything written on the same ballot. On the first paper, write the location for the EFC, and on the second paper, you will vote on the auditor proposal. Depending on how many votes you're carrying, you need to get the amount. So, if you have a proxy, then you need to have four papers. If not, then just two.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): So, have your voting cards ready. Per voting card, you will receive two papers. The first one is the location being received in 2026, right around a city, well, not just any city, either Belgrade or Athens. And the second one is yes, no, or abstention, because it's a question.

Joining the other tellers, thank you very much. We are now continuing with the other votes in expectation of these results. We have one more vote. It is the voting of the Congress presidium. Christelle, would you like to explain this election or should I do it?

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): Yes, so last time we gave you five names and then we had to change almost everyone because it's very difficult to ask people so ahead of time. And also, we have the online Congress in June and then we have the Congress physically, and both of them need to decide now. So, we put way more names in an attempt to have most people of the Congress in

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



June selected by you. And then we also asked that if this list is not enough, that your entrust us to find more names.

- Antonio Argenziano (Former President)
- Leonie Martin (Former President)
- Christopher Glück (Former President)
- Pauline Gessant (former President)
- Flavia Sandu (Former EB)
- Sabine Radl (Former VP)
- Christopher Powers (Former treasurer)
- Juuso Järviniemi (Former VP)
- Bernd Hüttemann (former SG)
- Knut André Sande (former EB)

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): If you understand this, I'm going to read it very briefly. This is a provisional list which might change, and if all the names are exhausted and we still need more people for a President, we also entrust with this vote to the EB to find people for those Presidents. And it's both for the upcoming online Congress, which will be later this spring, as well as for the fiscal Congress in November in Strasbourg.

Okay, I think we can do this as an open vote. Is anybody against this list and entrusting EB with finding President members for the Congresses? In favour? Abstentions? No. We have thus unanimously confirmed this list and entrusted to EB. Thank you very much.

We have another voting point left, which is voting on the updated budget of 2025 that was presented by Brigita during the Secretariat report. Do we have anything to say on this before we move to the vote?

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): I don't think so. Are there any last questions or interventions? I'm sure you all studied it during the night.

Aléxandros Apostolidis (Executive Board, Treasurer): Verification, this is an updated budget for those who don't know it. It means that we have only the pre-approved budget that we voted for last time last year and during the year we

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



updated for the first FC. So, the whole opening of the calendar right now always as the day goes is we make a first version of the budget that we voted for in the autumn FC. We did an updated budget in the spring FC and opening the calendar page below we have an extra Congress to close the year around May. So this is now the second of the three steps, the updated budget for those who don't know the procedure, maybe it's here. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): All right. Are there any other questions left after this? No? We can just proceed to the vote. Is there anybody against adopting the updated budget for the year 2025? In favour? Abstentions? With two abstentions, it is adopted. Thank you very much.

And with this, let's give it up because it was a large vote. Thank you. While we are awaiting the tellers to come back with the results, I first want to thank you very much for bearing with us for such a long time and sometimes complicated procedural issues. There were very many amendments today, very many resolutions and other things to be voted on. Thank you for your patience, for bearing with us. You did great. Great. Now we will move to the section updates unless there's a point, I saw a point. Is it gone? It's gone, okay. So we'll move to the section updates which will be interrupted once we have a result coming from the tellers.

Reinis Gils (JEF Netherlands, National Delegate): Yes, well, thank you a lot. Yeah, I want to update the FC of JEF Europe about what we do in JEF Netherlands. Recently, both JEF Netherlands, JEF Belgium, and JEF Luxembourg adopted the JEF Benelux Agreement, which strives to make collaboration even stronger between the Benelux countries as well as cooperate before every FC or Congress to coordinate our votes.

So, I think that's also a really big achievement of our three sections. So, I'd say thank you also to Belgium and Luxembourg. Where is Belgium? I don't see Belgium, but oh well. And I'm also really happy to say that we as JEF Netherlands have been accepted to host an activity in the European Parliament during the European Youth Event, which we're really proud of. So that's the big update, I guess. Thank you a lot.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): So you all know what is happening in Serbia, but to get the sheer scope of it...

So it has been happening since the last FC. And we have mostly been working on providing help to organise students and faculties. We've worked on raising awareness, which we really thank all sections that collaborated with us and JEF Europe as well. Especially for the statement that we had together.

But also, we applied recently for the Western Balkans Fund. We want to create a project of youth solidarity between our peers to talk about the economic barriers as well, so that is what we are doing right now. Thank you.

Moritz Hergl (JEF Germany, National Delegate): So hello everyone. I am happy to say that JEF Germany is alive and well, even though we are losing some members, which some sections might actually be happy about. But we're still the biggest section.

But I think it's maybe a general trend that we should be worrying about. We should continue to exchange how we can strengthen our membership. Two weeks ago, we had our common FC in Germany that we do with the German UAF section. That was very interesting, but very good actually.

We combined it with a pro-European demonstration in Berlin. We want to focus politically especially on Schengen also, so there we're also looking forward to working with you, with member countries, and neighbour countries of us.

Then, another exciting opportunity for everyone that hasn't been to Berlin and wants to learn more about federalism in practice. We have the International Berlin Seminar coming up from the 29th of May to 1st of June. The Wettertehrner of Germany, let's say. And you can still apply until the 2nd of May.

And yes, if any of your sections are looking for twinning, we have many sections that are open for new twinning projects. Reach out to me if you want. And yes, 75 years after we were founded, we're still here. Thank you so much.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Cecilia Jastrzemska (JEF UK, National Delegate): Hello. In JEF UK, some of you may know, and I'm very proud to say that we actually won the Youth Champions Award from the EU delegation to the UK, which is really exciting. Thank you.

We've also officially twinned with JEF Ireland. We've been in or written for seven national and international newspapers, including The Independent, which is a very big one. I've got one back home.

In terms of events, we launched our campaign which the European Parliament backed, which we were incredibly proud of because it's not an easy or politically palatable campaign, but it is championing gender equality – definitely not championing gender-based violence. We had huge engagement with MEPs, MPs, and policymakers.

We've hosted about seven webinars and teamed up with several different organisations like Grassroots for Europe back home. I have also officially founded JEF Women and JEF UK Women. In 75 years, they never had a women's branch, so we now have official representation at our JEF National Board, and JEF Women has a standing notice for that as well.

We were invited to the annual News Network event hosted at the European Committee of Regions, so that's 100 different networks attending. Spoken at a whole bunch of different launches, events, and the National Rejoin March, for example.

And finally, quite excitingly, we were invited to be and have accepted being the secretariat for the EU-UK Stronger Together Network, which comprises 125 organisations. Thank you.

Robin Mudry (FC Presidium): Thank you. For these first updates, we will interrupt it here. Don't worry, it will go on because we have results, and people have to leave. So, the tellers, please come to the floor and present your very tense results.

Matthias Meinert from JEF Germany and Derk Hans Beemer from JEF Netherlands: We start with the cooptation to the Auditors Committee. We have



41 votes for yes to, 1 for no, and 2 abstentions. **So Pierre Louwerse is coopted to the Auditor's Committee.**

And we have 22 votes for Athens and 23 votes for Belgrade. So congratulations to **Belgrade for hosting the 2026 Spring FC!**

But also thank you, JEF Greece, for your amazing presentation, and hopefully, we'll see you in 2026 or 2027.

Nenad Bušić (JEF Serbia, National Delegate): I just want to thank everyone. We are very proud to host the FC 2026 in the spring. This is a huge achievement for us and a huge recognition. I just congratulate you, Belgrade, for the FC, but also for the continued fight for democracy in Serbia. Thank you.

Sofia Viviani (JEF Italy, National Delegate): Well, congrats again to Serbia, that's amazing. Very happy for the result. So, JEF Italy, I'll keep it short. First of all, big event we had on the 15th of March – the protest manifestation in Rome.

So, a couple of comments on that. I think you saw it on the news. We're very happy that other cities decided to join us on the 15th of March. I think it was quite connected, all the cities that joined, so thank you very much for the other sections that decided to put the work into that. We also had a collaboration with UEF, and that was great in Brussels.

The only political, let's say, debate we had internally in the Board of JEF Italy, is the fact that it's a bit bizarre that we were not the ones proposing the manifestation – like it was a newspaper coming up with the idea. That was a bit... okay, but then we were very much involved, so we played our part. But for the future, it's a whole conversation going on. I mean, we should be representative of that thing, but whatever, La Repubblica did it, and we're happy they did.

But it's always good to remind ourselves that we are not pro-Europeans like we're federalists, and those are two completely different things. La Repubblica is very pro-European, but we are federalists. So, let's federalise the pro-Europeans, let's say.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Then, second thing, this weekend, the reason why George and Sarah, the president and secretary-general of JEF Italy, are not here is because we are having the UEF Italy Congress at the same time, so they're in Lecce. We received a couple of updates from Lecce; it's not going that well. We have four different motions, and it's the first time since decades that we have four different motions. Yesterday, they had 80 (8-0) speakers on the list for debate, which never happened before. I mean, we've had long debates, but never like this. Five minutes each. It was more than 8 hours of continuous debate, and I think me and Federico are very happy to be here with you and not there. Even more now, so thank God we're here and they're still discussing.

Today, we'll have the results, and it's a 50-50 chance, so we have no idea who's going to win. And they have very different political opinions. It's not just a matter of power, but there are different approaches to federalism. So I think this will impact us as well enormously in JEF Italy. We'll keep you updated, and if you have any questions on that, I'm happy to answer.

Just so you know what we did at JEF Italy for this Congress — our action was just one. The board created a document with the political priorities of JEF Italy and submitted this document to all four motions. So, we told all four candidates what we want as an organisation. For me, it was a good thing because we were united in that sense, even though in the board we are all part of UEF as well, and in the board, we vote for different candidates. But the document is just one, and the main point — that's why I'm saying this to you because it concerns you — the main point was involving us more in the decision of the Ventotene Seminar and the Ventotene International Seminar.

This was the only point basically. So we asked all candidates to include us in the board of the Spinelli Institute, which would give us enormous benefits and spare us lots of time and energy for the international seminar. And also, to be fair, we deserve it because we've been working, and you know it because most of you worked with us as well. We deserve the recognition from the Spinelli Institute.

Third thing, then I'm going to shut up. We are continuing to do the Europa Porto Europa project, and we will focus on migration policies even more now,

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



considering also the developments of the policies of our beloved government. So, anyone that's interested in migration policies, federalist migration policies, please reach out because it would be very interesting to do something together. And especially with the Mediterranean countries – it would be good, and Albania, we will be in touch, of course.

That's it. I'll update you on UEF, and let's hope this Ventotenna seminar will be as good as the other ones, but maybe with less, you know, with fewer mental breakdowns on our side. So that would be also good.

Erwan Laurent (JEF France, National Delegate): On our side, we are still alive, and we are not losing members.

Yes, some updates from our side: we just finished a big European project, Check'Europe, and we now have two new Erasmus projects.

One focuses on climate change, with different partners from Denmark, Spain, and Hungary, aiming to tackle climate change and raise awareness about this issue.

We also have a new project, which is very specific because it links sport and European citizenship. This week, we are organising a national event and are pleased and very happy that CES will be with us. It will be the first event on this new European project linking sport and EU citizenship. Because in JEF France, we have many people with a high level of energy, like Elise, for example.

Then, we are still working with our overseas territories because it's very important to raise awareness there. We were in Vienna a few months ago, and we decided, like Germany and Italy, that it's time to organise the first edition of our Federalist Academy, the first weekend of July in Saverne. This will be the first year, and we're excited.

We're also planning to organise a big mobilisation in Paris for the 8th of May, and our summer university will be at the end of August in Clermont-Ferrand, where we'll finish our mandate and transition to the next speaker. Because transitions are very important, and Torillon is doing a great job.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



We also organised, last week, for the Democracy Under Pressure campaign, publishing several articles in collaboration with other editions, for example, Treffpunkt Europa.

Dvir Ezra (TNF): TNF, the magazine of JEF Europe, is not a section, but like always, I'm here to report on what we're doing.

So, generally, it's been a very good half-year. We've done a new recruitment campaign and accepted 12 new contributors. We've co-opted two new board members.

We are especially working to improve the social media activities of TNF, and we've published almost 200 articles in the current mandate.

We've conducted around 5 writing workshops, both for events of JEF Europe and also for external organisations. So, if your section is interested in upskilling your membership and getting a writing workshop, we'd be very happy to provide it.

We've signed a new memorandum with Tadisto, the magazine of JEF Finland, and we're very happy to increase the cooperation with them and integrate them into the multilingual network of magazines.

Also, a big thank you for all the good translations coming from the other magazines.

We generally work in cooperation with sections, so if your section is organising an activity and wants reporting on it, or if you're organising a general assembly and want to write about your priorities for the mandate, please reach out to us.

We are also having the Meet the EB Member series, where the idea is to get the activities of the EB towards the membership in a more informal way than the FC.

We're really thankful to Cathy, Xesc, and Christelle, who have already taken part in this series, and we're looking forward to interviewing the rest of the EB members and publishing about our activities because that's what we're here for.

Again, thank you very much to JEF Europe for inviting us here. We are really looking forward to writing about this FC as well. It was very interesting to take part in the discussion. So, thank you, everyone.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Kalojan Hoffmeister (JEF Belgium, National Delegate): So, both achievements and challenges – not going to lie.

In terms of achievements, Belgium is, of course, Brussels, the capital of Europe. So, we have direct access to stakeholders, and we did a lot of events with ambassadors – high-level events.

For example, we had a very nice Schengen march. Together with JEF Germany, we took a car and went to Schengen, protesting against closing the borders. I think Xesc and Christelle were also there, so that was really an amazing event. I'm very proud to have taken part in it.

We had our training days as well, as every year, and this year, we focused on EU defence, which is very topical. We tried something new by being at the College of Europe, which was a great location, with great speakers, including MEPs, members of the cabinet, and professors. That was indeed an achievement as well.

We also had, on the 15th of March, the speeches and protests for a reformed Europe, as mentioned by the Italian colleague. This was also held in cities like Italy, Berlin, and many others.

One thing that's very important from my point of view is that we're trying to resolve a money problem. As some of you know, we had the funds, but we didn't have access to them. It took us a couple of months to get access to that money, but now we're back on track.

However, we also have challenges. I think Belgium is in a unique position, but we are too focused on Brussels. I feel we need to diversify more, to go into student cities like Leuven and Antwerp. The capacity building exercise is very important for that.

And speaking of Brussels, we have more than 350 members in the WhatsApp group, most of whom are non-Belgians, and that's something we'd like to change.

Last but not least, those members in the WhatsApp group should also become paying members. So, if you're in Brussels or know anyone in the WhatsApp group, please tell them to become paying members because that's very important for our capacity building.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Lastly, a big shout-out to the Luxembourgish and Dutch sections because we have now created the first stepping stone for JEF Benelux, which will promote more cooperation. In that sense, I'm also really looking forward to the future weeks and months of cooperation with you guys. Thank you.

Caroline Kokholm (JEF Denmark, National Delegate): Okay, I'll keep it short and to the point. First of all, we're focusing a lot on recruitment at the moment, and we're running different campaigns. The first one is titled: "Apparently EU is too cool for school". It's because EU doesn't take up much space in the school curriculums in Denmark, so with the current global situation, it's a bit challenging to push this campaign. But we're still trying!

We just finished our European training programme with JEF Steiermark, with whom we've had a lot of good cooperation. It was an Erasmus Plus SSP project, and yes, it was a big success. Always a good experience!

Additionally, we are organising three study trips this year: one to Brussels, one to Cyprus, and another to the Benelux area. We need to apply for some funding regarding the Benelux study trip, and I'll be in touch about that soon.

We also have a summer camp coming up! Many people have been asking when they can apply, and while the application isn't out yet, it will take place from 24th to 28th of July. It's always a big success, and we gather a lot of people from all sections. This year, we secured a lot of funding, so we'll be able to accommodate many more participants. We're probably looking at around 100 people. Very exciting!

Patrick has also been working on some cool projects in our local section. He's currently collaborating with JEF Spain, JEF Georgia, and JEF Albania on a project about EU Eastern Enlargement. They'll be organising two mobilities in Georgia and Albania.

So, a lot of cool things happening in JEF Denmark. I think that's it from me.

Mihail Nesteriuc (JEF Moldova, Observer): It's a great honour to stand here in front of you, representing JEF Moldova, as we reaffirm our strong commitment to

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



the European movement of JEF Europe and to the European federalist movement, and take another step toward becoming a full-fledged member of JEF Europe.

While today isn't yet the moment of our official accession, it's the moment where we make it clear: we are here, we are active, and we are determined to bring Moldova into the JEF family.

As many of you know, our journey began long before today. We participated in the Federal Committee in Budapest last November, where we took our first steps toward becoming an official member.

Since then, we've been working tirelessly to build our organisation, expand our network, and mobilise young people in Moldova around the European cause.

Today, we stand before you not as spectators, but as committed actors, ready to contribute to JEF's mission with energy, ideas, and passion. But let me be clear, this is just the beginning.

In Moldova, the European dream is not just a political aspiration. It's a cause that young people are ready to stand for.

That's why we have already started our campaign, reaching out to participants, growing our movement, and training our core team. Right now, we have 16 dedicated young activists who are learning how to write grants, organise projects, and advocate for European integration in a country that stands on the front line of Europe's struggles for democracy.

JEF has always been a movement of ideals, action, and solidarity. And today, as we continue our journey toward membership, we bring our voice, our energy, and our commitment to building the Europe we all believe in.

The future of Europe, I am convinced, will not be shaped only in Brussels or Paris. It will be shaped in Chisinau, Kiev, Tbilisi, and in every corner of our continent where young people stand up for European values.

So, let us continue this fight together. Let us make JEF stronger, louder, and make us present where it matters most.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



Let our efforts today be a signal that the European dream is alive and growing, and that Moldova is ready to play a part in it.

Thank you very much.

Dimitar Uzunov (JEF Bulgaria, Observer): This is a section update, but I also understand it's somewhat of an outgoing speech if that's not included in the agenda.

So, thank you all for being here.

Thank you for visiting my beautiful city, enjoying the food, the people, and finding your stay here, at least, a little bit comfortable, despite everything. I hope you enjoyed our hospitality with all the ups and downs.

I believe that you all made a huge effort. Everyone tried their best to make this event a success, and I want to thank all of you for your wonderful work. Thank you.

Christelle Savall (Executive Board, President): On behalf of the board, we are also very grateful for this weekend and all the intense contributions and meaningful debates. There were so many amendments to the political resolution, and I think that's a very good sign of the quality of the debate in the network.

So, I want to thank all of you for your participation, the directly elected Federal Committee members for all their contributions to the programme and discussions, particularly the Praesidium and our co-opted member, who I think was a very good addition to the committee.

I also want to thank the Secretariat for all the hard work in preparing this event, taking the minutes, the gender watch, and Brigitta in particular for all the tireless nights, and Loubna for all the work on the Federal Committee.

And then I will also do a small thank you from me to my board, because there was a lot of preparation and hard work that went into this.

Lastly, we want to thank JEF Bulgaria for all the amazing work – for all the contributions, and all the volunteers who helped make this possible. It's really cool to see new faces that we haven't met yet.

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



I'm really grateful to Mustafa and Dimitar for all the great work on this, for finding this cool venue, and for providing all the great food and atmosphere here. You mentioned before that it was a great success, and I'm happy to see that we had a very successful FC. Thanks to your hard work.

Brigita Krasniqi (Executive Board, Secretary General): Thank you, Christelle. I also want to start by saying a huge thank you to Dimitar and JEF Bulgaria. It's been a pleasure. Thank you for your effort, your support, and for making this FC happen. It's been a pleasure.

And I want to say that I've heard so many good comments about the food. I remember when we had the discussion about the budget, and I said the food might be a bit expensive, and you said, "Wait until you see." And now, yes, I get it, and it was totally worth it. Thank you.

We've had so much fun, and you organised everything so well. Thanks for being a continuous support for us during this event. I can't express how thankful I am.

I also want to thank the network for coming here, for being so participatory in this event, for joining the debates, taking part in the FC, and being active. It's a pleasure having you here, and I hope you've had fun as well.

And I also want to thank the Praesidium. I'll see you again at Congress or maybe before that if you come to Brussels. Yes, and the online Congress as well.

Lastly, I want to thank the board for your hard work, especially Christelle for all your hard work over these months that we've worked together. It's been a pleasure, and I'm grateful to continue this path with you.

Thank you, and safe travels.

Alexiane Terrochaire - - Barbançon (Executive Board): I know we all want to sing and dance to Europe United, but here are some updates on the game.

The game is a combination of a membership activity, but also part of the campaign. It's essentially a guided tour of the city. You will be accompanied by some JEF Bulgaria volunteers, who will adapt the tour based on the time. And if

YOUNG EUROPEAN FEDERALISTS



you're not too tired, I promise you'll discover at least four wonders of this beautiful capital city.

Before you leave or during lunch, we have additional stickers that are not linked to the campaign, but still fun to collect.

And also, a heartfelt thank you because I've heard amazing anecdotes about your time in Egypt, which filled me with a lot of joy.

Actually, it's going to be with great pleasure that we'll include them. I see some of you laughing, but wait until you hear some of them – some were really passionate about karaoke and sometimes even failed spectacularly

Gergana Blazheva (FC Presidium): But before we unite and sing Europe United, I also want to say thank you to all of you, JEFers, for coming here. It is true that this weekend has been a success, and it has been such because of all of us.

We are really giving our best and finding ways of working together, fighting for a more just federal Europe.

And it is not always easy. We are all human. We all make mistakes. What is important is that we know when it's time to say "I am sorry for doing wrong" and ask for forgiveness.

So, while you're still in Sofia, know that there is a Europe bench that you can see. This is an achievement, I would say, of JEF Bulgaria, because some things are more difficult due to administrative work here.

And again, thank you for being JEFers. Thank you for investing your time. Thank you for being open-minded. Just enjoy your time here, and see you in Strasbourg.

Europe United