



YOUNG
EUROPEAN
FEDERALISTS

**Federal Committee Meeting
Online
4 - 5 April 2020**

Federal Committee Presidium:

Simon Devos - present

Christelle Savall - present

Gerhard Soyka - present

SATURDAY, 5 APRIL 2020

1. Official Opening

1.1 Official Opening

- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “Welcome to this very first time Online Federal Committee on behalf of the Presidium”.
- Presentation of technicalities. Explains the functioning of the online tool ‘Click Meeting’.
- Presents the draft agenda.

1.2. Opening words of the President

- **Leonie Martin**, President of JEF Europe: “Dear JEFers, these are extraordinary times, for our organisation and for Europe. The past weeks have shown how a proper European coordination of health policies is missing and how instead, national governments acted according to their own interests and less so in European solidarity.
- Instead of a common approach in protecting health, borders are closing for now, and possibly also including the one I grew up crossing every day.
- Instead of a European approach to our economy, instead of a stronger European budget with its own resources, instead of bonds to support our currency, members of the Council seem to be rather making politics for their home audience, prioritising cashing pluspoints ahead of upcoming elections over European solidarity (sorry for my own government on that point).
- Instead of a European migration and asylum policy, some do something, some prefer to do less. Just this week, the legal receipt came: the European Court of Justice ruled that three countries broke European law by failing to accept refugees.
- Dear JEFers, for years we have been speaking about different fires across Europe and now these are fully intertwined. We observed and criticised how the finance crisis was handled, the increase of youth unemployment for instance, how populism in different countries rose and how people preferred to tolerate racist, anti democratic statements as just populists using their freedom of expression.
- We have seen Brexit - a General Election with a crazy promise, then a referendum with a very bad idea, a horrible referendum night, an again and again a torturing extension period - and just last year in support of our JEFers in the UK, we marched during our FC in London at the People’s Vote March.
- In this period, time might seem relative - it’s a Saturday for those who need the reminder - but Brexit had happened, just a mere three months ago. We have given our support to YEM UK during a weekend full of candystorm and I want to thank you all for your participation there.
- Dear JEF UK and federalists living in and coming from the UK, Brexit might not be over yet as this is just the transition period but be assured you can count on JEF Europe.
- We have seen and keep seeing the humanitarian crisis with refugees coming to Europe, seeking our help. Now more than ever it is crucial that we call and act for a Europe with a human face. Even if it's just for the fact that you accept that our health systems are only as strong as the most vulnerable amongst us are. While we might be safely staying at home, we know about the horrific living conditions in refugee camps where the first cases of COVID-19 have been reported yesterday.

- And then, Democracy. Just two weeks ago we organised our annual Democracy under Pressure action week, come rain or shine. We as Executive Board have been proud to see JEFers demonstrating and organising even in quarantine - this is why tonight's Social Hangout at 6pm CEST is going to start with the Democracy under Pressure Awards 2020.
- And how desperately it is needed to speak up for democracy in Europe! After years of 'two steps to the front, one step back', after years of crumbling down democratic standards and democratic attitudes and courage to speak up, this week, in Hungary, the Parliament has been suspended for an unlimited time, abusing the excuse of the pandemic. The government can rule with decrees. And so they have: luckily for instance a law taking power away from municipalities - crucial as just in the last six months 4 out of 5 Hungarian big cities voted for an opposition mayor - has been taken away.
- In Poland, the so-called muzzle law questions the constitutionality of the legal order in Europe as it fines judges who implement European over national law.
- How is it possible that this is tolerated in Europe, in the European Union? The intergovernmental checkup system of the so-called Article 7 procedure - something we have criticised for a long time in our resolutions - is certainly one of these elements. This week, we have also taken the extraordinary step this week, addressing the European People's Party to reclaim the values of European Integration it has formed crucially and expulse the Hungarian governing party Fidesz.
- Dear JEFers, We need Europe to work, and we need to work now. We need national governments to get over working for their own self-interest and recognising that only together we will come out here stronger.
- I know this is by now a massive hit in federalist speeches but never before has it been more crucial to have a federal Europe. Sure, it might not be the bandaid for everything. And in a federal Europe the pandemic might still occur - but:
 - In a federal Europe, European interests will be pursued for the better of all citizens,
 - In a federal Europe, the national interests blocking proper criticism to anti-democratic decisions by countries do not exist,
 - In a federal Europe, Europe would have a voice, one voice on the global stage.,
 - A federal Europe with a proper budget, with a stabilising mechanism,
 - In a federal Europe, this would all work smoother.
- Dear JEFers, I hope you, your loved ones and fellow JEFers in your sections are feeling well. This organisation is also a big community, be there for each other as this period will be hard on all of us, at one point or another.
- We are meeting here today, the first statutory meeting of this mandate. It is also the first statutory meeting that JEF Europe is organising online in our soon 50 year - and if you count the formation of JEF International - our 65+ years history.
- Yesterday evening we might have had a beer together, this morning we wished each other a good morning in the breakfast room. These are things that are currently missing - but from our spontaneous hangout a few weeks ago over scrolling my social media - I know and see that we are all active.
- We have set up a living library for you and your local sections to help transforming how to JEF in these times, we have set up an excel sheet calendar for when you want to invite other JEFers to your events. Use it. Tell us how you JEF.
- We can show this way that we are a big organisation, a big community that has a heart, beating louder than ever.

- We will show that we will not shy away, that we will work for a democratic, federal Europe come rain or shine.
- We are doing our very best to translate and adapt how we usually work to the digital. At this point I want to especially thank the Secretariat headed by Milosh for their incredible work these past weeks, from our initially big thing of an office move, - which was supposed to be the big event this year- quickly switching to digital transition, including all our projects.
- I wish you, now more than ever, interesting discussions in the Political Commissions, a good time at the social hangout tonight and a great Federal Committee meeting. Thank you”.

2. Formalities

2.1 Presentation of the Code of Conduct

- **Christelle Savall**, Presidium: “The Code of Conduct applies for this meeting even if it’s online. You can find it available on the private area of JEF’s website”.
- “So if you write on the chat or take part in the session, if you have to ask yourself about your conduct these are the following questions: is it ethical?, is it legal?, is it consistent with the values of JEF Europe?, is it consistent with the rules of this Code of Conduct?, will it reflect well on me?, will it reflect well on JEF Europe?, would I want to read about it in the newspapers?”
- “If the answer is no to any of these questions, do not do it”.
- “If you are still in doubt, you can reach the contact people, which are **Milosh Ristovski** and I”.

2.2 Presentation of the Gender Watch

- **Christelle Savall**, Presidium: “**Simon** is going to implement the Gender Watch, which is based on the gender identity of the person that is speaking as filled in the form when applying for the FC. You all identified as female, male or other gender.”
- ‘We don’t count technical talks, but we do count the other content wise talks”.

2.3 Declaration of the votes present and represented (roll-call)

- **QUORUM REACHED AT 10.36am (CET)**

2.4 Adoption of the agenda

- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium, presents again the draft agenda and the voting procedure. Reminds taking a selfie for the group picture.
- **AGENDA ADOPTED**

2.5 Resolutions submitted after the deadline

- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium, presents the resolutions submitted after the deadline.
- “We require an additional vote for these resolutions. According to RoP I. Art. 4(c), a 2/3 majority is needed on these”.
- “We will vote one by one”.

- No one speaks for or against.
- **Request to continue a Monitoring Process regarding the Membership of JEF Armenia, JEF Lithuania and JEF Serbia APPROVED**
- **Gerhard**: “I have received a notification now saying that we can vote on the rest of the resolutions as a package”.
- **Request to discuss “For a EU coordinated response to tackle the COVID-19 health emergency” (PC2) APPROVED**
- **Request to discuss lapsing resolution “On the institutional design and governance of the Eurozone” (PC1) APPROVED**
- **Request to discuss lapsing resolution “Strengthening the economic and political union within the Lisbon Treaty” (PC1) APPROVED**

- **Gerhard** reminds that the next FC in fall will be in Hamburg due to the fact that because of COVID-19 the Spring FC is taking place online and not in Germany.
- “Please remember that you are not automatically registered in the FC Hamburg. You will have to register again to attend the FC on 23-25 October”.
- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “The only point that I wanted to make is that we are only voting that we are planning to discuss these resolutions, we are not voting to adopt them. It is only a decision on whether we want to start discussing these resolutions, and not whether we want to make them a formal policy of JEF Europe”.
- “These resolutions can still be changed in their respective PC sessions”.

2.6 Installation of the Resolution Committee

- Proposal: **Kalojan Hoffmeister** (PC1), **Flavia-Gabriela Sandu** (PC2), **Ine Tollenaers** (PC3), **Ben Cassar** (FC), **Christelle Savall** (FC Presidium), **Sebastiano Putoto** (EB).
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “The proposal is to have these people as well as two more people: **Andreas Hostgaard Poulsen** (EB) and **Chris Powers** (EB)”.
- “Quick note for those who are here the first time: the Resolution Committee is here to prepare the voting of tomorrow on the resolutions. They will check the language and if there is a logical order after the PC discussions. They will give us the final draft of the resolutions with which we can work on”.
- “The Resolution Committee is proposed by the EB and only a simple majority is needed to approve it”.
- **RESOLUTION COMMITTEE APPROVED**

2.7 Final deadline to hand in amendments

- **Christelle Savall**, Presidium, reminds that the final deadline to hand in amendments is today (Saturday, 4 April) at 14:00 CEST.
- “Only submissions by email to presidium@jef.eu will be accepted. If you send the amendments to PC Chairs and not to the Presidium, those amendments will not be taken into account by the Resolution Committee”.

- Reminds about the agenda, especially the Informal Hangout at 18:00, organised mainly by **Juuso Jarvienimi**, **Moritz Schleicher** and herself.

2.8 Group selfie session

- **Christelle Savall**, Presidium: “Because it’s a FC we are going to have a group picture. We will take selfies and then **Karoliina Rajala**, the Communications Officer at the Secretariat, will do a collage with our pictures”.

2.9 Results of the Gender Watch

- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “We have the results for this session. We have counted the speaking time of people identifying with male and people identifying with female as a gender”.
- “60% of the time this morning men were speaking, and as a consequence of that 40% of the time women were speaking”.
- “We have also counted the time in the chat. Here we didn’t check the technical questions either. Content-wise, we had two questions from men and one from a woman”.
- “We will not be doing the Gender Watch during the PC sessions, but we will of course have it during the plenary tomorrow”.

SUNDAY, 6 APRIL 2020

3. Formalities

3.1 Welcome

- **Christelle Savall**, Presidium, reminds about technicalities, the Code of Conduct, how the Gender Watch works, and the agenda.

3.2 Updates on the Federal Committee

- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “A summary since we were elected in Paris”.
- “The Presidium - Christelle, Simon and I - meet once a month. We had a physical meeting last month in Brussels to prepare the FC in Hamburg. We were supporting the Task Forces to set up and to start working, contributing to FC news to the newsletter and reminding FC members about certain deadlines”.

3.3 Declaration of the votes present and represented (roll-call)

- **QUORUM REACHED**

3.4 Explanation of the voting system

- **Milosh Ristovski**, Secretary General: “We are going to change a little bit the voting from what we did yesterday”.
- “I need you to react a bit faster and follow our instructions, as we are going to have quite some votes today”.
- “We are not going to do the vote through thumbs down and thumbs up like yesterday, but through surveys when the Presidium says they are open. You will see the results immediately”.
- “Please, clear your status because if you don’t, we will assume that you are blocked in the system and will not count your vote”.

3.5 Adoption of the minutes of the Federal Committee in Paris, October 2019

- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “Thank you, Secretariat, for the very detailed minutes from the FC in Paris”.
- No comments against.
- **MINUTES ADOPTED**

4. Resolutions

- Colour code - in green was discussed and carried in the PC yesterday
- In red what was discussed and was not carried
- yellow - no agreement reached for those amendments. The FC has to decide
- blue - language washing

4.1 Resolutions submitted by PC1 - Institutions and governance

4.1.1 Calling for a European Constituent Assembly

- **Simon Devos**, Presidium, presents the amendments.
- **AMENDMENT 1** submitted by **Juuso Jarvinemi**, member of the FC, proposes to add: *“Warns against the Conference of the Future of Europe itself as a true Constituent Assembly for a European federation because, despite efforts by a number of MEPs, treaty reform was not universally understood to be the objective of the Conference when it was announced”*.
- *Speech in favour of amendment 1* from **Juuso Jarvinemi**: “In the resolution there is a distinction between the Conference that was meant to start in May and the real Constituent Assembly for a European federation. This adds justification as to why we are making this distinction. The idea is that we must have a transparent process and the intentions have to be clear from the start. It is in line with the distinction that we already made”.
- *Speech against amendment 1* from **Mariasophia Falcone**, JEF Italy: “First, if it is as I understood from Juuso, it is already above in the text. Secondly, I do not think the text says that the Constituent Assembly is related to the Conference on the Future of Europe. In the text we are saying that once that there is the Conference, and at the moment there are no clear indications of when it is going to happen given the current situation, we want the outcome of that to be the step towards a Constituent Assembly. Also, the second part, when you refer to the MEPs, there is a resolution by the European Parliament that was approved in January. I do not think that we should involve MEPs here because that resolution is the one that counts. We should only take into account that document and nothing else”.
- **Amendment 1 not carried**
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “Sorry for that but apparently I need to give the floor to the PC Chairs before going into the amendments”.
- **Kalojan Hoffmeister**, PC1 Chair: “I will just give you a brief overview of the resolution. After a fruitful and intense debate yesterday with a lot of amendments from a lot of sides, we have come to the conclusion, as PC1, that JEF Europe would like to ask for a Constituent Assembly with a capital ‘c’ and a capital ‘a’. And only, as a second best, a Treaty revision process within the article 48 TEU”.
- “We hope that the Conference on the Future of Europe will bring some substantial outcome and will be seen as the legitimate will of the European citizens. Only in the second best, the will of the people as expressed in the Conference should be binding to the intergovernmental Conference as it says in Article 48.4 TEU. This would be held at the end of such procedure.
- “From my side I’m quite happy with this resolution and I would suggest adopting it as it is”.
- **AMENDMENT 2** submitted by **JEF France**, who suggests to change *“Calls the Constituent Assembly be composed of directly elected citizens’ representatives”* for *“Calls for the*

Constituent Assembly to be composed of Members of the European Parliament and national parliaments, representatives of the national governments, the European Commission, a selection of youth organisations, civil society organisations and randomly selected citizens representing the diversity of the Union”.

- **Anna Lena Sender**, national delegate of Belgium: “I just want to make sure that the Constituent Assembly is always in capital letters when referring to the Constituent Assembly as mentioned in JEF's Political Platform”.
- *Speech against amendment 2* from **Sebastiano Putoto**, Vice-President of JEF Europe: “This point was already touched during the PC discussion and JEF France legitimately re-submitted the amendment in a similar form, not exactly the same. The point of this resolution which I think we have achieved throughout is to differentiate between the Conference and the ordinary revision procedure as per Article 48 that has a Convention with a similar composition to what JEF France suggests, and a Constituent Assembly as JEF Europe calls for it”.
- “So these are two different things. The Constituent Assembly with capital ‘c’ and ‘a’ is a proposal not foreseen, it is a proposal that we are making, a political proposal that says that we have to have this process in a different way, that we need to have citizens’ representatives voting directly with one purpose: draft a Constitution and put this proposal to the Union. And for this reason we want to have directly elected representatives given the significance of such political event”.
- “In this sense, the amendment of JEF France would bring this back, at least this is my feeling, into the normal process and would not be satisfactory”.
- “And to offer one more element of the discussion that happened in the PC: it was raised whether this would lead to some lack of representation of some of the constituent entities of a would-be Federation. But this is not necessarily true because when there would be representatives to campaign to this Constituent Assembly, they could say ‘I stand for the interest of the nation’ or ‘I stand for the common European interest’, or that they come from a left-wing or a right-wing, or a liberal, or a green respective. So you would have this diversity in a directly elected Assembly. For this reason I would like to ask to vote against the amendment”.
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “I will mention that there was another amendment that was submitted after the deadline, one hour and a half after, and therefore not accepted”.
- **Amendment 2 not carried**
- *Speech in favour of the resolution* from **Kalojan Hoffmeister**, PC1 Chair: “Once again, I think this was a heated but fruitful debate, and that we have come to a very good compromise. We as JEF Europe hope that this resolution will go very far. We would like indeed to have something totally new and then a Constituent Assembly. And even if this did not happen, we with this resolution have a backup plan meaning Article 48 TEU”.
- “So to be very precise, I believe that this resolution as a whole gives us a lot of flexibility while at the same time we are saying very clearly what we would like the very best option to be. And, if not, we still have a very good backup plan which gives us a lot of space in the political debate. That is why against the background of yesterday’s heated debate I would recommend to carry this resolution as a whole”.
- **Language washing approved**
- **RESOLUTION CARRIED**

4.2 Resolutions submitted by PC2 - Internal European affairs

4.2.1 For a coordinated EU response to tackle the COVID-19 health emergency

- Point of order by **Sebastiano Putoto**, Vice-President of JEF Europe: “I just wanted to ask if Christelle, who was in the Resolution Committee yesterday for the Presidium could maybe explain all the recommendations and decisions about the amendments that came in yesterday, because there were quite a few. I think it would be better to go through all of them now instead of doing it every single time”.
- **Christelle Savall**, Presidium: “We could understand a few minutes delay after the deadline but refused a set of amendments that were sent at 15:50.
- “For the other resolutions, if they were not discussed in the PC we had to postpone them to the next FC. If they were lapsing we had to decide whether we let them lapse or whether we adopted them again as they are now. Now, if we let them lapse they are open for comments, but we adopt them with amendments next time”.
- “We received amendments on lapsing resolutions that were not discussed and this we can do: if they were not discussed we have to re-adopt them as such, as they were voted two years ago. We have to let them lapse, and then amend them”.
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “So for the lapsing, the vote will have to take place in Autumn in the FC in Hamburg, right? The option is to adopt them as they are now or let them and re-open the discussion in the next FC. Is that correct?”
- **Christelle Savall**, Presidium: “Yes, if we want to change something we have to let them lapse and we will discuss it in Hamburg”.
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “I would suggest we put this at the end when we are done with the other resolutions”.
- **Sonja Afanasjeva**, PC2 Chair: “This resolution has been submitted by the Executive Board and discussed within PC2. It was a very good resolution and we had a couple of suggestions or amendments during the PC discussion. It’s a call for a coordinated response and for more powers to the Union to deal with such health emergencies, so we call for a Treaty revision to change that in the field of public health”.
- “We also had an important amendment that was submitted to call for the Health Union. We also added a paragraph on the gender-specific impact of the pandemic. Thank you to the Board who submitted and to everyone who contributed”.
- **AMENDMENT 1** submitted by JEF Belgium, who proposes to add in the introduction of the resolution: “*Welcoming the EU’s initiative to promote research on COVID-19 by mobilising funding for vaccine, treatment and diagnostics under the Horizon 2020 research programme and the European Innovation Council*”.
- *Speech in favour* from **Anna-Lena Sender**, JEF Belgium: “There was no mention to welcome EU’s support to research and innovation responding to the COVID-19 crisis”.
- **Amendment 1 carried**
- **AMENDMENT 2** submitted by JEF Belgium, who proposes the following paragraph in the introduction as well: “*Concerned in particular by the measures passed by Prime Minister Orban in Hungary on 31 March 2020, suspending parliament, announcing a state of emergency without a time limit, restricting the power of mayors and making spreading “fake news” an imprisonable offence*”.

- **Leonie Martin**, President of JEF Europe: “Quick note that the decree on limiting mayors’ power (for now) has been withdrawn”.
- *Speech in favour* from **Anna-Lena Sender**, JEF Belgium: “We need to speak up and name and shame Member States if things like this happen”.
- **Sebastiano Putoto**, Vice-President of JEF Europe: “What Leonie says. Also, the Prime Minister did not pass the measure, but the Hungarian government in the first place”.
- **Anna-Lena Sender**, JEF Belgium: “Can we leave out the last part then?”
- **Leonie Martin**, President of JEF Europe: “I’m not really speaking against. I would suggest we update the text, the part that I mentioned in the chat. That is what the Hungarian government does, they do things like this and then they withdraw the laws to have us confused”.
- “I would ask the Presidium to be gentle and to take out that from the text. For the rest I’m part of the team in the EB that works on the rule of law and I’m sure you also saw the statement that we released this week”.
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “Anna-Lena’s question is a procedural one. **Simon**, please correct me if I’m wrong but I don’t think we can do such changes after the deadline”.
- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “In theory, we cannot. But given that this is a decision by the Hungarian government and we want our resolutions to be up to date, I think from the side of the Presidium we can be gentle and leave this part out from the text. I think it does not make a difference to the amendment and we should make sure that our resolutions are not outdated”.
- **Anna-Lena Sender**, JEF Belgium: “We agree”.
- **Amendment 2 carried**
- **AMENDMENT 3** submitted by JEF Belgium asks to change a point of the introduction “*Noting with satisfaction*” for “*Applauding*”. The point follows like this: “*the individual initiatives that have made it possible to take patients from France and Italy to hospitals in Germany and Luxembourg, as acts of true cross-border and European solidarity*”.
- *Speech in favour* from **Anna-Lena Sender**, JEF Belgium: “The idea is to strengthen the praise of this great initiative. ‘Noting with satisfaction’ seems a bit too weak”.
- **Amendment 3 carried**
- **AMENDMENT 4** submitted by **Helena Robert** to add a piece of text, making point 8 as follows: “*Calls for the establishment of an EU-wide health professionals network in order to facilitate the transfer of medical personnel between Member States in the event of a health problem that leads to medical systems’ saturation, regardless of the number of countries affected by such problem*”.
- **Amendment 4 carried**
- **AMENDMENT 5** also submitted by **Helena Robert** to make point 9 of the resolution as follows: “*Requests the systematic transfer of patients whose cases are most critical, in the event of saturation of the medical system in one or more Member States, taking into account the reception capacity of each Member State and not limiting such transfer to neighbouring countries*”.
- *Speech against amendment 5* from **Diletta Alese**, member of the Executive Board: “The content of this point is already present in point 7. So we would suggest to not have it because the resolution is already very long and we think that the content is there and we agree with it”.
- **Amendment 5 not carried**
- **AMENDMENT 6a** submitted by Simon Devos, who wants to modify point 17 (“*Calls for the introduction of a temporary European minimum income scheme in the form of direct*”).

monetary transfers to Euro area households with the support of the European Central Bank”) deleting “*in the form of direct monetary transfers to Euro area households with the support of the European Central Bank”*

- *Speech in favour of amendment 6a* from **Simon Devos**: “They are new and untested and unconventional methods of monetary policy. And this will have, most probably, huge side effect on inflation and will particularly affect the rich and the families with financial assets. I am not against taxing the rich, I’m far from being against of it, but we should be very careful. We need now to get confidence from the rich who are usually the business owners because they will have to help us to restart the economy after the crisis, more than ever. Dear federalists friends, let’s discuss about taxing the rich later, this is not the right moment to do so”.
- **Simon Devos**, as Presidium: “For your information, we vote on Amendment 6a because this is the most drastic change. In case this amendment does not pass, we will discuss **AMENDMENT 6b** (*“Calls for economic measures financed by European resources and managed at the European level that shall aim to preserve employment levels, so as to considerably enhance the scope of the SURE initiative”*) as suggested by JEF Italy. If amendment 6a passes we will not discuss the amendment of JEF Italy anymore”.
- **Sebastiano Putoto**, Vice-President of JEF Europe: “Point of order/information: Does Amendment 6b automatically fall if Amendment 6a passes? Because what Simon is aiming at is taking out the monetary financing part of it. Amendment 6b is proposing something different. Are we sure that taking out the part that Amendment 6a proposes makes Amendment 6b fall automatically? Because I’m not entirely sure we can be against monetary financing and still want to change the text”.
- **Flavia Sandu**, member of the FC: “Amendment 6b basically replaces the whole point 17”.
- **Ine Tollenaers**, member of the FC: “Yes, so it is a more drastic change”.
- **Sebastiano Putoto**, Vice-President of JEF Europe: “Yes, but Italy changes the whole thing”.
- **Simon Devos**, as member of the FC: “The way I see Amendment 6a is that we delete a part completely. But I can also see Amendment 6b as a friendly amendment because from what I read JEF Italy doesn’t have the monetary transfers. In that case I could withdraw my amendment”.
- **Ben Cassar**, member of the FC: “If anything, it is up to JEF Italy to whether to withdraw their amendment or not”.
- Mariasophia Falcone, national delegate of JEF Italy: “We’d rather not as we are proposing something else, although we agree”.
- **Amendment 6a withdrawn**
- *Speech in favour of Amendment 6b* from Mariasophia Falcone: “Our starting point is actually the same as Simon’s. I was not in the PC2 discussion so maybe I’m missing points of the debate but that being said, we are proposing this amendment because we think that the previous formulation might only appeal to certain JEFers and we know that there is another part of JEF who might not completely be on board with that kind of measure. Instead, we think that our proposal is a little bit more non-partisan. The second reason is that we believe that fiscal interventions are needed after a post-monetary one, which obviously can drive inflation.
- **Amendment 6b carried**
- **AMENDMENT 7** submitted by JEF Belgium, who suggests to insert point 23: “*Strongly encourages the EU to provide awareness to citizens about the importance of vaccines and science based solutions to the Covid crisis*”.

- *Speech in favour of amendment 7* from **Sonja Afanasjeva**, PC2 Chair: “Insertion makes sense”.
- *Speech in favour of amendment 7* from **Anna-Lena Sender**, national delegate of JEF Belgium: “One more concrete proposal for what the EU can do in the context of COVID-19”.
- **Sonja Afanasjeva**, PC2 Chair: “If this amendment is finally adopted, can we move it up? Because the last point is about treaty revision and it’s a very strong point. I don’t know if we procedurally we can do that, but I’d suggest to do so”.
- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “I don’t know until what extent JEF Belgium particularly asked this paragraph to be point 23. If they did I’m afraid we need to keep it as point 23. If they did not, we could potentially think how it could be matching better. If this is the case I’d suggest that the PC Chairs elaborate on this”.
- **Anna-Lena Sender**, national delegate of JEF Belgium: “We just suggest it as a new point. Please, Sonja, propose where to put it best”.
- *Speech against amendment 7* from **Sebastian Lang**, national delegate of JEF Germany: “We talk about subsidiarity. But tendency in resolutions is to ask for any kind of solution on EU level, that is why we oppose point 23. This is not something to be done on EU level, even though measures as such are good, of course”.
- **Amendment 7 carried**
- **AMENDMENT 8** submitted by **Helena Robert** to include: “*Strongly supports the elaboration of EU-led campaigns which, drawing on the current and previous experience, aim at raising awareness and better training citizens in barrier gestures and prevention measures, as well as in the management of health risks and crises, all at the European level so that European citizens are prepared, informed and can in advance develop a shared spirit of solidarity in the event of a future pandemic*”.
- *Speech against amendment 8* from **Sebastian Lang**, national delegate of JEF Germany: “Same argument as before for point 23”.
- **Amendment 8 not carried**
- *Speech in favour of the resolution* from **Sonja Afanasjeva**, PC2 Chair: “On behalf of PC2, I strongly encourage you to vote in favour of this resolution. It’s very good and timing. We definitely need it to work in the upcoming months on improving the EU response to tackle the COVID-19 crisis, and to avoid that those crisis happen again”.
- **Language washing approved**
- **RESOLUTION CARRIED**

4.2.2 Better integrated and more sustainable mobility infrastructure for an Ever Closer Union

- **Flavia Sandu**, PC2 Chair: “There are no yellow parts because this resolution has not been amended during the discussion that we had in PC2. Honestly, I don’t think it’s a controversial resolution at all. There were a few amendments during the discussion to correct some things. Basically, this resolution is about how the transport sector is going to be affected by the green transition. We call for it to be beneficial for citizens and be climate-friendly”.
- *Speech against the resolution* from **Mariasophia Falcone**, national delegate of JEF Italy: “Before voting the resolution I’d like to comment on it. I really appreciate the efforts that have been put in this resolution by the PC Chairs. It does not say anything that anyone could be

possibly against but my comment is about the lack of political aspects and content. Therefore, I will not vote in favour of this resolution”.

- “For the future, if we don’t face this argument now, we are just going to present it again in the next FC. Not everyone has the time to work on all the documents from all the PCs and we need to put our energy where we have to do it. As I said, even if it’s agreeable and positive content, it lacks political one and, therefore, I would suggest the PC Chairs to put a little bit more effort to produce resolutions that have more political content so that can be better exploited by JEF Europe”.
- “This is not at all a critic to your work. I can understand that something can go wrong when you don’t have much experience. I’ve been in your shoes. But I can’t give my vote to a resolution that has no political content. I’m sorry if I sound very strict and aggressive but I want you to learn from this experience as much as possible”.
- **Language washing approved**
- **RESOLUTION CARRIED**

4.3 Resolutions submitted by PC3 - External Affairs & Global Governance

4.3.1 Towards the accession of the Western Balkan countries

- **Riccardo Moschetti**, PC3 Chair: “We wanted to update this resolution that was adopted two years ago. We just wanted to give the opportunity to JEF Europe to renew its commitment towards the integration of the Western Balkans”.
- **AMENDMENT 1** submitted by JEF Italy which proposes to delete in the introductory text “*Agreeing with the view that Enlargement should be a reversible process and that chapters of the acquis communautaire should be able to be reopened under specific circumstances confirmed by a quality majority vote by the European Parliament that backsliding is taking place*” and to add the following part: “*Agreeing with the view that Enlargement should be a reversible process and that chapters of the acquis communautaire should be able to be reopened under specific circumstances*” and “*that backsliding is taking place*”.
- Also, according to the Presidium, the following amended text is linked to Amendment 1, which proposes to delete the whole point 11, which reads “*Expresses support for the idea that chapters of the acquis can be reopened, requiring a qualified majority of both the European Parliament and Council to support thereof, provided that additional safeguards prevent the reopening of chapters becoming a political game*”, and add the following part: “*Expresses support for the idea that chapters of the acquis can be reopened, requiring a qualified majority of both the European Parliament and Council to support*”.
- **Ine Tolleanaers**, PC3 Chair: “It is a full deletion, to be clear”.
- *Speech in favour of amendment 1* from **Mariasophia Falcone**, national delegate of JEF Italy: “The two amendments are linked. I would like to make a point first on the procedure because when a draft is submitted everything that is in the text can be amended”.
- “When we got the draft, we got a comment that said somewhat these points were not definite and they had to be discussed and, therefore, our amendments were not presented before the PC discussion”.
- “Then, when we joined the PC discussion these points were in the text and that is why we proposed the amendments after the PC discussion. Just to make sure: for next time we need

to know that everything that is in the text is going to be discussed and that there can be any amendments. That being said, let's go straight to the content”.

- “First of all, the idea that a Member State can be expelled from the EU worries us a lot because we think it is an undemocratic behaviour and that is what we are criticising it. Our priorities should be the citizens and we should not punish them because of their governments, when their governments do not behave in compliance with the EU rules. We should not punish the population of that state”.
- “Somebody might argue that they have voted for that government. I want to say that if that is your argument you need to think a little bit more on the ‘Democracy Under Pressure’ campaign. People that vote for this kind of governments, Hungary for instance... That is not democracy, democracy works in different ways. Therefore, I’m not going to think that expelling a country is a very democratic procedure”.
- “Going to the second part of the amendment: same thing basically. The *acquis communautaire* has been a model for the entire world. Therefore I think reopening the *acquis communautaire* is very risky. It could be used as a political tool for national States and we don’t want that”.
- “For both points, we should focus on implementing more effective, more concrete tools to protect the rule of law, to protect the citizens and not to use measures of either you are in or either you are out”.
- **Amendment 1 carried**
- **Riccardo Moschetti**, PC3 Chair: “Very briefly, I think this is an important resolution. It shows that we are moving on and that is an important step for the EU in general, and also for a specific region. In general, I hope that you will support this resolution”.
- **Language washing approved**
- **RESOLUTION CARRIED**

4.3.2 Towards a strong, future-oriented relationship with Africa

- **Ine Tollenaers**, PC3 Chair: “This resolution is on Africa, which is an existing one that we have outdated. We had a good discussion ahead of the FC. In the end we only received yesterday a couple of amendments. To briefly summarise, we have a strong resolution with Europe speaking as one voice, its interaction with Africa and dealing with its colonial past. We support regional integration in Africa and to strengthen the EP scrutiny in the financial instruments. We also touch important topics such as climate change, management of financial flows, structure of natural resources and private sector investments. And lastly, but most importantly, we also encourage JEF Europe to support federalist movements in Africa.
- “We received a few amendments yesterday that were linked from JEF Belgium. And for one, I can already say that is my fault because initially we had accepted this amendment in a point and accidentally I put it in the recita. I apologise for that”.
- **AMENDMENT 1** submitted by JEF Belgium that deletes “*and through which there is an increased exchange between the European Parliament and the Pan-African Parliament*” of the introductory text/recital “*Recognising that, since the Schuman Declaration, promoting development in Africa has been a goal for Europe, progressively extending development assistance throughout the continent and today covering a political partnership enshrined in*

the Joint Africa-EU Strategy (JAES) and through which there is an increased exchange between the European Parliament and the Pan-African Parliament”.

- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “This seems as it is more like language washing than a new amendment”.
- Point of order by **Ine Tollenaers**, PC3 Chair: “Just to clarify, this amendment was submitted and discussed as I explained earlier during the PC so it was marked green. Initially JEF Belgium wanted to amend this in point 3 and then they decided to move it to the right place. So it’s not about language washing but to have it in the recital because it makes more sense there”.
- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “But it is an amendment to delete a part of the text”.
- **Ine Tollenaers**, PC3 Chair: “Yes, because if you scroll down you can see that it is added in what is now amendment 2 in point 3”.
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “So basically amendment 1 and amendment 2 would be the same one”.
- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “So the text would be added in point 3 then”.
- **Ine Tollenaers**, PC3 Chair: “Yes, indeed”.
- **Amendment 1 carried**
- **AMENDMENT 2** submitted by JEF Belgium that adds at the end of “*Acknowledges that regional integration can support Africa’s growth potential and act as a catalyst for peace and prosperity and calls on the EU to promote regional integration and to give technical advice where it is requested, for instance in support of the African Continental Free Trade Area*” the following part: “*or the creation of an African education and research area, including an intra-African mobility scheme*”.
- *Speech in favour of amendment 2* from **Anna-Lena Sender**, national delegate of JEF Belgium: “It is to highlight that regional integration can also be achieved in other areas than economy and trade. Education and research are key actors for sustainable social and economic development on the whole continent. The EU can contribute to this process with its learning from the Bologna process. But it is not about academic cooperation or exchange programmes between African and European universities here as in point 8”.
- **Amendment 2 carried**
- **AMENDMENT 3** submitted by JEF Belgium that reads as follows: “*Calls on the EU to increase the cooperation with higher education institutions in Africa to harmonise qualifications and to expand exchanges as part of the Erasmus+ and Horizon Europe programme, particularly targeting women and students who are at risk of persecution because of their political activism*”.
- *Speech in favour of amendment 3* from **Ine Tollenaers**, PC3 Chair: “This point has partly moved back up so that is why it is proposed to be deleted here”.
- **Anna-Lena Sender**, national delegate of JEF Belgium: “Sorry but one thing is missing: Horizon Europe is not mentioned”.
- **Milosh Ristovski**, Secretary General of JEF Europe: “Should I cancel the vote?”
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “I don’t understand. So did you submit something different from the current amendment or did you forget to add something and you are realising now?”
- **Anna-Lena Sender**, national delegate of JEF Belgium: “We submitted like that after Erasmus+”.
- **Ine Tollenaers**, PC3 Chair: “My mistake again”.
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “So it was forgotten to be added. Ine, could you clarify, please?”

- **Ine Tollenaers**, PC3 Chair: “I apologise. I must not have seen that in the text of the amendment text”.
- Correction of the amendment.
- **Janez Grabrovsek**, national delegate of JEF Slovenia: “I think it is a bit narrow to mention women and students, perhaps it should be put ‘groups with less opportunities’”.
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “I see your point, Janez. But it is not part of today to debate on the text. You should remember this for the next time”.
- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “This is also a shout out to all of you. The resolutions as they are being discussed right now have been shared with you yesterday afternoon after the meeting of the Resolutions Committee. So for the next time, please, inform us about these items before the plenary session so we do not waste our time”.
- Code of conduct point by **Christelle Savall**, Presidium: “Please, keep in mind that capital letters in the chat can be considered as shouting”.
- **Amendment 3 carried**
- *Speech in favour of the resolution* from **Ine Tollenaers**, PC3 Chair: “All in favour, that is my official statement”.
- **Language washing approved**
- **RESOLUTION CARRIED**

4.4 Lapsing resolutions

4.4.1 PC2 - Internal European affairs lapsing resolution

- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “Yesterday, we were discussing a lapsing resolution on Brexit and the negotiation process related to it, but the chairs of PC2 recommend to let the resolution lapse and then for one of the upcoming FCs think of a new resolution that deals with Brexit. However, people from YEM UK were not able to join us and could not make statements on whether they want to let the resolution lapse. At the same time, since Great Britain has left the European Union we are not sure whether Brexit should be a topic discussed in PC2 as by definition it should be something for PC3. Therefore, the idea was to discuss in plenary whether we want to keep the lapsing resolution”.
- **Kalojan Hoffmeister**, PC1 Chair: “Simon, do not forget about the two lapsing resolutions by PC1”.
- **Sebastiano Putoto**, Vice-President of JEF Europe: “Three lapsing resolutions: Eurozone, Lisbon and MFF”.
- **Kalojan Hoffmeister**, PC1 Chair: “MFF goes in PC2 from what I have understood”.
- **Leonie Martin**, President of JEF Europe: “I had a quick discussion with Julius from YEM UK yesterday also comparing the currently lapsing resolution with the one we adopted in London. The one main element that is not specifically mentioned in the London resolution is our guarantee as JEF to advocate for Erasmus+ and for the UK to still be part of that. So my proposal would be to let them lapse and continue to think together. This is a discussion that we already started a few weeks ago to figure out how we can set up a campaign to make sure that the UK stays in the Erasmus+ agreement. This is not only a crucial element for our organisation as it means that the participation of living in the UK is in danger in our upcoming seminars for instance, but it is also a crucial element when young Europeans living in the UK

need basically to find ways to connect to Europe. The offer stands that we as EB will be discussing with YEM UK how to organise this campaign”.

- **Julius Lajtha**, national delegate of YEM UK: “Thank you, Leonie. Just adding to this: apart from Erasmus+, it is also about the clauses 1, 2 and 5 (which are underrepresented in the 2019 resolution). But yes, we agreed to not contest the lapsing motion”.
- **Resolution lapsed**

4.4.2 PC1 - Institutions and governance lapsing resolutions

PC3 External Affairs & Global Governance lapsing resolutions

- **Giorgia Sorrentino**, PC1 Chair: “Our proposal as PC Chairs is to re adopt this resolution **‘Strengthening the economic and political union within the Lisbon Treaty’** as it is because with this document we ask the EU Member States to exploit the instruments provided in the Lisbon Treaty and undertake the measures that can be implemented under this legal framework. At the same time, of course, we ask for a step further and at least to have a Treaty revision process. We think it is a grounding document also for the resolution that we have just adopted on the Constituent Assembly”.
- **Kalojan Hoffmeister**, PC1 Chair: “I will briefly say something on the resolution on **‘On the institutional design and governance of the Eurozone’**. Shortly, we want a more democratic governance structure when it comes to Europe. Shortly, we call for a common deposit insurance scheme, the completion of the capitals market union, all resources for the European Union by for example, having direct taxes and a Eurozone budget, and also a Youth Finance Minister. It is our opinion as PC1 that this is also a great grounding document that is very sophisticated when it comes to the Eurozone governance. Therefore, I would suggest to re-adopt it as it gives a clear line on how we as JEF Europe stand when it comes to such a difficult topic as the Eurozone. I want to be very honest, I like this resolution for its details, for its comprehensiveness and also knowledge when it comes to economic and fiscal affairs”.
- Point of order by **Ignacio Esteban**, national delegate of JEF Spain: “Does voting in favour mean yes to keep the resolution or yes to keep it lapse (not keeping it)?”
- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “Voting in favour means that we will keep the resolution and it will not lapse. We are going to vote on both resolutions as a block”.
- **RESOLUTIONS READOPTED**

4.4.3 PC3 - External Affairs & Global Governance

- **Ine Tollenaers**, PC3 Chair: “PC3 updated the resolutions, no further lapsing ones”.

4.4.4 PC1 - Institutions and governance & PC2 - Internal European affairs lapsing resolution

- **Sebastiano Putoto**, Vice-President of JEF Europe: “We are doing this in a bit of an unorthodox way, since it is PC1 and PC2. The recommendation of both PCs is to re-adopt the resolution **‘A Federal Budget for the European Youth: Reforming the Multiannual Financial**

Framework' as it is because it is valid to conduct our advocacy work on the MFF while there is no MFF agreed”.

- **RESOLUTION READOPTED**
- Point of AOB by **Mariasophia Falcone**, national delegate of JEF Italy: “I would like to raise a point, before we go on to the Task Forces, to the Executive Board, the Presidium and the sections present here. These statutory meetings until fall are our only chance to discuss where our friends are for the next months. The next few months are going to be crucial. With the ongoing pandemic here we are either making or breaking Europe. Therefore, towards the other sections present, and if they want to jump in, please, feel free to do that, at the EB/FC meeting, please open today’s discussion on a pan-European strategy, clear political priorities for the next months. I really feel we need to act and be present as soon as possible in the way we federalists know how to be”.
- **Leonie Martin**, President of JEF Europe: “Very well noted, Mariasophia”.

5. Task Forces

5.1 Presentation of the Task Forces

- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “We have here the list of the suggested Task Forces [**Green Transition, Empowerment & Diversity, Resilient JEF, Y-FED, Civic Education, Capacity Building**] because we could not vote on them when in Paris [Paris Congress, October 2019]. It was not clear which Task Forces we would have but it was clear after the EB/FC meeting that we had in December in Brussels. This list is the result of that meeting. Now we have to vote on whether we want officially to set up these Task Forces”.

5.2 Green Transition Task Force

- **Aleksandra Aleksejeva**, Green Transition Task Force Chair candidate: “This task force is focused in creating a strategy for JEF Europe and for sections to become more environmentally friendly. Therefore, our main goal is to develop concrete strategies and tools to achieve that by engaging as many sections and people as possible, and creating an infokit based on the need of sections. Also, we would like to develop methods and exchanging best practices. After a while, we would also like to collaborate with climate-activist organisations and draft a resolution”.

5.3 Empowerment & Diversity Task Force

- **Iida Laurila**, Empowerment & Diversity Task Force Chair candidate: “First of all, I’m happy to tell you that we have already started to activate the Facebook group. We have already held a Skype discussion on the future and the tasks we are going to tackle next. I’m very excited to continue the great work and working on the implementation of our internal resolution on the topic. I want to make sure that JEF is a community where everyone belongs, and therefore we

need a space to discuss these topics as empowerment and diversity. There are going to be three co-chairs for this task force”.

5.4 Resilient JEF Task Force

- **Leonie Martin**, President of JEF Europe and Resilient JEF Task Force Chair candidate: “The idea of this new task force is to face organisational challenges to make sure that our organisation remains simply ‘a generation ahead’. And how do we want to do that? I’ve been talking to most of the sections, especially after summer, and actually we all face the same challenges”.
- “There are ways to engage volunteers, but how do we want to face that? What we want to do is something we can learn. In this task force, national sections would, a little bit like in statutory meetings, submit amendments and appoint national contact points”.
- “We will organise different online sessions where we will also invite experts to sit together and to think how, and if, we want to adapt in JEF. These guidelines would fit then in the work of the Capacity Building Task Force”.
- “There is a second idea for this task force, which is to identify local sections that are in sort of say non-JEF typical content settings, meaning they are not in a university town or they are not political science or law students. Then we bring this together: JEF sections from rural areas, JEF sections from technical university cities, JEF sections with a lot of young professionals, high school students so that we understand how to JEF with this people and then we can also create guidelines and to make sure that in the future we as JEF become very strong. The overview of that is in the private area. For this task force, I would propose to the Federal Committee **Ophelie Omnes and Malte Steuber** to co-opt”.
- **Malte Steuber**, co-opting candidate: “Hello from my side, as I’d like to co-chair the TF Resilient JEF, bringing in experience as president of JEF Germany and its international officer for some years”.
- **Chris Powers**, Treasurer of JEF Europe and member of the Executive Board: “To be a co-chair, you need to be co-opted to the FC first”.
- **Leonie Martin**, President of JEF Europe and Resilient JEF Task Force Chair candidate: “Yes, merely pointing out the procedure step of proposing Malte”.

5.5 Y-FED Task Force

- **Ben Cassar**, Y-FED Task Force Chair candidate: “The idea behind is for the FC to follow what the Secretariat is up to with the Y-FED project over the next three months or so. Until then it would be to support the Secretariat and organise events, etc”.

5.6 Civic Education Task Force

- **Anne-Marie Hertner**, Civic Education Task Force Chair: “Civic Education is an important pillar for JEF. That is why on the European level we would like to support and coordinate in between the countries. As you know in some countries Civic Education is stronger and more

developed than in others. And perhaps the latter need support. The task force would aim to exchange and support the activities in different sections, exchange best practices”.

- “There is also a website which is currently up to change about Europe@School. We already had our first call and hopefully we will have our second call next week. We have already exchanged a lot of documents on Google Drive”.

5.7 Capacity Building Task Force

- **Christelle Savall**, as Capacity Building Task Force Chair candidate: “We do twinnings between sections, we do webinars, we have the Secretariat doing capacity building trainings. A few new ideas: ‘Borrow a JEFer’, so the idea is that you could contribute to the sections that are missing some talent in some tasks, and also if you want someone to do something for your section you could request help from a different section. Last thing is that we continue to do Faker Fighters”.
- **Sonja Afanasjeva**, member of the FC: “Just to be sure: we stick to the ‘capacity building’ title of the TF and drop the idea of ‘Twinning & Training?’”
- **Christelle Savall**: “Yes, Sonja, there has been a discussion and we keep ‘capacity building’ for now”.
- **Juuso Järvinemi**, Capacity Building Task Force Chair candidate: “The scope is a bit broader than twinnings and trainings, so that is why ‘capacity building’ I would say. In practice, Faker Fighters continuation has so far consisted in working on a toolkit on how sections can do media literacy at home”.
- **TASK FORCES APPROVED**

5.8 Co-opting FC members

- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “Two amazing JEFers, Ophelie Omnes and Malte Steuber, are co-opting to be FC members. They have been active since I can remember, and I think I have known them for several years”.
- **Tosia Stępniaik**, national delegate of JEF France: “Now that we vote, can we explain why? Not that I don’t want you to be there”.
- **Gerhard**, Presidium: “They are not members of the FC and don’t have any official position in JEF Europe. In order to be co-chairs of a task force, we need to co-opt them to the FC”.
- **Gerhard**..: “Yes, sorry, I can’t be impartial when it comes to those two”.
- **Sebastiano Putoto**, Vice-President of JEF Europe: “I think there is a part of Tosia’s question that was not addressed. Co-opting would mean that they would be able to chair the task force, not that they will have a vote on the FC”.
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: “Only the European Congress can vote on the FC members. Co-opting means that they can talk but they do not have any voting rights”.
- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “One thing that I would like to add is that for one person to be co-opted, this person has to clarify to the FC, in written form, that this person agrees or consents to be a co-opted. Both Ophelie and Malte have sent their written forms with their consentment to the Presidium”.

- **Ophelie Omnes**, co-opting candidate: “A very short introduction on why I would like to continue to work in this task force. First and foremost because I worked on this task force a lot, helping in creating it over the last mandate. There are actually a few things that we already did in the previous mandate like the Gender Watch that you guys are trying to use today”.
- “Also, there is an internal resolution that we need to implement and contact organisations that are, let’s say, more aware or more comfortable with these topics, meaning empowerment and diversity. So that’s what I’ve been doing in this task force before. I’ve been in JEF for almost 10 years now. I was a full normal member of the FC in the previous mandates”.
- “Since it looks difficult to get rid of JEF I would like to spend a little bit more time helping to this task force over the next mandate”.
- **Gerhard Soyka**, Presidium: [Malte has some difficulties to speak] “Malte is the president of JEF Germany and has been in the Board for six years. He was an international officer before he was president of JEF Germany, I believe since 2014. Great guy, he lives in Berlin now, he is a lawyer”.
- **Malte Steuber**, co-opting candidate: “I have been International Officer for four years, and as such I know JEF very well. I have been caring for the challenges of local, smaller, diverse JEF sections a lot and would like to bring this experience to the task force. I will also quit being President of JEF Germany in October to avoid conflict of interest”.
- **TWO CANDIDATES CO-OPTED**

5.9 Voting

5.9.1 Task Forces Chairs

- Green Transition: **Aleksandra Aleksejeva & Simon Devos**
- Empowerment & Diversity: **Iida Laurila & Ophelie Omnes**
- Resilient JEF: **Malte Steuber & Leonie Martin**
- Y-FED: **Ben Cassar**
- Civic Education: **Annemarie Hertner & Raimond Nrecaj**
- Capacity Building: **Juuso Järvinemi & Christelle Savall**
- **TASK FORCES ELECTED**

6. Finances

- [Presentation](#).
- **Chris Powers**, Treasurer: “Sections and members: JEF has 31 sections and 12 706 individual members (in 2018), one candidate section (Romania) and the deadline for membership (payment?) is on May 31 2020.
- 2019 accounts: Accounts will be closed in April. Expenditure and reporting according to plan. Internal audit to follow the external audit. The New EB has been registered with the Belgian officials (Moniteur Belge) and Treasurer on the bank account (!)

- Secretariat managed over 1 million €
- Provisional budget: “It’s more work, but hopefully it’s more good for Europe. If you have the budget spreadsheet open, I hope you understand it. On the left you’ve got the income, on the right you’ve got the expenditure. Anything on the top is around the use of the operating grant and other unrestricted forms of income. That affects the daily work of JEF. That’s where we have mostly stuff like our salaries, expenditures that allow us to represent JEF, Federal Committee Meetings and technology and so on. And on the bottom, there’s information on the projects. And the budget and how that’s roughly written down by expenditure. You will see differently from there the congress in Paris our two projects. So Y-FED the big one and there’s also two smaller ones; MINDSET and ReAction.
- “And then we continue with European Youth Together. So in these spreadsheets they are all separated so you should be clear which is which, if you have any questions, feel free to ask. Main changes to the budget since Paris is the office move. Hopefully we get to show you the office soon, it’s a lot bigger, its JEF Green, the Secretariat I think were enjoying it until they weren’t allowed to work there anymore. We also had some staffing changes. We are hoping to improve our provision of some crucial aspects like insurance; health insurance, travel insurance and so on for the staff. And then there were changes on expenditures on the FC meetings. This may also change again in the future, in the practise on how we spend it, just because of all the uncertainty of the virus, how we cover the costs of the Hamburg FC that we should have had and how we are covering the Hamburg FC that we are going to have. Not to mention everything we do after that.”
- Income. “The picture is largely the same. We kept the projection from our membership fees how it was. The main thing I wanted to highlight is that it’s important for co-funding that we have those membership fees. So yes, our financial picture looks good but every time we get money, we are required to raise our own resources in proportions of that. So, for example if you have 25 000 € of membership fees, that can multiply by a factor of five on how much money we can receive in co-funding. So the 25 000€ turns into a further 125 000€. So it’s really important that we have that bedrock of unrestricted funds. We are also working on a fundraising strategy, mostly Milosh and I. Honestly it’s now behind schedule and most of the reason why it’s behind schedule is because my work has got busy with coronavirus now, I’m actually living at work now rather than going home.
- I hope to get back to normal in April but we’ll see about that. In short: The budget is strong, we have a lot of money and we have a lot of plans to use it, they have been disrupted but they haven’t been destroyed. I think kudos really to the Secretariat and I’m cautiously optimistic that if the budget is passed we get to implement it without too many problems.
- There’s always a question about the cash flow, how JEF is doing financially up to this moment. So it’s a few days ago now that we did a rough check the balance in the bank, it’s sitting around a 120 000€ (April 1st 2020), I’ve also listed below two of the big expected incomes we are going to have in the next few months, but the same carry that we have to be careful, it all sounds good but we have to be careful because it’s easy to get trapped in taking risks, taking actions without having enough money done the line but for us we need to be careful in the end of 2020/early 2021 part of the year because there have been issues of money to get through even though we’ve been awarded, these are the usual problems and they are ones that we have to keep in mind. And then on my last slide, I’ve rewarded a few other risks, I’ve mentioned the autumn/winter there but also there’s two small ones. One is UEF which is a forever on-going uncertainty financially they haven’t put any huge budget constraints on JEF

yet when it comes to asking for help, that might change in the future but I don't think we'll take any more action without consulting more wisely. For the December 2020 one, it's funny because I remember when I drafted this power point one that felt like the biggest issue in the world, it was clearly a time before corona. Basically with a hard Brexit it might be an issue with accessing some of the systems I need to use for the treasurer role because the UK could in fact become a third country, we don't know how this will play out yet but actually that Brexit might be extended again, sorry about that. So I guess we just have to play it there. I hope to have an up-date on that by October. And I think, That's it, so sorry if that was too fast, happy to clarify anything but I think people would like to pass this part quite quickly.

Q&A

- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “My question is about the moving of the Secretariat. Whether we could receive some more details on the new rent of the Secretariat office like how long we will be staying there and how we have spent on the new furniture and equipment. It would be nice if you could elaborate a little bit on that”.
- **Milosh Ristovski**, Secretary General of JEF Europe: “We are having the same exactly payments for the rent. We have three times more space that we had before but we pay the same exact rent. In the budget line you are going to notice that rent is higher because we are now also subletting to UEF. JEF, because of its financial stability succeeded to overtake the contract, and then we have an internal contract with three organisations: UEF, Garage Erasmus and Streamdis. But the rent remains the same, or maybe a bit less, but then there are other expenses like cleaning etc”.
- “About the duration of the contract, it's a two-year contract that ends in February 2022. The building is a corporate building that offers support to NGOs. We will reassess the contract in 2022 and decide if we extend it for another two years. The whole move with the new furniture and the equipment that we bought has been approximately 2000 euros”.
- **Sebastian Lang**, national delegate of JEF Germany: “Why did insurances increase by factor 10 - there were no insurances before? Why expenses for FCs in 2020 are even lower than in 2019 - haven't FCs brought in a deficit in the past?”
- **Chris Powers**, Treasurer: “About the insurance question: as we have grown as an organisation we want to look at how to take care about our staff properly, not that we haven't done it before, far from it, but we wanted to make sure that everything is in place and under control under all circumstances. That is why we have increased our staff insurances to make it a more complete and comprehensive scheme”.
- “Question about the FCs: simple question, the FCs have been over-budgeted in the last years and we are trying to show a commitment to keep within the budget ultimately because if we don't we need to raise participation fees and that is something that we don't want to do either. So we are hoping to stick to that and we think it is possible”.
- **BUDGET CHANGES 2020 APPROVED**
- **Anna-Lena Sender**, national delegate of JEF Belgium: “Short question: where can we find info about the ‘Mindset’ and ‘Reacti-On’ projects?”
- **Chris Powers**, Treasurer: “At this stage I would say Secretariat or we can talk offline”.

7. Expulsion of sections

- **Chris Powers**, Treasurer: “It is never something that we are happy to talk about, bear that in mind. But this is actually not a new process, this is a process we have gone through in the Turku/Stockholm FC in Autumn 2018, where we initiated the Monitoring Committee to review the situation with Armenia, Serbia and Lithuania, which haven’t paid the fees for half a decade now”.
- “There have been repeated attempts of contact, but there is no activity on the ground. These sections are as dead as they can be so we need to clear it up so that there are possibly new people in the future who can create a new section and commit to a new program of activities on a regular basis”.
- “So we are not creating something new with this internal resolution that we are discussing, but we are hoping to pass it to continue and conclude the process taking into account the actions that we have taken already. Milosh and I put together the formal letter which essentially will give these sections a notice period. So if they choose to revive in the meantime that is great, but we should continue to proceed. It’s easy to reverse this situation and not to expel them at the last second, but it is not easy to start it again”.
- “I hope we can approve a Monitoring Committee composed of me (EB), **Simon Devos** (Presidium) and **Aleksandra Aleksejeva** (FC)”.
- **Christelle Savall**, Presidium: “This is actually not correct. The resolution says Aleksandra, you and Sebastian Lang instead of Simon”.
- **MONITORING COMMITTEE APPROVED**

8. Presentation 2020 Autumn FC

- **Leonie Martin**, President of JEF Europe: “For the FC in Paris we did not have any application yet for the upcoming FC, so that is why we decided to transfer the competences to decide where the next FC is going to take place to the EB”.
- “We have been in contact with a couple of sections, mostly **Chris** and **Milosh**. At the beginning of the year, when nothing of this had happened we decided that the next FC would take place in Sofia. But as you know, this FC was meant to happen in Hamburg and we are very aware of the different annullations, postponing policies that airlines for instance offer”.
- “That is why the EB has decided again to postpone Hamburg for this fall. There is a date... Wait, until what extent do we have that confirm, **Milosh**?”
- **Milosh Ristovski**, Secretary General of JEF Europe: “At the moment we have a date that we have confirmed to the participants for the FC in Hamburg in spring. We are going to reconfirm if there are certain changes, but for now we have only shared the information with them”.
- **Leonie Martin**, President: “Be sure that we will keep observing, especially what is going on in Germany. For that we have a very active whatsapp group with the organisational team, JEF Hamburg and JEF Germany”.
- **Milosh Ristovski**, Secretary General: “I would like to thank JEF Hamburg and JEF Germany because this is not an easy moment to organise activities”.
- **Sebastian Lang**, national delegate of JEF Germany: “JEF Hamburg, mostly!”.

- **Knut Andre Sandeee**, national delegate of Norway: “23rd-25th October, right?”
- **Sebastiano Putoto**, Vice-President: “Yes, but as Milosh was saying this is information for those who had already applied for FC Hamburg (Spring edition). For other potential interested participants, please wait for official public communication for applications/buying tickets, etc”.
- **Severin Schweizer**, national delegate of Switzerland: “Question about the participation fees for Spring FC 2020: have they already been paid back? I remember an email sent about that”.
- **Milosh Ristovski**, Secretary General: “We are currently preparing all the reimbursements. That email was sent two weeks ago and we are doing everything possible to do it as soon as possible. Everyone is going to receive their participation fees back”.
- **Ignacio Esteban**, national delegate of JEF Spain: “I have a concern on what will happen to bid the FC proposed to be in Sofia. Is it postponed, delayed?”
- **Milosh Ristovski**, Secretary General: “In the next presentation where we will discuss the FC for 2021, we are also going to present the communication that has been done with each of the sections”.
- “There have been a couple of sections who approached the Board and the Secretariat regarding this question. Even if we said it clearly that this was a decision from the EB, we are trying to communicate with each of the sections that have shown interest to be sure that there are events organised in each of the sections that have presented their interest”.
- “We are quite lucky that next year besides the FC, we are also going to have other bigger events and we are looking for places to host them. We will make sure that everyone gets the change to organise an event by JEF Europe”.

9. 2021 Spring FC

Candidacy to host the Spring 2021 Federal Committee

1. **Chris Powers**, Treasurer:

“So following up what you said, on Monday I was very optimistic about that and we would sort out quite quickly where our statute meetings should be. Because we know that our congress has to be in Belgium to make sure statutes can be changed and we thought we knew that Hamburg was happening right now and so that we could get sections work together more closely. However, things have changed like Milosh has said so the main section I’d like to thank is JEF Bulgaria for providing information requested by me and JEF Europe

Those sections were Spain, Bulgaria and possibly Switzerland. Just towards the beginning of this week, I’ve contacted all three of them to ask what the situation was, given the circumstances at this point. Switzerland and Bulgaria were formally in order for autumn. So the main question is, was Bulgaria open to host in spring, the answer from them was yes. But not a yes in the form of a full application and that’s partly my fault, I should have done more to get that from them but it’s also partly just misunderstanding. So we do only have one application, that’s JEF Spain’s. I have made clear to all sections that JEF has a wide range of activities, not just the FC but seminars as well. I know that I’m interested in working with all three in hosting activities in the next year. With any section that’s interested. Anyway, let’s

move to JEF Spain and let them present their candidacy. Anything about the process and so on I'm happy to answer”.

2. **Xesc Mainzer**, national delegate of JEF Spain: “Thank you for letting Victor and I to present this candidacy to all of you. Both JEF Spain and JEF Catalunya’s boards have been working on this for the last few months. As you will see through the presentation, we haven't been able to get so many options regarding accommodation because of the COVID-19 situation and borders closing, etc”.
3. “We have many reasons to present Spain, and specifically Barcelona for the FC 2021. 2021 marks the anniversary of two important milestones: the 35th anniversary of Spanish accession to the ECC (1986) and the 10th anniversary of the reinstatement of JEF Spain (2011)”.
4. **Victor Lepine**, observer: “Thank you, Xesc, for your introduction. We are now to explain ‘why Barcelona?’. Barcelona, for the last ten years years, has been facing several challenges as nationalism and populism. The second challenge is the role of regions in Europe. The notion of nation has not been totally achieved and the Catalan crisis perfectly shows it. So it would be great to do it in Barcelona to debate and talk about what kind of regions we want in the future in the EU”.
5. “And last but not least, since 2011 there have been great social movements such as the ‘Indignados’, the 8th of March and its feminists marches, the independent movements and ‘Fridays for future’. I think it would be great to meet in Barcelona to talk about these new social movements as well as new ways of activism”.
6. “Barcelona, whose nickname is “la rosa de foc” (the fire rose), is a combination of history, openness and opportunities. With plenty of sights to be seen that showcase those elements”.
7. “Cohesion meetings: our intention is not just to provide a visual experience in the city, but a social one as well. Getting to know people from different parts of Europe in order to have a stronger connection among our members by getting the opportunity to grow up as both individuals and as a community”.
8. Breakfast with MPs: as Spanish we believe that breakfast is one of the most important meals. So what better than sharing it with some Catalan MPs and representatives from the European Parliament and Commission in our city? This way we can talk, in a relaxed fashion, both about Catalonia and the future of Europe”.
9. Venue options: 1) Parlament de Catalunya, Catalan regional parliament (and our preferred one) where the Declaration of Independence took place, 2) Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Catalonia and Spain’s most well rated-university with a campus right in the city centre), 3) Recinte Modernista de Sant Pau, a Catalan ‘modernista’ complex turned into museum, 4) Diputació de Barcelona, 16th century building located in the old town, which hosts the first ‘people’s feminine library’ and the cultural institute.
10. Due to COVID-19 we only have one accommodation option: Residencia Salesiana Marti Codolar.
 - 20 minute ride from the city centre. Diversity of price options: hostel (207 capacity) and youth hostel (172 capacity).
 - The complex is located in the Horta neighbourhood.
 - Pricing options (person/night with towels and breakfast included in prices): 1. Hostel option: 23,5/26/28,5/40 euros. Depending on room type (Quad/Tri/Dual/Single rooms). 2. Youth hostel: 19 euros.

11. **Xesc Mainzer**: How to get to Barcelona: Barcelona and Catalonia have historically been very well connected to the rest of Europe, and that hasn't changed in the 21st century.

- Air connection to almost every single European capital via low-cost airlines.
- Regular coach services between the city and most of France, Western Germany, Northern Italy and Switzerland.
- High-speed rail services link with SNCF network.
- How to move around Barcelona: Barcelona and its metropolitan area are served by a wide public transportation network of metro, bus, bicycle, commuter rail and tramway serviced.
- Budget expenditure.
 - Total economical option: €7167.5
 - Total expensive option: €10727.5

Q&A

- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “Talking about expenditure, you said that dinner would cost 16 euros per person and in the slide it says 1600 euros. But don't we have two dinners? One on Friday and another one on Saturday? The same for lunches, as we have one lunch on Saturday and another one on Sunday. I'm afraid you would have to add around 3000 euros to the budget, which is still a fairly and decent amount of money”.
- “I also wanted to ask you how quickly you could get the confirmations from the venues?”
- **Xesc Mainzer**, observer and President of JEF Spain: “About the finances of the meals, that is indeed my fault and I apologise for that. However I only forgot about one lunch. I did not forget about the first dinner, the thing is that we were thinking of providing some kind of buffet dinner at the venue. But I should have included an estimation as well. Sorry for that”.
- **Victor Lepine**, observer: “Regarding the rooms, we could have them right now. They told us to tell them as soon as we have a confirmation from the FC”.
- “Concerning the Recinte. we would just to do some administrative papers, but it would go really fast”.
- “The real concern is about the Parliament due to the situation in Catalonia and Spain. There should have been elections in June, but they have been postponed to September”.
- **SPRING 2021 FC CANDIDACY APPROVED**

10. Secretary-General 2020-2022

- **Simon Devos**, Presidium: “One of the last points of today is the ratification of the selection of Secretary General for the mandate 2020-2022”.
- “I would like to start off by explaining the procedure when the organisation selects a new SG. Basically in the year before the SG has to be changed, briefly after the Congress, the newly elected Executive Board has to start the procedure of electing a new SG. Then the EB and the SG will search for interested candidates. Normally, there will be a few selected and in the first EB meeting of the year following the Congress, they will come up with a proposal:
- Once that the candidate has been chosen, the EB presents the candidacy to the FC, where the member have the chance to ask questions to the candidate.
- The FC is required to ratify the EB's decision”.

- **Milosh Ristovski**, proposed candidate to Secretary General: “Thank you very much for the time and for the space to do my presentation. As in the email that I sent to everyone and in the documents uploaded in the internal area of JEF Europe’s website, I reiterate what I said in my letter that I submitted to the FC two years ago.
- This was not a decision made very fast. I’m very honest about this and about the reasons why it took some time: I wanted to talk before with the EB and reflect myself on the job.
- I have been involved in the work of civil society organisations for more than 12 years now, and I’m very much aware of what it means to work in a youth organisation, and how important the role of the SG is for a youth organisation. About the need to make that this position is alive.
- I took my time to think about the reasons why I would not take a second mandate. I also talked to previous SGs to think and understand about their reasons and their work. I noticed that there were differences between my mandate and the previous ones. There are some changes that have happened through my mandate. And I realised it was very difficult to find a reason to not do it. So I decided to submit my letter to go for a second mandate and continue this great experience.
- I will speak in two parts in my presentation. In the first part I will speak about the results and the achievements of the last one year and a half because I still have 6 months from my old mandate. And then I will also reflect on what else I can do and what are my views on what we can do and improve in the Secretariat of JEF Europe.
- It’s a pleasure that I had the chance to work for an organisation which due to its previous membership, leaderships and SGs, it’s very well recognised. And this is something I knew from before. I felt the pressure when I took over the position of SG to continue the great work. This is something that I can probably say that I succeeded to do. We have succeeded to be recognised among the partners. We have succeeded to be one of the most active political youth organisations, and we have succeeded to be visible in as many places as possible. I think this was clear in the report of activities that we have presented.
- My promise when I presented my candidacy in the FC in Macedonia was to continue the great work and raise 1.000.000 euros for the organisation. And I have kept that promise by writing projects and getting grants, etc. And this is of course an important point if we want to be relevant as an organisation.
- Thanks also to the staff of the Secretariat we have been able to work with as many partners as possible. We have worked with organisations that we never worked before. We decided to push ourselves this year to speak about human rights, to work with organisations which work on Roma rights, refugees, migrants, people with disabilities. Thank you very much to the Board and the Secretariat for backing up decisions like this, to speak about messages that outside our circle of JEFers can easily understand. I will get back to this point later on when I’ll elaborate more on my motivation for the future.
- I can say now that we have succeeded to implement “I Choose Europe”. We close the campaign in January, and we managed to have 1.000.000 outreach in a week on Twitter. We have succeeded to post more than 2000 times on Instagram, with more than 300 profiles.
- I feel honoured to have been in the leadership when all this happened, but this was definitely not only due to my work. It was the amazing work of the Secretariat, the Board and also yourselves. I just feel very proud to be part of this.

- I went back to my letter of motivation to apply as SG that was presented two years ago to share what were the things that I shared. I already said that I want to be the SG known to work for setting up the ‘Pool of Trainers’, which we succeeded to structure and it has been working for a year. I also spoke about using more digital tools in an FC. I didn't really plan to have an FC online as we are doing it now but we are showing that we are really a generation ahead, that we have the capacity to really adapt and to do this FC.
- On my motivation to continue to work on: JEF Europe has had stable work for several years now. When it comes to the growth of an organisation, stabilisation can be one of the hardest things to keep up, because the organisation comes to a moment when you feel safe and comfortable - this is where we are at the moment.
- My job and something that I really want to do in the next mandate is to make sure that I leave an organisation which is ready to adapt as we do until now but we also succeed to have a very positive line in our project applications and in our financial work. We are going to run soon into the application of one of the most important grants for the life of the organisation, which is the application for an operating grant. And this time will be different because we will have a new financial framework. This was one of the challenges at a personal level that I wanted to take and we succeeded. So far we have had a really good record of writing applications.
- We talked a lot about finding new ways to make our message accessible. This has already been done by the EB but I really want to be with them when we continue to speak with groups that we haven't much spoken to before.
- With Chris Powers we talked about the idea of having a diversity of funding. And this is something that we really want to do: we want to work with different partners and different foundations. I am happy that we have succeeded with some but we still have so many more partnerships to establish. And I think if we work together we could really achieve that.
- As I have always told the EB, one of my biggest motivations is to feel that I'm learning, and then I give my 100% and I'm active when I feel that I learn. I think I'm still in an age where I need to get that from my job.
- In the first two years of my mandate I also was expecting that JEF's role would become more active politically. I have done, but in order to do that I had to, in my opinion, sacrifice important things and that were in the profile of the SG. I feel more confident about engaging and talking about the developments happening in the EU with the EB, and I would really like to continue and push myself in that direction.
- There is going to be a lot of work in the next period: the accession of the Western Balkans, the Conference on the Future of Europe, and also some other work that we are going to be doing. This also motivates me to continue because I will continue learning in that direction.
- The previous and current EBs have given me so much homework and I have been listening to their discussions that I hope that towards the end of this mandate I can fully participate, and then from the next mandate I can also contribute to their policy discussions.
- Last but not least, I will be honest, I have been engaged with JEF Europe for more than 10 years now. I have been a participant, a trainer, facilitator, project officer and SG. And I would also like to be the SG that celebrates the 50th anniversary of JEF Europe.
- Finally, I would also like to thank the EB for giving me this opportunity. I know that I'm the first SG that has had this privilege of applying for a second mandate. I would also like to thank the Secretariat, the incredibles as I call them. The life of the SG is very easy if he has colleagues.

Q&A

- No questions
- Leonie Martin: “I think it’s a really wise decision for us as an organisation to make when recommending Milosh”.
- “I have had the pleasure to work with him. As part of the EB I recruited him as project officer and then SG. He’s been employed by JEF at least since 2018. But before that and as Milosh mentioned he was a trainer for JEF years before that. So he knows our organisation now super well.
- He is a very dedicated person, he keeps bringing up new perspectives. He is a very good team leader. No matter how he feels himself there is always a good atmosphere in the office, the team always comes first. In the past few months that I’m also in the office I can tell how precious this is.
- Without him being a good team leader and pushing for the complete digitalisation of the FC, this would not have been possible in a very quick time. And I can also say that I have witnessed multiple times where he had to take tough decisions as well.
- Milosh has always an eye on how to make work a learning experience for the employees and for himself. He has really good project writing and reporting skills that bring us a lot of money. Do not be shy about that, Milosh. And he keeps seeing links for the organisation that perhaps I do not see when there is a project request or when people want to meet with me. And I like that Milosh joins me in those meetings so we can discuss politics, networking, etc.
- As he said, when discussing this, it was not an easy decision to take, but it’s for the love of the organisation. We wanted to know that he’s double certain and not taking this for granted. So we have agreed, should you grant this today, we are going to have an evaluation moment, also on how to make the role more political to keep the job interesting.
- These are all the good things that Miloh has. No one is 100% perfect but I think he is the most suitable candidate for this.
- **SG MANDATE EXTENSION TO 2020-2022 APPROVED**

RESULTS OF THE GENDER WATCH:

Gerhard Soyka, Presidium: 79% of men and 21% of women have talked.

Ophelie Omnes, co-opted FC Member: I guess we can be glad that we have accepted to keep going with TF Empowerment and Diversity.