

Minutes
LYMEC Autumn Congress
13 - 14 November 2020
ONLINE



Day 1 - Friday 13th November 2020

1. Opening Speech by Antoaneta Asenova, LYMEC President

Starts at 17 h 00 CET (Brussels time)

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) opens the Congress and welcomes the delegates. She explains how the online Congress will be organised, including the new system being used (OpenSlides), which the Secretary-General is streamlining. She explains how to raise points of order and how to use the online OpenSlides platform.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President): Someone pointed out that we have chosen Friday the 13th for this Congress. This is ironic because the whole year has been Friday the 13th. I would like to congratulate you all on how you have been working throughout this entire time. This is not how I imagined giving my welcome address. None of us, when we ran for the Bureau, predicted this. But young people are excellent at adapting, as proven by the Member Organisations which took part in the working groups on policy discussions. The pandemic has changed everything, but while the initial impetus of European countries was to shut themselves in, it has highlighted the beauty of open borders. It has shown the possibility of digital acceleration, as long as we think outside the box. Our first digital event was in the Spring Congress. We also successfully held one hybrid event. Many organisations have had to think outside the box, while transnational organisations have used hybrid models for working. Even the European Parliament is using hi-tech applications now. LYMEC has been calling for these digital models for some time. We need to look into the future: decision-making processes are not going to stop just because of the crisis. We need to function together- young liberals have worked together and shown the way. Young people have suffered a lot, but we here in LYMEC are one liberal family. You will see so many faces from all over Europe. It is important to challenge each other and our views and ideas. I want you to take a moment and learn to build and compromise, and to listen with the purpose of understanding. This is what LYMEC's togetherness is about. Together we can do more - that requires that all of us think outside the box and forget the small things that divide us. That requires digitalisation - so be it. No fatalism, no virus and no stay at home order can change that. It is true that technology cannot replace real human interactions - I am tired of being in front of a camera and all the bad news too. I would have liked nothing more than an in-person Congress - including raising a glass at the end of the day. But Spring will come again - maybe a vaccine - and we will gather together and celebrate our togetherness. It is a virus - it will not end the world. Wear your mask, wash your hands and help each other. Thank you and welcome to this LYMEC Online Autumn Congress which I hereby open.

2. Roll call and Voting Rights

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) invites **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** to perform the roll call.

Roll Call

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) performs the roll call with **Annemiek van Vliet (LYMEC Administrative Assistant)** and **Lucasta Bath (LYMEC Policy Intern)**

	Full Members	Votes	Roll Call Congress start Friday 13 Nov
Andorra	Joves Liberals d'Andorra	3	3
Austria	JUNOS - Junge Liberale NEOS	5	5
Belgium	Fédération des étudiants libéraux (FEL)	4	4
Belgium	Jong VLD vzw	5	5
Belgium	Jeunes MR	9	9
Bulgaria	Youth MRF	10	10
Catalonia	Juventut Nacionalista de Catalunya (JNC)	7	7
Croatia	Istrian Democratic Youth (IDY)	4	4
Czech Republic	Mladé ANO	3	3
Denmark	Venstres Ungdom	6	6
Denmark	Radikal Ungdom	5	5
Estonia	European Reform Party Youth (ERPY)	6	6
Estonia	Centre Party Youth (Eesti Keskerakonna Noortekogu)	7	7
Finland	Svensk Ungdom / RKP-nuoret	6	6
Finland	Keskustaopiskelijat(former Keskustan Opiskelijaliitto)	4	4
Finland	Suomen Keskustanuoret ry (Centre Youth of Finland)	7	7
France	Jeunes Radicaux	4	4
Germany	Junge Liberale (Julis)	10	10
Germany	Bundesverband Liberaler Hochschulgruppen (LHG)	5	5
Hungary	Momentum TizenX	3	3
Iceland	Uppreisn	3	3
Ireland	Ógra Fianna Fáil	6	6
Latvia	Atisūbai Youth	3	3
Lithuania	Lithuanian liberal youth	6	6
Luxembourg	JDL - Jonge Demokraten Luxembourg	3	3
North Macedonia	Lidem	3	3
Norway	Norges Unge Venstre (NUV)	5	5
Spain	Jóvenes Ciudadanos	6	6
Sweden	Centerstudenter	4	4
Sweden	Liberal Youth of Sweden (LUF)	6	6
Sweden	Centerpartiets Ungdomsförbund	5	5
Switzerland	Jungfreisinnige Schweiz (JFS)	6	6
The Netherlands	JOVD	6	6
The Netherlands	Jonge Democraten	7	7
Ukraine	Liberal Democratic League of Ukraine	3	3
Ukraine	European Youth of Ukraine	3	3
United Kingdom	Young Liberals	8	8
IMS	Laurenz Van Ginneken	1	1
IMS	Huw James	1	1
IMS	Casper Pedersen	1	1
Greece	Young Liberals Greece	3	
Serbia	Nova Stranka Youth	5	
		TOTAL	195
	Simple majority of those present	101.5	97.5
	Two thirds of present	135.3333333	130

There were 195 votes present at the Congress.

The following Member Organisations were absent:

- Lidem North Macedonia
- NUV Norway

3. Election of chairs, secretaries and scrutineers

Election of chairs

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) proposes **Rémi Guastalli, Vedrana Gujic, and Pau Castellvi Canet** as Congress Chairs.

Congress accepted the Chairs.

Election of secretaries

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) presents the Congress secretaries, proposing **Annemiek van Vliet (LYMEC Administrative Assistant)** and **Lucasta Bath (LYMEC Policy Intern)**, together with **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)**.

Congress accepted the secretaries.

Election of scrutineers

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) presents the Congress scrutineers, proposing **Matilda Kylefors (Centerstudenter)** who is replacing **Sanda Krekikj (Internal Auditor)** and **Tuuli Helind (Internal Auditor)**.

Congress accepted the scrutineers.

*As we do not have paper votes there is no need for additional scrutineers and auditors. We have our team formed by **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)**, **Annemiek van Vliet (LYMEC Administrative Assistant)** and **Lucasta Bath (LYMEC Policy Intern)** in the office in Brussels supervising the event while respecting social distancing and measures in place in Belgium.*

4. Adoption of the Agenda of the Online Congress

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) asks if there were any changes to the agenda as proposed by the Bureau 8 weeks before the Congress.

One amendment has been received so far from the LYMEC Bureau. **Vedrana Gujic (Chair)** invites **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)** to take the floor and explain.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) states that the Bureau has one suggestion for changing the agenda, as discussed during the working groups prior to Congress. In fact, the Future of Europe document was submitted in a way that allowed Member Organisations to delete parts. We are now proposing the outcomes for the platform on the Conferences on the Future of Europe just for a broad general discussion. The document is a political statement, so there is no voting on the amendments or the final outcome. It is just meant as understanding that this is a common platform.

The Bureau proposes to address the two documents from the platform as an information point ahead of the discussion on the outcomes of the Policy Book renewal process and therefore create a **new agenda point (17)** for these two documents.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) asks if there is anyone against adding this new agenda point.

Congress accepted the new agenda point.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) asks if there is anyone opposing the agenda as a whole.

Congress accepted the agenda with the addition.

5. Adoption of the minutes from Spring Online Congress 2020

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) asks if there are any comments about the minutes from the Online Congress in Spring 2020. The minutes were received well beforehand and comments have already been accepted. The updated version was available to the delegates before the Congress.

Congress adopted the minutes from the Spring Online Congress as proposed.

6. Urgency of resolutions

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) invites the mover of the first Urgency Resolution to explain why the Resolution is urgent. She emphasizes that the discussion and the vote should only focus on the urgency of the proposal, not the content of the resolutions.

- Urgency Resolution on LGBT-free Zones in Poland.

Umberto Masi (LLJ) states that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. It is an assault on the core values of Europe. We cannot stay idle when these values are trampled on. According to Masi, the reasons are that human rights and the rule of law in Poland are backsliding, the judicial branch is politicised, reproductive rights limited and LGBT-free zones

created. The LGBTQI community feels ostracised by their own members of government. Masi proposes to take a strong stance through this proposal.

Huw James (IMS Delegate) requests a point of order. He states the Individual Members Section does not see the urgency of this issue, as this has been going on for several years.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that this is not a point of order and that delegates should put themselves on the speakers list for a substantive point.

Casper Pedersen (IMS Delegate) states that this resolution is not urgent, as this issue has been going on since 2015, since PiS took office. He states that we have known this for a long time and does not think this resolution qualifies.

Laurenz Van Ginneken (IMS Delegate) agrees with Casper and has nothing to add.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) requests to move to a vote through OpenSlides.

Vote

For - 63

Against - 104

Abstain - 0

Urgency Resolution is therefore not passed.

- **Urgency Resolution on Peace and Stability after the Nagorno-Karabakh Peace Deal**

Kaspar Kannosto (SU) explains the urgent need for the EU to take a role in preserving respect for human rights.

Carol Ayoub (Centerstudenter) states that they wrote a resolution on this same issue but due to the changes that happened all solutions proposed became ineffective. Therefore, they co-signed this resolution. Centerstudenter called for agents to do more in the initial proposal.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) asks to proceed to a vote

Vote

For - 140

Against - 10

Abstain - 17

Urgency Resolution is therefore passed.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) explains that these resolutions will be discussed and voted on the next day, *Saturday 14 November*. The deadline for amendments is at night, *Friday 13 November at 23 h CET*. She asks delegates to respect this deadline and send their amendments through email to office@lymec.eu and marina@lymec.eu.

7. Snap vote on the order of resolutions

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) asks **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** to open the vote on OpenSlides, where heads of delegation can cast their votes on the order of resolutions. She explains that they have to select 5 resolutions in the list of resolutions. She states that the voting time will be extended, as this is a complex matter. While the delegates are voting, Congress will proceed with the Bureau reports. The results of the snap vote will be communicated to the delegates after the Bureau reports.

Results of the snap vote on the order of resolutions:

1. Right to Abortion
2. Freedom from Rape
3. Let Taiwan be Taiwan
4. Urgency Resolution on Peace and Stability after the Nagorno-Karabakh Peace Deal
5. A Better EU Response to Health Crisis Management
6. Tackling Cyber Attacks: Security of a Modern Era
7. European Railway Authority
8. EUnited Against China
9. Freedom of Speech to Include All Opinions and Its Way of Expression
10. Time to Enforce LGBTIQ+ Rights in Europe
11. Solidarity with the Hungarian LGBTQ+ Community
12. Protecting the Freedom of Surrogate Families and Mothers
13. Free Love in a Free World
14. Protecting Civil and Social Rights During Global Pandemics
15. Unsafe Astravyets Nuclear Power Plant
16. For Freedom and Democracy in Russia
17. European Digital Identity
18. Standing up for the Values of Democracy: The Case of Fidelitas
19. International Train Ticket Payment System
20. Save Our Biodiversity
21. General Situation in Crimea
22. Enabling Educational Mobility in Times of Crisis
23. Gender Neutral Conscription
24. Escalation in the Eastern Mediterranean between Turkey and EU Member States
25. EU eResidents
26. Greater Focus on Animal Welfare in the EU
27. Multilateral and Liberal Model of International Commerce

28. Climate Justice for National and European State-Owned Funds

8. Bureau reports and debate about the reports

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) invites the Bureau to the floor, starting with **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)**

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President): I hope that you have had time to read the Bureau reports. I will not go into too much detail and will try to be as succinct as possible. None of us could have imagined that we would be doing our job in this environment: it is a learning curve for us, which means there will be mistakes and glitches. Also not everything has gone as planned and to some degree we are operating in the dark. That being said, I would like to underline the following points: Representation - I have not refused any invitation to participate or speak at events, except when it was impossible to take part. I am working closely with Member Organisations to ensure that I stick to our position. This is not always easy, as topics arise in the process of debating, which we do not have a position on. In these situations, I have to come up with something. The next point is communication- I cannot stress enough that the Bureau wants to be as close to the membership as possible and to anyone that is interested in asking questions. Therefore, I would ask the Secretariat to put my phone number in the chat. I will always take concerns and get in touch. If you have a concrete proposal, outline it in a structured and justified way, as precedent is not a reason - things must be justified. We are trying to do things in a noble way, like our first digital assembly, which was not a perfect attempt, but we did receive feedback, and this is really important. Regarding communication, if you want attention for your posts or actions, send it to office@lymec.eu through the official way. As for the general working of the Bureau, please read the report. My next point is on the working groups, which have received a new breath of life. We would like to know what you think of them and if you have additional topics. The digital tool we are using has changed and it is better than previous tools. Our statutes have also been reviewed by a notary to create a more professional LYMEC. Furthermore, we have put aside money to encourage cooperation projects - **Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer)** will tell you more about that. We also want LYMEC to be more political - hence we will focus on discussions with MEPs and Commissioners - we would like to have regular LYMEC talks with them. We further try to support grassroots projects and bring them to decision-makers where possible. An example is the Jonge Democraten project Railways to the Future. For the Platform for the Conference on the Future of Europe we wanted organisations to work together as well. We presented Energising Europe to the Commission and our Values First publication was distributed to MEPs. I encourage you to participate in future events and to put forward a diverse range of participants. Lastly, we have a little surprise at the end of today's Congress: there will be a games night online as a way of staying together. One of the options will be to play the test of the Liberal Cards against Humanity, made by ELF. There will be a few other options as well. **Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer)** will explain this in more detail later. I hope you will forgive our mistakes, but we are trying our best to navigate through the challenges we are facing.

Dan-Aria Sucuri (LYMEC Vice-President): As **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)** said, these are special times. As you heard and read in our Bureau Reports, this has forced us to change plans and change how we work. Almost everything moved online. So far, we have been focusing on making our events more content-based. Events usually have two aims: to debate something specific and to network. Obviously, this is harder online, so we now mainly focus on content. We are not spending money on travel and hotels, so we spend instead on specialist speakers, which we know might be more interesting. We want to deepen our knowledge and the one of the participants, our members on certain topics. This approach meant that Bureau members have had to work differently. For example, **Ida-Maria Skytte (LYMEC Communications Officer)** has worked harder on social media presence and our new Communications Strategy. For certain events we have hired professionals to help us be more present online. **Ida-Maria Skytte (LYMEC Communications Officer)** has therefore been very active. On events and projects, **Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer)** has been very active with JCs post-Covid project, one of our largest projects with collaboration of our Member Organisations. **Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer)** has also been representing us, developing the relations with several other organisations. On policy, **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)** is responsible. We are trying to be more political and push more for our ideas. **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)** ensures that everything is aligned with our policies. **Laia Comerma (LYMEC Events and Trainings Officer)** has worked on events a lot, for example with the Individual Members Section on cyber security, on Energising Europe and others. One of the events received lots of attention from the office of Frans Timmermans. So even though we are not seeing each other physically, we are making online progress. Obviously **Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer)** has always been reshuffling budgets and expenditures. To conclude: so far during this mandate we have had to be more alert and flexible, and have had to work hard to make our work more attractive and engaging online.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) states that he has to restart the earlier vote and create a new ballot, as the Urgency Resolution was not on the list and an old withdrawn resolution was still on the ballot. He restarts the vote.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) reminds the delegates to apply/request through OpenSlides if they would like to take the floor.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) states that each Bureau Member should now address their Bureau report with a short sentence.

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer): I have been getting to know all financial processes of LYMEC. I have also done my first internal audit and co-hosted a hybrid physical event.

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer): A lot has been re-organised or moved, including the ALDE Congress. Most proposals for our Youth Response to Covid have been accepted at the

ALDE Council. Still, lots of LYMEC policy work remains to be done. I am always open to feedback, so please contact me at any time.

Laia Comerma (LYMEC Events and Trainings Officer): My work is easy to follow: it is organising events, which has been hectic. I would like to remind you all that our Call for Experts is still open, so please get in touch with us. I would also encourage you to send your members to LYMEC events, and if you have any contributions, let us know.

Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer): My main focus has been on the cooperation project for post-Covid, which will go into the lobbying phase in January. Projects like the Young Changemakers' Academy (YCA) are very interesting and we are very happy to see results there. Finally, we have been working for a while on the cooperation project funding, which we will discuss in further detail tomorrow, the call will be launched next week.

Ida-Maria Skytte (LYMEC Communications Officer): Dan-Aria Sucuri (LYMEC Vice-President) mentioned most parts already, but I have been working on our Communications Strategy and focusing on social media and content as much as possible. Better planning of content has made things more structured and has also made things easier, for example for the interns to be part of the communications team. You can read further information in my report.

Benjamin Fievet (Representative to the IFLRY Board): Since the elections, I have been improving our communication and representation. Information is flowing better. Because of Covid, the General Assembly of IFLRY was cancelled and the new team was not elected. Therefore, the current Bureau will be continuing until the end of the year. On December 20th, a new Bureau will be elected and there will be more possibilities for cooperation after that. This summer we cooperated on the nomination of Simon Lindkaer Andersen for Board member of the European Youth Forum. The elections will be next week. I did not write a written report yet, but I will send one to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) reminds the delegates that they can comment on the Bureau as a whole or on a specific member, in that case they should mention who the question is for.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) states that the Bureau has done an amazing job and has been very willing to communicate. They have also been adaptive. There have been some mistakes, including the working groups ahead of Congress, for which some adjustments are necessary. Sometimes the communication has also been poor, for example regarding the LYMEC delegation to ALDE and the platform on the Conference on the Future of Europe, which had a blackout in communication over the summer. He states that more mail is better than no mail.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) states that the Bureau has noticed and discussed that there is room for improvement with the digital working groups, this will be addressed at the next Bureau meeting. The ALDE Party Council has adopted some approaches with this

regard which we might also try. Regarding communication, she would like to give the floor to **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)** who is the Bureau member responsible for the communication on these projects.

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) states regarding the ALDE delegation issue that at that moment the Bureau was not entirely sure about what was happening and when, so they took a little time to communicate about what they knew. The Bureau communicated with the delegation to know if they will be present at the Congress in April. Everyone confirmed that they can still participate. The Bureau will wait to be sure about the details before they communicate to them further. Regarding the Conference on the Future of Europe, she states that she has been very busy at work, so she could not take as much responsibility as she would like. Now she has a system and a strategy and will share it with everyone. From now on, there will be more communication. We also do not know how and when the Conference on the Future of Europe will happen or if it will even happen.

Hieronimus Eichgrün (Julis) has a question for the whole Bureau, but especially for the Communications Officer. He is thanking the Bureau for their work, but would like it if LYMEC was more ambitious in communicating policy to the public, especially via social media. We should be prouder of our Policy Book. For example, after the poisoning of Alexander Navalny, the Bureau waited months to say anything about this on social media. Also regarding farming subsidies, LYMEC has not communicated on this recently.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) states she agrees that there is room for improvement. She wants to remind the delegates of that first point on communication: the Bureau is always looking for suitable communication points, not to look opportunistic. For example, regarding Charles Michel, they waited for his comment to say something, which was more relevant to the Navalny question. Also, remember that Bureau members are not paid. They do it out of the goodness of their hearts, so she wants to praise **Ida-Maria Skytte (LYMEC Communications Officer)**. There is room for more communications. She would also like to urge Julis that if LYMEC puts up a post, to please share it and like it, because if Member Organisations do not spread it, it is a waste of time.

Ida-Maria Skytte (LYMEC Communications Officer) agrees that LYMEC could do more. They are always striving but they have other jobs and other things to do as well. They always try to do more but one thing that is important is that the communications are professional and the content needs to be thoroughly planned. For example, with the Navalny case, they did not want this topic to be thrown out there out of nowhere, but were rather waiting for the European Parliament discussions on the topic. LYMEC should always try to do more and if Member Organisations want communication on something, please let LYMEC know. Furthermore, if there is a topic which is highly controversial, LYMEC will not comment on it.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) states they do take the criticism, but she would like it if the delegates could also think about the humans behind this.

Abel Hartman (JD) states he wants to congratulate the Bureau for their hard work, but also agrees with **Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom)** on the LYMEC policy work in ALDE, it wasn't communicated enough. He asks if the documents that **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)** mentioned in her report could be shared with the delegates. He asks **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)** to highlight some areas where LYMEC has been more political.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) asks **Abel Hartman (JD)** if he is asking about specific policy areas, or in a general sense.

Abel Hartman (JD) states he means it in a general sense.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) states there are several policy areas and that she has tried to reach out to relevant Commissioners' offices with grassroot projects. This is something they will do with the post-Covid19 project as well, trying to build support from MEPs. The Bureau has also sent the sustainability kit to relevant MEPs. However, they can only act when there is a clear mandate and a real consensus behind something. As an example, the EU army debate in London was very controversial. From now on they will try to avoid pushing for things that are very divisive. The Bureau also has a very early idea to invite a decision-maker once every few months, for example an MEP, commissioner, etc., to speak on topics of importance. There can be a half an hour session, providing LYMEC members with a chance to ask questions. Didier Reynders' office was very interested in this, to talk about his work on the rule of law. The decision-makers should hear what our views are and what we want, but LYMEC can only speak on issues on which the membership is united. To try to be more political, we must be involved with decision-makers, but the members are the Bureau's navigation system. Therefore, the Bureau wants to hear their ideas.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) reminds the delegates and the Bureau members to be more precise and shorter in their answers.

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) states that the deadline to submit amendments was very short, only a week, and so there was little time to gather delegates together. She states she will send everything to the ALDE delegation later.

Alice Schmidt (Julis) states that for them, it is not possible to share something that was posted very late, two months after, as it looks bad to their members. Julis felt it was not possible to repost about the Pope, they feel that it is cool he made this statement but the Catholic Church is still against equality of women and other issues like abortion. Julis promises to reshare communications when they can and relevant to do so, they want to do it. She states that Julis also needs to do their work, they do not get paid either. She states that two months is too long to communicate on issues of such importance. She explains that Julis has many communications officers as well and they need to react faster, she knows it's a challenge but it's necessary in politics to adapt. It is hard, she acknowledges that. In addition, regarding

agricultural subsidies, the discussions are hard and not unanimous, but there are many policies which are controversial - that is why we should accept democratic majorities. She also wants to say some positive things: she thinks the clarification on the Platform on the Conference on the Future of Europe was very good, and she felt very well involved with many of the officers' discussions. She states LYMEC is much better than IFLRY at organising events and being transparent, even during the pandemic. The Bureau did a good job adapting and giving members a chance to discuss positions.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that this was not a question but she thanks the delegate for her comments. She also reminds the speakers to turn on their cameras when speaking and she will close the speakers' list now.

Julius Graack (LHG) would like to thank the Bureau for their work. Pan-European political youth organisation work can still continue despite COVID and the Bureau has really demonstrated that. He thanks them for sacrificing their free time. He makes the point that larger Member Organisations have many members who would like to be more engaged but they do not know how to approach certain events, which is really sad, for example if things are not recorded or shown on social media. He would like to encourage the Bureau to invite more members to participate, as this is a great opportunity.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) states that she knows what the delegate means, as her organisation has 20,000 members and it is hard to provide enough space for everyone. This is why the Bureau is developing the Digital Assembly concept. She reminds the delegates to make sure to follow the calendar and stay updated, as it is often the case that LYMEC gets tons of applications just before the deadline. She also states that the delegates should encourage their members to be more involved. To return to **Alice Schmidt (Julis)**, she agrees that LYMEC should be quicker and they will propose to have a working group on the Common Agricultural Policy. In the Policy Book, LYMEC has two different positions on this topic, so it is hard to decide which one has primacy. That is why we are cleaning up the Policy Book and we encourage Member Organisations to work together.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) has a question for **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)** wondering what her plans are for purging the Policy Book. He also has a question for **Ida-Maria Skytte (LYMEC Communications Officer)** regarding communications and what her definition is of 'controversial'.

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) states that in terms of the Policy Book purge, the Bureau is calling a working group for the next Digital Assembly in January. By the end of November, the members will receive the call.

Ida-Maria Skytte (LYMEC Communications Officer) states that of course LYMEC should communicate what is in its Policy Book, but some resolutions are contradictory, or the Policy

Book contradicts the Manifesto. Everyone who has taken part in discussions on CAP or the EU army knows that these topics are controversial.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) asks the delegates to complete the vote on the order of resolutions.

9. Programme of Action approval 2020-2022

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) invites **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)** to present the Programme of Action 2020-2022.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President): As we are lagging behind on schedule, I will not go much into detail. There is an uploaded document and I hope everyone saw it. LYMEC's role is to support young liberals to be as politically active as possible. I hope it will continue to be a place where young liberals can come together and share ideas and where we share positions, to be as vocal as possible. We have unique IMS and Alumni sections, and I intend to continue the work that previous Bureaus have put in place. We have to do things differently and we made quite a few mistakes, but we are trying to have a new vision of how LYMEC does it, which is in the Programme of Action we put forward. We hope members will approve it.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that if no one is opposing the Programme of Action, it will be adopted automatically.

Congress adopted the Programme of Action 2020-2022.

10. Report of the Secretary General

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) invited **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** to present his report and take questions.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General): He thanks everyone. He would have liked to be there in person in Paris, but this summarises the year well: a big part of the year involved figuring out decisions by the Bureau, how to implement them and how to find the best solutions in this crisis time. It has been a very different year than others, as normally you have a certain rhythm when you have one event a month. This year was quite different, we basically had one physical event this year and there have been a lot of challenges for which we have been trying to find solutions. Our first hybrid event was the Young Changemakers' Academy in the Hague: it was very interesting to manage this. The good part is that we have learned a lot in this process, we have taken new approaches to events and communications and we have embraced the digital opportunities well. We have also learned how to use new tools so there are long-term benefits from these new ways of working. Of course there are many other points in the report that you can read about, but I will leave it here and take questions and comments.

Kasper Langelund (Radical Ungdom) states he does not have a question but wants to say that **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** is doing an amazing job. He is so responsive, fast and efficient, while maintaining personal flair.

Ioana Abeseaca (USR Tineret) would like to add a positive comment to the Secretariat. She appreciates the Member Organisations' briefing document that was recently launched, and hopes to see more of it, as it was very useful.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) would like to thank the delegates for their positive comments. He adds that the Bureau and mainly our President has to be congratulated for the Briefing to MOs initiative.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) thanks Julis for their support in the chat.

Umberto Masi (LLJ) would like to thank **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** for his activities and also has a question: what is he most proud of during his activities here and what, if given the chance, would he improve, if he could travel back in time or improve for the future?

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) wonders if the question is about this year or in general.

Umberto Masi (LLJ) states he means for the time of his mandate.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) replies to the first question that it is the first edition of the Online Congress. They came up with that format and it happened quite smoothly in 2.5 weeks, which is something they can be proud of. At the time, there was a lot of pressure on the Secretariat, which was only a team of two, now there are three which made the process easier.

Regarding the second question, there are always things that you learn, but once you are at the end of a process, you reflect and realise your mistakes. For example, they learned things from the first Online Congress that they are implementing now. All big processes have failures in general.

Peter Banks (Young Liberals) states he was at the Young Changemakers' Academy in the Hague and it was excellent. He would like to thank **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** for organising that and asks him to comment on the best practices he has developed and how to apply them.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) states it is important in current times to learn how to do hybrid events. The most important aspect is technology, even if you have to pay more for it. That is also why the event in the Hague was running so smoothly. The person who was helping on the spot was excellent, he really embraced LYMEC's needs and helped the team to deliver. Hybrid events are essential and overall logistics are vital: the event needs to be

adapted to the format that you want. Previously in LYMEC, we met in person or did things exclusively online - never hybrid. Also, depending on the organisation, you need to know the organisation and what the expectations are. The first two points are more practical, and also do not be afraid to change your approach and adapt it to your needs and expectations of your members. It is really sad that there will be no hybrid Congress in Paris to show everyone what LYMEC has learned in the "The Hague process".

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) outlines the outcome of the vote on the order of resolutions (**see agenda point 7 for the results**).

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) states that the results of the vote should be shown on OpenSlides, which is a good practical example of what he was just saying on complications.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) explains that they are now showing the order of resolutions. She hopes everyone can see it. She invites **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** to email participants after the first day of Congress so that they know the order of resolutions for the next day.

11. Approval of the Secretary General

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) invites **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)** to present the Bureau recommendation.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) proposes to renominate **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** to be LYMEC's next Secretary General. The Bureau is of the opinion that he has been very good as Secretary General and would like to extend his service for one additional mandate. The Bureau thus proposes **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** for a renewal of his mandate

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) thanks the Bureau for their trust in him for two more years. He states the past year and four months have been exciting to say the least. He feels like he was growing and learning with the organisation, and feels like he still has a lot to bring. He would be very happy to get the approval from the Congress and support for two more years.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) invites **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** to leave the room, to discuss his approval as Secretary General.

Alex Alvarez Valero (Jóvenes Ciudadanos) states that, as the other delegates mentioned in the previous agenda point, he would like to thank **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** for the work he has done and his professionalism. Jóvenes Ciudadanos wants to vote in favour for the following reasons: professionalism, good transition from one day to another to

the digital atmosphere, good coordination, not only with the Bureau, but also with the interns. They are very important key players in this organisation. He wants to thank the Secretariat for their support, nothing would be possible without them. Together we will overcome this situation. He is especially thanking **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** and the Secretariat, because everything has been made easier by them, especially with Covid-19. We can be sure that in the coming two years LYMEC will work, no matter the situation we will face.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) states that without **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)**, everything would be doomed.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) agrees that without **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)**, we would be doomed. She can only encourage the delegates to support his appointment.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) encourages **Rémi Guastalli (Chair)** to proceed to a vote. She also states that the delegates will receive an email on the order of resolutions. The vote will also be on OpenSlides.

Vote

For- 166

Against- 0

Abstain- 0

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) was approved as **Secretary General for 2 more years**.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) invites **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** back into the room and congratulates him on his election, with overwhelming support.

12. Approval of the Committee of Discipline and Arbitrage

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) invites **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)** to present the proposal for the Committee of Discipline and Arbitrage.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President): As you know, the mandate of the Committee has to be renewed for two years. We propose a new committee as a Bureau. The candidates are **Erki Raja** (former Internal Auditor), **Katharina Schreiner** (former International Officer of Julis), **Keith Henry** (former International Officer of Ógra Fianna Fáil), **Pieter Sannen** (member of Jong VLD and very familiar with LYMEC), and **Sissel Kvist** (former President of LYMEC). We hope the Congress will approve our proposal.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that as no one is taking the floor or opposing the Bureau proposal, it is accepted as such.

Congress approved the Committee of Discipline and Arbitrage for 2020-2022 mandate.

13. Finances

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) invites **Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer)** to present the state of the LYMEC finances.

a. Requests for debt reductions and payment plans

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer): I will try to be quick, but there is quite some ground to cover. I will start with requests for debt reductions and payment plans, on which I can be very quick: there are none. While we were reviewing the statutes, we found out that only the Spring Congress can be used for this, while the practice has been different for a lot of years. We will fix this in the new statutes, if approved. Since there are no urgent requests, we will move this to the Spring Congress. By then we will know what every Member Organisation is supposed to pay us.

b. Interim financial report

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer) presents the Interim Financial Report for April-November 2020

Written Statement, Profit and Loss Statement & Balance Sheet:

- This has been a very unpredictable year, which makes the result quite far from what we expected or intended, due to the pandemic:
 - There were (almost) no visits to Member Organisations, no physical Congress and less physical events. Most ELF events were online, which meant less money was spent on them, but also less income was received through these events;
 - Moving the Paris Congress online brought financial challenges. Both Congresses were in the end online. This will be an extra challenge for next year, as the Renew Europe Group reserves a certain amount of funding for our Congresses. They pay this directly to hotels, restaurants etc. and this is a fixed amount. We made far-reaching preparations for Paris, as after Skopje, we would have had only one physical Congress and we would spend all of the budget on the Paris Congress. Paris will now be moved to spring and Skopje to autumn. Now we have to find a way to be able to organise both Congresses from the same grant, which is a challenge. We moved money from this year to next year to compensate for that and are trying to find other ways to cut costs.

- Other than this, not too much has happened in a financial sense. We spent less than expected, as there was no travel and less use of office space but our income was also hurt by the pandemic:
 - There was less funding from ELF due to fewer physical events.
 - The EYF online event was successful. However, the second event was not granted, the EYF Study Session II. Another application has been made for autumn 2021 and we want to apply for structural funds in the future. We will need to have an event every year.
- Profit and Loss Statement: there is an expected high surplus because of a lack of opportunity to spend money on traveling and events. We are not able to spend money as we usually would:
 - Result of the report of 13 October: €19 010,12, the actual number will end up somewhere around this number
 - Balance Sheet: assets grew due to lower spending because of Covid-19: €19,000
 - Equity on 13 October: €97 648,08

Debts to LYMEC on 11.11.2020

There have been a few changes to the report, as there were quite a few new updates since **Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer)** drafted the report. There is one unpaid membership fee for this year: Nowoczesna Youth. There has been good progress on getting the outstanding debt down. **Total debts to LYMEC 11.11.2019: 3,156.52 €**

- Mladi LDP (2019 or earlier: 1068,88; total: 1068,88): there were quite a few new debts from Mladi LDP. They are working on repaying this and sent €200, for this year they paid their membership fee.
- Nowoczesna Youth (2019 or earlier: 525; 2020: 175; total: 700): Nowoczesna Youth has no capacity to pay their debts for now.
- UDI Jeunes (2019 or earlier: 350; total: 350 (paid)): UDI Jeunes paid back their debts, their suspension has been lifted by the Bureau.
- LiFT (susp.) (2019 or earlier: 350; total: 350): LiFT remains suspended, they intend to pay back their debts.
- ANC Youth (susp.) (2019 or earlier: 211.64; total: 211.64)
- Youth Forum of Nasa Stranka (total: 105)
- EYMU* (2019 or earlier: 175; total: 175): there is no contact with EYMU, we do not expect this money back. They have been suspended and up for disaffiliation.
- LLJ (2019 or earlier: 240; total: 240 (paid)): LLJ has paid recently.
- TLDE Romania (disaff.) (2019 or earlier: 175; total: 175): the debt of TLDE will be written off, they have been disaffiliated.
- Alliance Youth (2019 or earlier: 39,64; total: 39,64 (paid)): Alliance Youth has paid recently.
- Young Progressives Slovakia (2020: 175; total: 175)
- Mlade ANO (2019 or earlier: 300; total: 300)

- Musavat Youth Organisation* (2019 or earlier: 1; total: 1)

Received and Pending Membership Fees, Debts, Individual Members, Fundraising Activities & Extraordinary Refunds

- There is currently one unpaid membership fee (2020), unpaid by the end of the year.
- The debts to LYMEC decreased in 2020: from €3.596,16 to €3.156,52
- The Individual Member Section currently has 155 individual members

Umberto Masi (LLJ) asks **Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer)** about the last amount in the table, that says 1 euro (for Musavat Youth Organisation), which is a different number than the others.

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer) explains that this is indeed 1 euro, as this organisation requested a reduced membership fee. So they decided on the symbolic amount of 1 euro, which is the amount outstanding.

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer) states that Young Progressives Slovakia actually paid and apologises for that mistake so we indeed only have one outstanding unpaid MO fee for this year.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) reminds the delegates to take the floor through OpenSlides and to tell the Congress organisers if they are unable to use OpenSlides properly.

c. Revised Budget 2020

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer) presents the Revised Budget 2020

The Revised Budget is an update of the budget of every Congress, to make sure it still reflects what we expect to end up at:

- There were less participation fees due to the Congress cancellation: this means less income on the Congress side, but there were also less costs on the Congress side. There are quite some costs that I mention that do not show up in the documents, as ELF and Renew do not give us money but pay directly our costs. ELF gives the organisers a fee of approximately 20 percent of the costs. As we did not spend as much, this means less income.

We also have less costs: less costs for promotion material and communication and the Project Fund was moved. In short: no Congresses means less costs and less income.

- Therefore: ELF and Renew Europe Group payments of direct costs are not passing through our accounts and are not visible in the budget.
- There was less ELF-income.
- There were not as many communication expenses due to a lack of physical events.

- The LYMEC Project Fund of 3000 euros was not used this year, it is moved to next year for cooperation projects.
- There was no physical EYF-activity, so those €10.000 will not be received or spent this year.
- The same applies for the congresses.
- **The expected profit is €15.028,50**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) requests to proceed to a vote

Vote

For- 167

Against- 0

Abstain- 0

The Revised Budget 2020 was adopted

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) congratulates **Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer)** on the overwhelming support for the revised budget.

d. Interim internal audit report

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer) gives the floor to **Tuuli Helind (Internal Auditor)** on behalf of the internal auditors, to present the Internal Audit Report.

Tuuli Helind (Internal Auditor): She explains that unfortunately **Sanda Krekikj (Internal Auditor)** cannot join today. She would like to thank **Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer)** and **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** for their cooperation. The internal audit was fully online this time, which is the first time in LYMEC's history. **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** was willing to copy and scan documents. We are really pleased with what is happening with LYMEC's finances. They only made 2 points, which were not regarding finances, but more on organising and recording decisions. These points were in themselves not vital in their nature. Her and **Sanda Krekikj (Internal Auditor)** hope they can go to Brussels for the next internal audit, as this one was an interim audit, but we do not know what will happen. If there are any other questions, delegates can directly address them to her.

e. Proposed membership fees 2021

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer) presents the Membership Fee Proposal 2021

He explains that he can be pretty quick on this point: we propose to keep the fee the same as last year. However, there is one mistake in the document, the following sentence is wrong: "as the fee would skyrocket if the cap were kept in place". That was a mistake, because this is not applicable to any current Member Organisations. The Cap is there just in case in the future there is a Member Organisation which tries to downgrade its numbers.

The proposal:

- The proposal is to keep the membership fee unchanged from 2020
- Which means for Associate Member Organisations: €175
- And for Full Member Organisations: €200 + €0,06 per member (with a €1.200 cap)

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) requests to proceed to a vote on this proposal.

Vote

For- 160

Against- 1

Abstain- 0

The proposed membership fees for 2021 were adopted by the Congress.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states there has been overwhelming support for the proposed membership fees.

f. Draft Budget 2021

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer) presents the Draft Budget for 2021: He forgot to respond to the internal auditors and wanted to thank them for their work. They have been very supportive during the audit, but also outside of it. They showed flexibility when we moved the audit online and they could not travel to Brussels. Congratulations to all, we almost made it through. But now the most important thing: the Draft Budget for the next year.

These are the main points:

- Substantial loss budgeted because of surpluses of recent years: we budgeted a substantial loss for the next year. This looks scary, but it is intentional, as for a few years, we have had big surpluses, which was more than necessary. In discussion with the internal auditors, we decided to invest the surplus of 2020 in 2021. This is not irresponsible: running this deficit is just a one-time expense. In 2021, we will invest in a new website (15.000 euros). This is not to run a big deficit every year, but only a one year thing. This new website is very widely budgeted, the offers for a new website are under this budget, but we want to be sure that it does not go over the original plan and make sure it fits in the budget.
- The loss can be credited to the investment of a new website (€15.000).
- Less ELF funding goes through our accounts, because more costs are directly paid for by ELF. We expect lower income from ELF, but do not worry: this is an administrative thing: normally we would pay costs ourselves and get them refunded, now costs are paid directly by ELF. This does not show up in our documents, but both income and expenses are lower.
- Increase spending on Bureau meetings and staff expenses: we hope we will get to meet in person more often as a Bureau: that is why the account we increased.

According to the reward scheme, there will be a pay raise for **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)**. It is also reflected in the budget.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) asks to proceed with the vote.

Vote

For- 159

Against- 0

Abstain- 0

The Draft Budget for 2021 was adopted by the Congress.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is overwhelming support for the Budget 2021 and concludes the Congress for the day. She reminds the delegates of the cultural evening, which **Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer)** will lead them through. **Vedrana Gujic (Chair)** closes the Congress for this day and reminds the delegates of the deadline for amendments on the Urgency Resolution at 23:00 CET and states the order of resolutions is on OpenSlides and will be emailed by the Secretariat.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) states that the rules were well respected, which is important, also for the next day when the Congress will discuss amendments and resolutions. He states that those who were not able to cast their votes, should reach out to the Secretariat. We lost quite a few votes of International Officers that were present at the roll call but not voting systematically: these issues should be fixed for the next day. He asks delegates with issues to reach out.

Day 2: Saturday 14th November 2020

Day starts at 10 h 00 CET.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) opens the day and gives the floor to **Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair)** to chair the Congress.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) opens the second day of the Congress and welcomes everyone. He mentions that the Congress is being recorded and states that by being present, the delegates are accepting this. Other than that, it is a special day, especially for two of the delegates who are having their birthdays: **Laia Comerma (LYMEC Events and Trainings Officer)** and the International Officer of Nowoczesna Youth who is unfortunately not present. **Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair)** states that after the roll call, the Congress will discuss membership issues.

Roll Call

Bálint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) performs the roll call with **Annemiek van Vliet (LYMEC Administrative Assistant)** and **Lucasta Bath (LYMEC Policy Intern)**

	Full Members		Votes	Roll Call Congress start Saturday 14 Nov
Andorra	Joves Liberals d'Andorra		3	3
Austria	JUNOS - Junge Liberale NEOS		5	5
Belgium	Fédération des étudiants libéraux (FEL)		4	4
Belgium	Jong VLD vzw		5	5
Belgium	Jeunes MR		9	9
Bulgaria	Youth MRF		10	10
Catalonia	Juventut Nacionalista de Catalunya (JNC)		7	7
Croatia	Istriani Democratic Youth (IDY)		4	4
Czech Republic	Mladé ANO		3	3
Denmark	Venstres Ungdom		6	6
Denmark	Radikal Ungdom		5	5
Estonia	European Reform Party Youth (ERPY)		6	6
Estonia	Centre Party Youth (Eesti Keskerakonna Noortekogu)		7	7
Finland	Svensk Ungdom / RKP-nuoret		6	6
Finland	Keskustaopiskelijat(former Keskustan Opiskelijaliitto)		4	4
Finland	Suomen Keskustanuoret ry (Centre Youth of Finland)		7	7
France	Jeunes Radicaux		4	4
Germany	Junge Liberale (Julis)		10	10
Germany	Bundesverband Liberaler Hochschulgruppen (LHG)		5	5
Hungary	Momentum TizenX		3	3
Iceland	Uppreisn		3	3
Ireland	Ogra Fianna Fáil		8	8
Latvia	Attīstībai Youth		3	3
Lithuania	Lithuanian liberal youth		8	6
Luxembourg	JDL - Jonk Demokraten Luxembourg		3	3
North Macedonia	Lidem		3	3
Norway	Norges Unge Venstre (NUV)		5	3
Spain	Jóvenes Ciudadanos		8	8
Sweden	Centerstudenter		4	4
Sweden	Liberal Youth of Sweden (LUF)		6	6
Sweden	Centerpartiets Ungdomsförbund		5	5
Switzerland	Jungfreisinnige Schweiz (JFS)		6	6
The Netherlands	JOVD		6	6
The Netherlands	Jonge Democraten		7	7
Ukraine	Liberal Democratic League of Ukraine		3	3
Ukraine	European Youth of Ukraine		3	3
United Kingdom	Young Liberals		8	8
IMS	Laurenz Van Ginneken		1	1
IMS	Huw James		1	1
IMS	Casper Pedersen		1	1
Greece	Young Liberals Greece		3	3
Serbia	Nova Stranka Youth		5	5
		TOTAL	203	186
	-Simple majority of those present		101.5	93
	Two thirds of present		135.3333333	124

There were 186 votes present at the Congress.

European Reform Party Youth (ERPY), JDL - Jonk Demokraten Luxembourg, Lidem and Attistibai Youth were absent.

14. Membership issues

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) explains the procedure: the delegates can ask the organisations questions, then there will be a closed session where there will be discussions and a vote, which is confidential. He reminds the delegates not to take screenshots of that part. **Pau**

Castellvi Canet (Chair) gives the floor to **Dan-Aria Sucuri (LYMEC Vice-President)** to present the first prospective Associate Member.

Associate Membership

- **Vesna Democratic Youth Movement (Russia)**

Dan-Aria Sucuri (LYMEC Vice-President) states that the Congress will discuss two applications, starting with Vesna Democratic Youth. Vesna will first give a short presentation to talk about their application, afterwards there will be a Q&A session and the Bureau will give their recommendation. **Dan-Aria Sucuri (LYMEC Vice-President)** invites Vesna to enter the Congress.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) invites **Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM)** to present her organisation.

Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM) presents her organisation by showing a presentation.

- She states that Vesna was founded in 2013 and has 124 members. They have 1752 supporters (among them 5 councillors), 7 branches and 7 other cities where active members live. More than 80 percent of their members were detained or victims of police misconduct at some point. She states the treatment of their organisation says a lot about Russia. It is for example complicated to get legal status in Russia without being challenged or experiencing other issues, due to its oppressive laws. They have a lot of partners and allies and are independent from any government structures. They have no mother party or affiliation with any political movement. They are against the current Russian government.
- The basic values of the organisation are liberal: personal and political freedoms, free market, human rights, anti-Putin, anti-war, anti-corruption, pro-European, pro-Ukraine and Belarus, pro-LGBTIQ+, pro-secular. They are against any form of discrimination and xenophobia, which we find a lot in Russian government and politics.
- Structure: the organisation has a federal structure: it has a Federal Coordination Council, which is elected by regional branches. The Congress elects the Auditing and Controlling Body. Due to Russian geographical complications, they are unable to hold a Congress as often as they would like. Therefore the Federal Coordination Council has a lot of functions that are traditionally held by a Congress. They elect the International Commission for example.
- Branches: the main branch is in Saint-Petersburg, which is the biggest and founding one. There is a wide geographical spread. The other branches are: Moscow, Chelyabinsk, Barnaul, Krasnoyarsk, Kurgan, Veliky Novgorod.
- Finances: Vesna has no government funding, it is based on voluntary membership fees. They also receive donations from supporters and from anonymous donors. This is due to Russian law and the fact that a lot of people are scared to donate to these kinds of organisations.

- Activities: organisation of events, direct actions and grassroots campaigns, education, elections (observation and participation as candidates), human rights advocacy.
- Partners, in Russia: Navalny team, Russian United Democratic Party (Yabloko), Parnas, Libertarian Party of Russia, Open Russia; At international level: Associate Member of IFLRY
- Activities/events: Picture 1 shows a protest with yellow rubber ducks: this was in 2017, which was an eventful year, with the Presidential election. This was a protest with Navalny, the rubber duck became a powerful symbol in Russia; Picture 2 shows people wearing face masks of a politician: this was a protest against censorship in Russia: a Russian organ was banning websites and trying to ban Telegram for two years. In the end they gave up, because they could not do it. The picture showed a Vesna action in support of Telegram in 2018; Picture 3 shows a group of Vesna Youth with their flag, they were election observers during local elections; Picture 4 shows a group with different flags at a summer camp: this was a place for discussion, to share ideas and have a good time. The flags are libertarian, LGBTQ, they share liberal values in Russia and think it is better to unite than argue amongst themselves; Picture 5 shows the funeral of the Russian future: this was during the pre-election time and reflected what they felt. It showed the experience of everyone in Russia; Picture 6 shows a recent protest in solidarity with Belarus: this topic is very important to them as they are neighbours. Belarus is a dictatorship in Europe. Vesna stands in full support of everybody in Belarus and is scared of what is going on. This protest was in August when the police reports from Belarus came out; Picture 7 shows a rally for Boris Nemtsov: he was the leader of the liberals in Russia for a long time, then he was killed by Putin. Vesna believes that Putin was responsible and demands justice for it every year; Picture 8 on Crimea: Vesna is against the occupation. It has been 6 years now and Vesna wonders what happened during this time: unfair courts, no freedom of speech, no free internet and unfair laws imposed by the Russian government; Picture 9 is about solidarity with a city in the Russian far east. A person was arrested for a crime he did not commit and there was no fair trial for this. He was just arrested for no reason, the courts are not fair and it will never be known whether he did it or not. This has been 3 months already and Vesna stands in solidarity with this; Picture 10 is showing Putin's birthday party: it is a tea party serving novichok and everyone ends up dead. This action mocks Navalny being poisoned by drinking tea in an airport; Picture 11 shows the last Congress in summer 2019 with delegates from all the regional branches.

Dan-Aria Sucuri (LYMEC Vice-President) asks whether there are any questions from the delegates.

Sebastien Martin (Jeunes Radicaux) has two questions. First on the anonymous donors: he wants to know if Vesna could tell the Congress more about this. The second question is on secularism, as this is an important notion for Jeunes Radicaux, he would like to know if Vesna could tell him more about this and about their actions on this topic.

Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM) first replies to the question on their donors. Vesna does not get any huge donations. They have anonymous donors, but the only thing they can say is that these donors are inside of Russia, as Vesna cannot accept money from outside, as this would lead to criminal charges under Russian law. There is no governmental involvement in Vesna. Personally she does not know a lot about these anonymous people, they are mostly ex-activists or people who were involved with Vesna before, but inactive now because of their age (Vesna has an age limit of 35 years). A lot of people in Russia are scared to support these kinds of movements: they donate a little bit of anonymous money. Vesna needs this money to base their actions on, their budget is mostly based on fundraising for events and membership fees.

Sebastien Martin (Jeunes Radicaux) repeats his second question on specifying Vesna's actions in Russia for more secularism.

Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM) states that Vesna is pro-secular. In Russia, the Russian orthodox church is highly related to the government, they are basically the same body. Vesna stands against this. There are a lot of issues regarding this, which are mostly regional, with the church trying to obtain some cathedrals. There is a story about a cathedral in Saint Petersburg that is a private museum now, but the church tried to claim it. There have been two years of fighting on this, in which Vesna participated. Vesna is also against the law to protect religious feelings, as they see it as a repressive instrument: anything can be put under it, memes were prohibited because of this, for example. Vesna does not have anything against religion, but mostly against the Russian orthodox church.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) gives floor to **Alice Schmidt (Julis)**

Alice Schmidt (Julis) states that she has great respect for Vesna and its members being active in this way in a country like Russia. She is wondering if there will be consequences from the Russian government if Vesna joins an organisation like LYMEC and what data Vesna has to share with the Russian government if they would join.

Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM) states there will not be any consequences that are more severe than the ones they are already experiencing now. There are no laws in Russia prohibiting them to participate in LYMEC or IFLRY, as the government does not care about that. They mostly care about what Vesna does inside Russia. There won't be any severe consequences, but that also does not matter to them. On the second question, Vesna does not want to share any data with the government. The only thing they have to do is publish their statutes on their page (as an unofficial organisation), to prove they are not extremist or terrorist. They do not share any other data, for example on who is in the Council or who is the head of the organisation.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) apologises for skipping **Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom)**, which **Umberto Masi (LLJ)** pointed out in a point of order. The speakers' list keeps deleting the first person. The floor is given to **Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom)**.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) jokes that if someone should be censured, it should be him. He states it is good to see **Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM)** again. He has one last question on the benefits: what can Vesna get out of LYMEC and what can they provide to LYMEC?

Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM) states that they are currently living under a dictatorship, with at its core principle, the isolation from the rest of the world. Russian propaganda states that it is different from Europe. Russia has homophobic laws and anti-human rights laws. Vesna does not believe in that, but believes that Russia is a European country by ancestry and culture. They want to be part of Europe and LYMEC stands for the same thing, togetherness in Europe. They stand for European values in their country, it is about values and beliefs. They want to be part of Europe and the bigger progressive world that they do not get to be part of now because of Putin. What they can give to LYMEC is to share experiences different from a lot of the other members of LYMEC (from Western Europe, Northern Europe, although Eastern might be a bit closer to their experience), they can build communication on that ground. Putin and his regime does not only harm them, but also the rest of Europe and everybody. For example, Navalny poisoning was a big case in Europe too and he was transferred to Germany. They want this to stop, as Putin is harmful for everybody. Why don't we stand together in this?

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) reminds the delegates to rename themselves in Zoom, according to the procedures explained many times already.

Ellinor Juth (Svensk Ungdom) states that Vesna has reached out to some Nordic organisations and had an interview with them before this application. She is wondering why Vesna did not reach out to the Finnish organisations, especially considering they share a border.

Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM) is really sorry about that. They did not have enough time and did this in a few days. They did not get the necessary contact, but they should and she is very sorry about this. She hopes to build bridges in the future. She hopes they can get to know each other better, regardless of how this application goes. There are a lot of things to discuss, especially since they are geographically close.

Anna Komziuk (LDLU) has a first question on what Vesna's position on the recent constitutional amendments in the Russian Federation is and whether they have ever been involved in any legislative procedure in Russia.

Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM) states they are strongly against these amendments, Vesna is outraged, as these amendments are outrageous. She doesn't know another word for it. Putin gave himself 12 more years to be President. There are also homophobic ones, about the family being a unity between a man and a woman. Some of them are just purely cosmetic. Vesna is angry and upset about these laws. They are also angry that it happened during a pandemic, as it is not a legal procedure, there was no referendum or anything alike, it was unnecessary. The voting on it was during the pandemic, in which large groups had to vote

outside. They were not allowed to have rallies or anything or events to show their opinion. They hope that Putin will last less than 12 years.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) states that the Bureau recommendation will be presented in a closed session.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) states that the Congress will enter into a closed session, in which guests, observers, candidate- and associate members will go into a break-out room, outside of the main session.

Congress went into a closed session to discuss the membership of Vesna YDM.

Vote

For- 151

Against- 25

Abstain- 5

Vesna Democratic Youth Movement is approved as an Associate Member of LYMEC.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) lets everyone back into the main room and congratulates LYMEC's new Associate Member, **Vesna YDM**.

Maria Lakhina (Vesna YDM) thanks everyone, is happy to hear that and ensures the Congress that everything is going to be great.

- "Movement for Latvia" Youth (Latvia)

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) invites **Laura Rigerte (Movement For!)** to present her organisation and asks her to please keep it to 5 minutes maximum, with less being even better.

Laura Rigerte (Movement For!) wishes the delegates a good morning and states it is a great pleasure to join them. She thanks the Congress for the opportunity of welcoming them. The delegates already know about what Movement For! Youth is and what they do. They are the youth wing of Movement For!. Together with 2 other political organisations they won seats in the parliamentary elections and won the Riga elections. They are a relatively young organisation of only 5 months old. However, they have already done great things. They have 4 board members and 16 official members. They also have thematic branches in the youth wing. She will not go into detail about the things they have done, as these can be read in the application. What they have done since is a successful online discussion on populism, specifically in Europe and on how populism developed in Europe. They also discussed the future of European politics, including issues like Covid-19, Brexit and the refugee crisis. For a young organisation, they are very successful, with a lot of listeners, and they have been hosted by a representative of Latvian politics. In October, they protested next to the parliament in Latvia: they were standing there on Thursdays to support LGBTQ rights. Before that, they

initiated a collective initiative with 10.000 signatures submitted to parliament for the right of same sex couples to register their partnership. Normally, if you have this amount of signatures, it has to be discussed in parliament, but this time parliament refused. Movement For! reached out to 5 youth organisations and organised these protest actions, which was a big success. She hopes that the conservative parliament gets the message and takes different measures in the future. Regarding the issue of their young age and not having a lot of experience, she understands that with experience comes knowledge. However, she states that their strongest point is their members, who have done volunteer work in different organisations and have worked on legislative initiatives and legislative amendments for non-discrimination laws in Latvia. They would be happy to join the LYMEC family and gain expertise and knowledge from it. In return, they want to give their knowledge and enthusiasm to LYMEC. She thanks the people she has been in contact with from LYMEC, as they were very helpful and speedy in their answers.

Franziska Brandmann (Julis) thanks Movement For! for the presentation and thinks it is great they are organising events. However, she states they are not a legal entity and are not registered as an organisation. She wonders how Movement For! can be a Member Organisation if they are not an organisation. They do not have a bank account or budget and are 100 percent dependent on their mother party organisation. They have also only existed for 5 months. She thinks it could be better to get things in order before joining LYMEC. She asks whether Movement For! can tell the Congress how dependent or independent they are from the mother party organisation.

Laura Rigerte (Movement For!) states they are not an independent legal entity. They are part of the mother organisation, of which they are the youth wing. They do not have their own resources or finances, but they are very sure that the mother party will keep providing them with a budget. She does not know what the usual practice is, but does not have worries on their membership fees or anything like that.

Felix Häring (LHG) states LYMEC already has another Member Organisation from Latvia and wonders what their relationship is with Attistibai Youth. He also asks what other contacts they have with liberal organisations in the Baltics?

Laura Rigerte (Movement For!) states they have a good relationship with Attistibai Youth, which is one of the 5 organisations they were doing the protest actions with in October. Both of these youth organisations are of the same political alliance in the Latvian Parliament and Riga City Council. They cooperate and have strong communication.

Jekabs Karlis Rasnacs (Movement For!) states that there is also the Freedom Party in Lithuania, although it doesn't have an official youth branch, with whom they have a good relationship, but they are still developing themselves and establishing relations. He mentions that there are two liberal parties in Lithuania - the Liberal Movement and the Freedom Party, and that in Estonia, Movement For! has a good relationship with the Reform Party.

Anna Komziuk (LDLU) thanks **Laura Rigerte (Movement For!)** for her presentation and enthusiasm, and asks whether the organisation has been involved before in international activities. She also wonders whether LYMEC is its first platform to speak out loud?

Laura Rigerte (Movement For!) replies that as an organisation this will be their first time to get involved in an international platform. They do have some partners, as mentioned in their application, they have worked on an Erasmus project and they have some European partners with whom they cooperate.

Nikki Fredriksz (JD) states that she has a question about the Manifesto. What is meant by the statement that Movement For! stands for strong families and civic patriotism?

Laura Rigerte (Movement For!) answers that the organisation stands for strong civil society actions and enthusiasm to make a change. She says that she is not sure if she has understood **Nikki Fredriksz's (JD)** 's question correctly - as she understood. It is then a different issue to talk about patriotism and families. There is a willingness there to get involved in issues affecting the country in general.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) invites people to the waiting room and **Dan-Aria Sucuri (LYMEC Vice-President)** to give the Bureau recommendation

Congress went into a closed session to discuss the membership of Movement for! Latvia Youth.

Vote

For- 111

Against- 33

Abstain- 44

Movement For! is approved as an Associate Member of LYMEC.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) announces that there is an absolute majority, which means Movement For! has been approved. He congratulates them and welcomes them to the liberal family. He also announces that we will have another roll call before full membership discussions.

Roll Call

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) performs the roll call with **Annemiek van Vliet (LYMEC Administrative Assistant)** and **Lucasta Bath (LYMEC Policy Intern)**

	Full Members		Votes	Roll Call Congress after Associate membership - Sat 14 Nov
Andorra	Joves Liberals d'Andorra		3	3
Austria	JUNOS - Junge Liberale NEOS		5	5
Belgium	Fédération des étudiants libéraux (FEL)		4	4
Belgium	Jong VLD vzw		5	5
Belgium	Jeunes MR		9	9
Bulgaria	Youth MRF		10	10
Catalonia	Juventut Nacionalista de Catalunya (JNC)		7	7
Croatia	Istrian Democratic Youth (IDY)		4	4
Czech Republic	Mladé ANO		3	3
Denmark	Venstres Ungdom		6	6
Denmark	Radikal Ungdom		5	5
Estonia	European Reform Party Youth (ERP)		6	0
Estonia	Centre Party Youth (Eesti Keskerakonna Noortekogu)		7	0
Finland	Svensk Ungdom / RKP-nuoret		6	6
Finland	Keskustasopiskelijat(former Keskustan Opiskelijallito)		4	4
Finland	Suomen Keskustanuoret ry (Centre Youth of Finland)		7	7
France	Jeunes Radicaux		4	4
Germany	Junge Liberale (Julis)		10	10
Germany	Bundesverband Liberaler Hochschulgruppen (LHG)		5	5
Hungary	Momentum TizenX		3	3
Iceland	Uppreisn		3	3
Ireland	Ógra Fianna Fáil		8	8
Latvia	Atsistībai Youth		3	3
Lithuania	Lithuanian liberal youth		6	6
Luxembourg	JDL - Jonk Demokraten Luxembourg		3	0
North Macedonia	Lidem		3	0
Norway	Norges Unge Venstre (NUV)		5	5
Spain	Jóvenes Ciudadanos		8	8
Sweden	Centerstudenter		4	4
Sweden	Liberal Youth of Sweden (LUF)		6	6
Sweden	Centerpartiets Ungdomsförbund		5	5
Switzerland	Jungfreesinnige Schweiz (JFS)		6	6
The Netherlands	JOVD		8	8
The Netherlands	Jonge Democraten		7	7
Ukraine	Liberal Democratic League of Ukraine		3	3
Ukraine	European Youth of Ukraine		3	3
United Kingdom	Young Liberals		8	8
IMS	Laurenz Van Ginneken		1	1
IMS	Huw James		1	1
IMS	Casper Pedersen		1	1
Greece	Young Liberals Greece		3	
Serbia	Nova Stranka Youth		5	
		TOTAL	203	184
	Simple majority of those present		101.5	92
	Two thirds of present		135.3333333	122.6666667

There were 184 votes present at the Congress.

JDL - Jonk Demokraten Luxembourg, Lidem, ERPY and Estonian Centre Party Youth were absent.

Full Membership

- Nova Stranka Youth (Serbia)

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) invites **Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth)** to present the application of his organisation.

Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth) introduces himself as the International Secretary of the New Party Youth Forum from Serbia. Serbia has been fighting for its freedom for centuries, against a lot of ideologies and empires. He explains that Serbia is still struggling for modern European liberal values. During Serbia's last elections, there were huge problems and evidence of fraud. In the current Serbian Parliament, there are 243 members supporting the government, and only seven opposition members from minority parties. All opposition parties are out of Parliament. A few days ago, Nova Stranka Youth launched its campaign for the elections starting in two years' time. There were huge changes in the mother party, and he hopes that this will lead to much better results in the future. He states that Nova Stranka Youth needs LYMEC's support to defeat the populists in Serbia, and to build a liberal and modern Serbia. He stresses that Nova Stranka Youth has already had great cooperation with LYMEC, especially with **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)**, **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** and **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)**. There has been great regional cooperation with other Member Organisations, with for example Lidem in North Macedonia but also the liberals from Montenegro, and Nova Stranka is hoping to build strong connections with all European Liberals.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) opens the floor for questions.

Gertjan Roels (Jong VLD) thanks **Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth)** for the information. He states he has heard that Nova Stranka Youth has strong relations with liberal parties in former Yugoslavia, but that he wanted to ask what the party's positions on the independence of Kosovo are, and also the possible relations with Albania. He feels that this is an important issue to address, as there are no Member Organisations from Kosovo or Albania in LYMEC.

Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth) states the importance of respecting the reality in politics, and explains that Nova Stranka Youth respects that Kosovo is an independent state. The organisation has no problems with relations with Kosovo or Albania, but unfortunately they do not have liberal parties with which Nova Stranka Youth could cooperate. However, the party cooperates with civil organisations and individuals in those countries.

Kasper Kannosto (Svensk Ungdom) states that he only wanted to ask the same question as **Gertjan Roels (Jong VLD)**.

Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth) has nothing to add to the previous answers.

Ioana Abaseaca (USR Tineret) congratulates **Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth)** on their organisation's approach, and especially its regional cooperation: she states that USR Tineret is trying to do the same. She asks if **Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth)** could give an example of the activities of the organisation in its election campaign.

Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth): He answers that media freedom is one of Serbia's largest problems. There is limited space in the national media to represent values or political programmes - social media collaboration is therefore very important. There are also issues with the government, which has achieved its aim of having a one-party parliament. Right now, the parliament is 92% controlled by the government, and they treat Parliament like a private company. They do not respect the laws or values which liberals stand for. Nova Stranka Youth is thus trying to put together a good campaign for the upcoming elections, and trying to get liberal representation back in Parliament.

Barna Biro (TizenX) states that **Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth)** reached out to him and they have had discussions, and he knows that Nova Stranka Youth is anti-Putin and anti-authoritarian. He asks about the Hungarian minority in Vojvodina - what is Nova Stranka Youth's stance on the party which claims to represent the Hungarian minority?

Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth) responds that one of Nova Stranka Youth's Vice-Presidents is Hungarian, and that he is the representative of the Hungarian minority in the party. The biggest Hungarian party in Serbia has been in government for a long time, since the 1990s, because they will enter into a coalition with anyone, and therefore are not the best representatives of the Hungarian people. Nova Stranka Youth will try, with the help of its Vice-President, to represent Hungarian people and programmes better; the party wants to improve the situation of Hungarians in Serbia.

Anna Komziuk (LDLU) asks what the party's position on Serbia's connection with the Russian Federation and with Vladimir Putin is, and what their position on the occupation of Crimea is?

Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth) states that Nova Stranka Youth regards the situation in Crimea as an occupation. He states that the party does not support Putin or his party and that he hopes Nova Stranka Youth will have the chance to cooperate with LYMEC and its Member Organisations in the fight against Putin. He acknowledges that Russia has a huge influence in Serbian politics, and that Nova Stranka is trying to fight against this. The party wants to have good relations with Russia, but better relations with the EU.

Nemir Ali (Julis) states that both his questions have been answered, and that he appreciates Nova Stranka Youth's position on Kosovo.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) asks two questions: Firstly, what is the organisation's position regarding China and the massive Chinese investments in Serbia? Secondly, what can Nova Stranka Youth provide for LYMEC, and what does it hope to get out of the membership?

Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth) answers that in respect of China, it invests heavily in Serbia because there is no need to respect Serbian laws: the government allows Chinese investors to behave however they want. Nova Stranka Youth is completely against this, as stated in its manifesto. Chinese companies cause huge problems, especially in smaller cities

in Serbia. On the second question, Nova Stranka Youth can contribute to LYMEC by providing a perspective from a less liberal country which is not an EU Member State. This is important because LYMEC is a pan-European organisation. Moreover, **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)** wants more Balkan Member Organisations in LYMEC so it makes sense for LYMEC as well.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) thanks Congress for a productive, positive and liberal tone in the debate. He reminds Congress that the vote will now be for full membership, and that the necessary majority is 2/3rds of votes. The percentages indicated in OpenSlides include abstention, which should not be counted according to the statutes and Congress rules.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) invites **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)** to give the Bureau recommendation.

Congress enters into a closed session to discuss the membership of Nova Stranka Youth.

Vote

For- 150

Against- 8

Abstain- 22

Nova Stranka Youth is approved as a Full Member Organisation of LYMEC.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) announces that Nova Stranka Youth has been accepted as a Full Member of LYMEC, and welcomes them to the liberal family.

- **Young Liberals Greece (Greece)**

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) invites **Eleni Siapikoudi (Young Liberals Greece)** to present her organisation.

Eleni Siapikoudi (Young Liberals Greece) presents the application of her organisation with a video first and then a presentation.

- Video:

Young Liberals Greece is a small group of young people which started in 2016, and which works towards an open society, justice, equality and non-discriminatory rights. We want reforms in Greece and a new and liberal mindset. Europe needs a more liberal Greece to actively contribute to the common endeavours. Young Liberals Greece believes that only through dialogue Greece can resolve its differences, through political conversations with Turkey and North Macedonia.

Young Liberals Greece promotes freedom of speech, social justice, democracy, the voice of young people in politics, young entrepreneurship, raising political and social awareness, motivating the young generation to take action, defending human rights, and making Greece more liberal. Liberals must fight for their values.

- Presentation by **Eleni Siapikoudi (Young Liberals Greece)**, the organisation wants to be part of LYMEC's family:

Young Liberals Greece's goals are to promote an open space for dialogue, inclusion, human rights & freedoms, an open economy and fight against discrimination.

The organisation aims at a long-lasting cooperation: they have been a LYMEC Associate Member since 2017, they have taken part in IFLRY workshops and seminars, been a partner to the Friedrich Naumann Foundation in events and initiatives, and cooperated with other liberal organisations too.

The organisation participates in international events, such as conferences, seminars, student and professional exchanges.

How are Young Liberals Greece working to achieve all of this?

Through:

- Liberal laboratories (on topics such as Equality & Diversity, Freedom of Expression, Climate Change, Women & Politics, Greek & European Politics);
- An annual Summer School for Leaders, which brings together people from all over the country to exchange views and increase leadership skills;
- An entrepreneurship Academy call with FNF, promoting innovative and fresh ideas in Greek society;
- Co-organizing & participating in events such as LYMEC's Congresses, the ALDE Congress in Athens, visits to Brussels, exchange trips etc;
- Promoting dialogue with neighbouring countries, e.g. the Greek-Turkish Young Leaders Symposium, and the first Greece-North Macedonia Dialogue;
- The podcast 'Liberals at Home', during the Covid-19 pandemic, encouraged communication with audiences in Greece and Europe, promoting the exchange of ideas and keeping dialogue as active as possible.

Eleni Siapikoudi (Young Liberals Greece) shows pictures of the first Congress of Young Liberals Greece, and the election of its Bureau. She introduces the organisation's manifesto, which has four main areas (economy, foreign policy, European integration and education).

The organisation has been as active as possible in the last few months, through podcasts with liberal friends such as JuLis and USR Tineret, and it has participated in initiatives of other organisations, such as the Russia dialogue and response to Covid-19.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) opens the floor to questions from the delegates.

Marko Zivkovic (Nova Stranka Youth) asks whether Young Liberals Greece supports a particular political party/candidate in Greece right now.

Eleni Siapikoudi (Young Liberals Greece) answers that in Greece there is no political liberal party right now, but that Young Liberals Greece wants to highlight that they aim to refresh dialogue and make Greek liberal values heard everywhere, even though this is hard to achieve. Young Liberals Greece are independent, and need to promote their ideas in every possible way.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) announces that he is closing the speakers' list.

Anna Komziuk (LDLU) says that while she was looking through the manifesto, she noticed strong concerns about migration issues in Greece. She wants to know what the position of Young Liberals Greece is with regard to the EU's New Migration Pact.

Eleni Siapikoudi (Young Liberals Greece) responds that the migration crisis is a great issue for Greece and all over Europe, and that Young Liberals Greece are heavily in favour of finding a better solution to the problem. Up until now the situation has not been dealt with well, and there are of course difficult circumstances on Greek islands. More support and more common initiatives are needed, and better provisions for refugees are necessary.

Ioana Abaseaca (USR Tineret) states that the podcast on which the USR Tineret and Young Liberals Greece collaborated was highly successful, with almost 2000 viewers. She wants to know, in light of the fact that Young Liberals Greece has organised field trips and exchanges with Turkish organisations, how they see relations between Greece and Turkey.

Eleni Siapikoudi (Young Liberals Greece) answers that Greek-Turkish relations are a foreign policy issue. The organisation supports peace in the Mediterranean region, and acknowledges that there are issues to discuss, and this can only be achieved through dialogue and cooperation. Europe needs to take part in this situation, as it concerns all European states. Through dialogue, the rule of law can be promoted and aggressive action can be avoided.

Following some requests that came in from delegates by other means, **Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair)** reminds Congress that Article 20 of the Congress rules lays out the formula by which the voting thresholds and majorities are calculated. It specifies what the statutes say about the approval majorities necessary for new member organisations.

Barna Biro (TizenX) states that Young Liberals Greece is sympathetic to TizenX, and asks if the organisation has ever participated in any elections, or whether it has any ambitions to do so.

Eleni Siapikoudi (Young Liberals Greece) answers that some of the organisation's members in the past have participated in regional elections, but not in national or European elections.

Umberto Masi (LLJ) asks what the organisation's position on China is, particularly as it has tried to buy up ports in Greece and other parts of Europe.

Eleni Siapikoudi (Young Liberals Greece) responds that China is an issue for Europe, and that Young Liberals Greece are in line with other European attitudes. It is necessary to bear in mind the importance of the rule of law and democratisation, and it is important to uphold European values.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) invites **Laia Comerma (LYMEC Events and Trainings Officer)** to give the Bureau recommendation.

Congress went into a closed session to discuss the membership application of Young Liberals Greece.

Vote

For- 174

Against- 6

Abstain- 1

Young Liberals Greece has been accepted as a Full Member Organisation of LYMEC.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) welcomes Young Liberals of Greece as full members of LYMEC as they re-enter the Congress.

Suspensions (none)

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) explains that there are **no proposed suspensions**.

Disaffiliations

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) informs Congress that there is one case of disaffiliation:

- **EYMU (European Youth Movement of Ukraine)**

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) invites **Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer)** to give the Bureau position and explanations on this proposal.

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer) states they would like to get the approval from Congress on this. In spite of the negative recommendation by the Bureau before, EYMU joined LYMEC.

They have been inactive and generated debt before cutting all communications with us. The Bureau is asking the delegates to take Bureau recommendations seriously, as it took effort and resources to get them into the system, pay their bills and get them involved, and now it will take time and effort again to close their case. He asks the Congress in the future to please critically assess organisations that want to join, especially if the Bureau gives a negative recommendation.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) opens the floor to questions for delegates.

Anna Komziuk (LDLU) states that LDLU would like to comment that they have not seen this organisation in Ukraine at all, and they are completely in favour of disaffiliation, especially as their mother party was involved in a scandal within ALDE.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) reminds Congress that voting 'YES' means voting in favour of disaffiliation.

Marten Porte (LYMEC Treasurer) adds that disaffiliation means taking the organisation completely out of LYMEC's system.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) adds that the LYMEC Treasurer is the embodiment of the carrot and stick paradigm in regards to finances and other issues.

Vote

For- 169

Against- 5

Abstain- 0

Disaffiliation of the European Youth Movement of Ukraine has been carried by the Congress. They are therefore no longer part of LYMEC.

15. Statutory Changes

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) informs Congress that the discussion is going to move on to the statutory changes.

Brent Usewils (JVLD) requests a point of order, saying there is a specific error in the French original version of the statutes, but he does not know if this can be fixed or whether we have to wait until the next Congress.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) answers that it depends whether this is a mistake of a technical nature and whether the Congress agrees to eliminate those mistakes. She further explains her following explanation is exactly about this issue. She explains that the following proposals are a response to the change in certain Belgian laws that impacts our

organisation. LYMEC's statutes have been professionally reviewed by a notary to ensure their compliance with these changes. She explains that LYMEC is based in Belgium as an ABSL, a body in Belgium subject to Belgian law. The notary made significant changes to the LYMEC statutes, and **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)**, **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** and herself have all worked together to produce an adequate translation in English of the notary's work, as there is no official translation of the original French version. If mistakes are noticed by the Congress, they should be pointed out to the Bureau as soon as possible. By way of context, the statutes of LYMEC set up the framework for the organisation's rules - for example, Article 21 governs how Congress is run. The current Bureau mandate has noticed some discrepancies in the Statutes, for example that there is no mention of the Working Groups, even though they are clearly mentioned in the Congress rules and there is a clear connection in Article 21. The only major change by the Bureau is an amendment submitted by the Bureau relates to the Secretary General - the question is whether there should be limits on the re-approval of the Secretary General's mandate, if it should be two years or whether it should be unlimited. Currently the limit is one time of re-approval. We are leaving this question to Congress. Per Belgian law, Congress should have an informed decision with regard to the Secretary General's term, so we submitted amendments to amendments, which explain that the Bureau should prepare a reasoned recommendation, including what is the necessity and what would the consequences be of such renewal. The Bureau would like to hear what the delegates think - Bureau has no expressed preference.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) asks if anyone wishes to take the floor.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) opines that it is a shame that these amendments were not discussed in the Working Groups.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that they were discussed in the Working Groups before Kasper joined.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) states that the Secretary General's mandate should last for as long as the Congress wishes it too, and therefore he is in favour of amendment three giving the option for more mandate renewals.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) asks if there are any more comments.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) says that as there are no more comments, Congress will move to a vote.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that there are likely to be some errors/discrepancies still in the translated documents. She invites the Francophone Member Organisations to take a look at the documents and help out, and emphasises that the Bureau and the staff has been doing its best to clean up the statutes.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) clarifies that Congress will be voting on amendments to amendments.

Brent Usewils (JVLD) requests a point of order, explaining that he was actually talking about mistakes in the original French version before, there is some confusion in the statutes about the majority of members and the majority of votes in the French version. There is a discrepancy between the English and French version.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) encourages **Brent Usewils (JVLD)** to email this correction to him so that we can correct that with the notary.

Brent Usewils (JVLD) asks which version is being voted on, as the English version is correct, but the French one might not be.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) clarifies that the French version is the binding one, the one that the notary made.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) explains that the vote will be on the English text, because that is the one the delegates vote on. Then this will be checked with the notary once again, who will transfer the documents to the authorities. He encourages delegates to communicate any issues in the text to him after the Congress so we can make sure the French version reflects the approved English one.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) explains that first Congress will vote on the amendment to the amendment, and then there are two separate amendments to be voted on.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) clarifies that Congress will vote first on amendments to amendments, beginning with the unlimited option, as this is the furthest stretching one and then to the less stretching one (two years extension). If both fail, the original wording will be maintained.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) states they will first move to **amendment to amendment 3** which is the unlimited option.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) makes a point of order, he states that the delegates are confused. He was hoping **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)** could maybe go through the amendments before voting on them, to explain why these amendments matter or what they change. Then he would suggest having a debate on them, then vote for that and then move on to the next one.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) confirms that indeed this would be the usual procedure. The reason why **Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair)** was proposing to take a faster route, was because he thought that after the explanation of **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)**, this usual

procedure might not be necessary anymore. But if an organisation asks for it, then the usual procedure is carried out of course.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) says she is happy to discuss this further. Amendment to amendment 3, which is line 881-882. The old text allows the Bureau to extend the mandate of the Secretary General by one term of up to two years by making a recommendation. Two options are being proposed: either that a proposal for a renewal of up to two years can be made by the Bureau, which would allow for unlimited renewals until the candidate is 33. The amendment to the amendment is to clarify the legal consequences of the contract - if a contract is extended too many times in Belgium, it becomes a limitless/unlimited contract which has complicated legal consequences. Hence, the Bureau is trying to make sure that Congress has relevant information. The amendment to amendment also makes clear that the extension can be any time up to two years - does not have to be a fixed period of two years.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) confirms that the speakers list is still open if someone wants to react or take the floor.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that there are three options:

- Congress can vote down all amendments and maintain status quo, i.e. one two-year extension;
- Or Congress can vote for amendment 3 and amendment to amendment 3 which allows unlimited renewals of the mandate of up to two years;
- Or Congress can vote for amendment 4, meaning the Bureau can propose a maximum of two renewals of up to two years;

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) states he will look at the speakers list. He gives the floor to the next one in line.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) confirms he understands the proposals, and says that he supports amendment 3, giving maximum flexibility to the Secretary General. He believes it is in LYMEC's interest to keep a good Secretary General in place for as long as they want. He adds that the process of approving a Secretary General can be quite complicated for Member Organisations.

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) states that he agrees with Kasper but has one small reservation - he questions whether amendment 3 is legally possible.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) ensures Congress that **Bálint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** has been liaising with the Belgian Labour authorities. She clarifies that, under the current statutes, any extension would result in an alteration to the contract, and the Bureau has discussed this extensively to avoid causing problems with the future Bureau.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) proposes that Congress moves to vote to avoid long discussions.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) requests a point of order about how the voting will be carried out.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) explains that all amendments are on the same point, so it will not be done by blocs. The amendments are numbered differently as they have different consequences.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that the most extreme option will be voted upon first, per Congress rules.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) reminds Congress that points of order are for order, not an alternative Speakers' List.

Abel Hartman (JD) asks one final question about the Secretary General being below 35 - will that change?

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that LYMEC is a youth organisation, and the same age rules will apply to Bureau and Secretariat members so it's not changing.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) requests another point of order, and apologises that this has been so complicated. She asks whether the Congress would agree that the French version of the text should be handed over to native speakers after the vote. She asks anyone opposing this to speak up.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) clarifies that no one opposes, this means the Secretariat will work on this after the Congress to make sure the French version is consistent with the English one we are approving today.

➤ **Amendment to amendment 3 by Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)**

Vote

For- 137 (taking into account mistaken five votes)

Against- 27

Abstain- 10

The amendment to amendment has been accepted.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) explains that 5 votes were shifted from "NO" to "YES", after a mistaken vote by CUF.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) explains that as amendment to amendment 3 was approved, amendment to amendment 4 will fall automatically. Congress will thus vote on the amendment.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) corrects him, saying that the most far reaching amendment has now been approved and therefore the others fall, but the statutes as amended now need to be voted on.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) says that as there are no objections, Congress will proceed to vote on the statutes as amended.

Vote on the Statutes a a whole

For- 167

Against- 7

Abstain- 0

The Statutes as a whole and as amended have been approved by the Congress.

16. Changes to the Congress Rules

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) invites the Bureau to speak to present the changes proposed. We will go one by one through the proposed changes.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President): We are now discussing the Congress rules - these changes were driven by the statutes. The statutes give us the general framework of operation of the organisation. The Congress Rules and the Statutes need to be aligned, so there are no discrepancies. We have tried to eliminate such discrepancies. There is nothing sexy or dramatic about the changes made - they just bring everything into alignment. Let's go through them.

➤ Amendment 1 (to Article 2):

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that this amendment introduces an online Congress option when necessary, as is the case now. The rules do not contain an official provision for digital congresses, meaning that the Bureau had to request permission from the Member Organisations. She asks if there is any opposition to that?

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) asks whether anyone wants to speak? It seems that no one is willing to intervene.

➤ Amendment 2 (to Article 4):

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that there was a set maximum number of delegates - this is for the organisations that have seen more and more members in previous years. This amendment is about giving the Bureau flexibility based on logistical and financial considerations. She asks if there is any opposition to that?

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) asks whether anyone wants to speak? It seems that no one is willing to intervene.

➤ **Amendment 3 (to Article 4):**

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that LYMEC has an Individual Members' Section Steering Committee which the Bureau thinks should be added to the process of making decisions about participation of the individual members. The Bureau wants this decision to be more transparent.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) Asks whether anyone wants to speak? It seems that no one is willing to intervene.

➤ **Amendment 4 (to Article 11) submitted by Benjamin Fievet (LYMEC IMS):**

Benjamin Fievet (LYMEC IMS) explains that he made two amendments to the rules and specifies that he is not proposing them in his capacity as representative to the IFLRY Bureau. He had submitted them before the last Congress, but no voting took place that time because of the situation so he submitted them again as an Individual Member.

He explains that the aim of this first amendment is to automatically put internal motions ahead of policy resolutions in discussions, whereas normally they have to be voted on, which means they risk not being discussed if they are too low in the order.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) Asks whether anyone wants to speak? It seems that no one is willing to intervene.

➤ **Amendment 5 (to Article 16):**

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) asks whether anyone is against this amendment?

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) asks for an explanation through a point of order.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) states that this has been explained. This amendment just changes the timeline after Congress for the sending out of minutes. Currently, the statutes state that the Bureau should send out outcomes of the policy part within two weeks of Congress, and the minutes within four weeks. This leads to an impractical outcome where the Policy Officer has to rely on their own notes, which are not always accurate. The idea is to bring these timelines into alignment for more consistency in our work.

She further adds that the next one is also a technical change - there are now three ways to archive a resolution: either proposing a new text, a new motion, or through the new sunset clause, which we enacted two Congresses ago. It's just a technical change from 'two' to 'three'.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) reminds Congress that at the end of this, we will carry out a digital vote on the whole Congress rules approval. Is anyone against this process? No one intervenes to go against that.

➤ **Amendment 6 (to Article 18) - submitted by Benjamin Fievet (LYMEC IMS)**

Benjamin Fievet (LYMEC IMS) explains that it is self-explanatory - this is to remove the motion to archive a policy resolution in the LYMEC policy book from the list of point of orders as this is not technically a point of order as it is not relevant to the functioning of the Congress. Moreover, there is now a specific paragraph in Article 16 of these rules which deals with the archiving of resolutions. Therefore, it has no place here anymore.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) asks whether, if a very unpopular policy is mentioned in a debate or found in the policy book, it will no longer be possible to object to it using a point of order and ask for a vote on it?

Benjamin Fievet (LYMEC IMS) clarifies that in that case a point of order could not be used indeed. We have now special rules explaining how to do that in any case in Article 16 and these rules provide that objections should be raised in advance. Rather than a point of order, resolutions or amendments should be used according to the explicit rules we have now.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) asks whether anyone is against this.
No one intervenes to go against that so he moves on.

➤ **Amendment 7 (to Article 25, 1.6):**

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that this is again bringing reality into the rules - the Policy Officer always leads the delegation to ALDE, but if that person was not elected to be part of the delegation, they cannot participate in any way, meaning it is useless for them to be there. Recently the Policy Officer has always run for election to the LYMEC delegation, and everyone has shown understanding and voted for them. In practice, there are only nine open seats, so this proposal aims to align the rules with the practice.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) asks whether there are any comments.
No one wishes to take the floor.

➤ **Amendment 8 (to Article 26):**

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that the text was wrong, saying LYMEC President to IFLRY, when it should say LYMEC representative.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) says there is no need to discuss this and we can move forward.

➤ **Amendment 9 (to Article 29):**

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that this is again aligning what is currently going on, in terms of the Working Group reshuffle. The Bureau wants to make it although not

mandatory, a practice, that a Bureau member can be appointed to each Working Group. This is mostly to encourage future Bureaus to adopt similar rules to ensure coordination in the Working Groups and continuity but also streamlining of the work.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) asks if there are any questions, and proposes to move to a vote on the Congress rules as a whole, as amended.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that the rules presented by the Bureau are a result of the Bureau having gone through the rules and the statutes and trying to address any existing discrepancies.

Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer) requests a point of order, saying that the speakers' list is open, and a discussion should be possible if needed.

Pau Castellvi Canet (Chair) moves Congress to vote as no-one asks to take the floor. It takes place on OpenSlides again.

Vote

For- 164

Against- 4

Abstain- 0

The Congress rules as amended have been approved by the Congress.

Lunch Break

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) thanks Congress for the end of the session, and invites delegates to return at **14 h 50 CET** after the lunch break (1 h). He emphasizes delegates not to log out and to be back on time for the roll call to ensure the Congress can continue smoothly.

Roll Call

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) invites **Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General)** to perform the roll call to start the last part of the Congress.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) performs the roll call with **Annemiek van Vliet (LYMEC Administrative Assistant)** and **Lucasta Bath (LYMEC Policy Intern)**

Belgium	Jong VLD vzw	5	5
Belgium	Jeunes MR	9	9
Bulgaria	Youth MRF	10	10
Catalonia	Juventut Nacionalista de Catalunya (JNC)	7	7
Croatia	Istrian Democratic Youth (IDY)	4	4
Czech Republic	Mladé ANO	3	3
Denmark	Venstres Ungdom	6	6
Denmark	Radikal Ungdom	5	5
Estonia	European Reform Party Youth (ERPYP)	6	6
Estonia	Centre Party Youth (Eesti Keskerakonna Noortekogu)	7	7
Finland	Svensk Ungdom / RKP-ruoret	6	6
Finland	Keskustaopiskelijat(former Keskustan Opiskelijaliitto)	4	4
Finland	Suomen Keskustanuoret ry (Centre Youth of Finland)	7	7
France	Jeunes Radicaux	4	4
Germany	Junge Liberale (Julis)	10	10
Germany	Bundesverband Liberaler Hochschulgruppen (LHG)	5	5
Hungary	Momentum TizenX	3	3
Iceland	Uppreisn	3	3
Ireland	Ogra Fianna Fáil	6	6
Latvia	Atisibai Youth	3	3
Lithuania	Lithuanian liberal youth	6	6
Luxembourg	JDL - Jong Demokraten Luxembourg	3	3
North Macedonia	Lidem	3	3
Norway	Norges Unge Venstre (NUV)	5	5
Spain	Jóvenes Ciudadanos	6	6
Sweden	Centerstudenter	4	4
Sweden	Liberal Youth of Sweden (LUF)	6	6
Sweden	Centerpartiets Ungdomsförbund	5	5
Switzerland	Jungfreisinnige Schweiz (JFS)	6	6
The Netherlands	JOVD	6	6
The Netherlands	Jonge Democraten	7	7
Ukraine	Liberal Democratic League of Ukraine	3	3
Ukraine	European Youth of Ukraine	3	3
United Kingdom	Young Liberals	8	8
IMS	Laurens Van Ginneken	1	1
IMS	Huw James	1	1
IMS	Casper Pedersen	1	1
Greece	Young Liberals Greece	3	3
Serbia	Nová Stranka Youth	5	5
		TOTAL	203
	Simple majority of those present		101.5
	Two thirds of present	135.3333333	136

There were 204 votes present at the Congress.

The following member organisation was absent:

- Estonian Centre Party Youth (Eesti Keskerakonna Noortekogu)

17. Platform on the Conference on the Future of Europe Outcomes (added agenda point)

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) thanks Congress, and explains that the new simple majority is 103 votes, and the new two-thirds majority is 137 votes.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) invites **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)** to take the floor.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that she will try to be succinct - we have taken up enough time with the statutes. This platform was created after the LYMEC elections, and aimed to launch a call to all Member Organisations to get together in one common platform and build a minimum compromise base, upon which all members can build a policy platform when the Conference on the Future of Europe starts - if it ever starts. She admits that this was supposed to be quick and easy, but the Commission keeps postponing the opening, so we don't have a start date. We thought, why not have a proper drawn out discussion and give Member Organisations more time. Unfortunately, the Young Leaders meeting also went digital and we didn't have a chance to discuss this there - so it is now in front of the whole membership of LYMEC at Congress. We don't know what is happening next but the Commission is not giving out much information. Every time she has been in a debate with anyone from our liberal family or with other youth organisations, we received nothing but awe and respect that we have done this. She thanks everyone who has participated in the process. There was some criticism from JuLis that she does accept. She hopes it is clear now that this doesn't reflect the resolutions - it's a minimum platform. Let us know if you accept the result and I hope you can fully endorse this work. If you really feel you can't work with this, tell us now. If there is an absolute red line, our Policy Officer will expand the process a bit more, until those red lines are dealt with.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) reminds Congress that time is limited, and asks them to be concise and to avoid endless speaking. He gives the floor to the first delegate in the list.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) expresses that the Bureau has done an amazing job, and that Radikal Ungdom and other Member Organisations are very happy with the result, particularly as such documents are not easy to create.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that there are no more speakers so he will close this point.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) that the floor to response and explains that this is just a matter of discussion - if no one objects, it will be uploaded on the LYMEC website and, when the Conference begins, it will form the basis for LYMEC's lobbying. She asks Congress to reach out to MEPs and other decision-makers once the Conference has started and actively use this document.

18. Renewal Policy Book Working Group Outcomes (presentation and vote on the outcomes of the Policy Book renewal working group)

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) gives the floor to **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)** for some explanations on this point.

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) explains that the LYMEC Policy Book is being renewed and updated. The following discussions will be on the work of the second Policy Book Renewal Working Group, which focused on Chapter 2 (Justice and Citizens' Rights). She explains that there were extensive discussions about the work of the Working Group at the last Digital Assembly already, but there are also new amendments which were submitted after that Assembly, which will be voted on today. First the amendments will be voted on, and then there will be a vote on the resolutions as a whole. Finally there will be a vote on the resolutions to be archived.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether there are any objections: as there are none, Congress moves to voting on the amendments.

- **2.09 Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Gender Expression as Grounds for International Protection**

Amendment 37 submitted to this resolution was withdrawn by the mover.

- **2.10 Recognise Same-Sex Marriages in the EU**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) explains that there are three amendments, two from Jong VLD, and one from LHG.

- **Amendment 59**

Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD) explains that this amendment aims to recognise that an opposite-sex marriage is not necessarily a heterosexual marriage, as for example one or both partners may be bisexual or transgender. The amendment is stating different sex couples instead of heterosexual couples.

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) requests a point of order, saying that a vote on each individual amendment is still needed, as Congress was already moving on to the next two amendments.

Vote

For- 178

Against- 6

Abstain- 0

The amendment has been accepted.

- **Amendment 60**

Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD) explains that the original wording leaves doubt about the recognition of marriages which were formalised outside of the EU. He also cites the concept

of legal cohabitation in Belgium, which is almost the same as marriage there, but this may not have an equivalent status in other Member States.

Vote

For- 153

Against- 6

Abstain- 6

The amendment has been accepted.

➤ **Amendment 73**

Felix Haering (LHG) explains that the amendment is to ensure that recognition of same-sex marriage is an entry criteria which applicant Member States must fulfil.

Vote

For- 131

Against- 20

Abstain- 13

The amendment has been accepted.

Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer) requests a point of order, as a point of clarification for delegates, they can go to the resolution on OpenSlides and tick the relevant box to show all changes, with the amendments that have been submitted.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) requests a point of order, asking whether it is possible to move to the next amendment while voting is ongoing for the previous one.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that if there are no objections, Congress can proceed in that way.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) states the vote is open on all three amendments now.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) requests a point of order, saying that a separate vote is only necessary if there is an objection. She suggests to mention the amendments one by one and if no one is against the first, moving on to the next one, instead of voting en bloc. This means only voting on an amendment if someone is against it. If there is no opposition to an amendment it will be accepted automatically.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) adds that we will proceed by voting by acclamation, saying that delegates should explicitly request a vote if they disagree with an amendment. He asks to

close the previous votes and starts the new procedure for the upcoming amendments. The new system will start from then onwards.

Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD) has a point of order stating his name is displayed incorrectly on OpenSlides.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) responds that he can correct this himself on the OpenSlides platform in his account.

- **2.13 Freedom of Gender Identity as a Fundamental European Right**

No amendments were submitted for this proposal

- **2.15 Urgent Resolution on Harmful Content Online**

- **Amendment 38** submitted by **Alex Alvarez Valero (Jovenes Ciudadanos)**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether we are still asking the people to defend their amendments in this new system.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) states that we should ask whether there are people against the amendment and if not, then it is being adopted.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks if there are any objections. No one reacts.

- **Amendment 39** submitted by **Alex Alvarez Valero (Jovenes Ciudadanos)**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks if there are any objections. No one reacts.

- **Amendment 40** submitted by **Alex Alvarez Valero (Jovenes Ciudadanos)**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks if there are any objections. No one reacts.

All three amendments are therefore accepted.

- **2.16 Stop Discriminatory Measures Towards Roma People**

No amendments were submitted for this proposal

- **2.17 Situation in Belarus**

- **Amendment 49** submitted by **Alex Alvarez Valero (Jovenes Ciudadanos)**

Alex Alvarez Valero (Jóvenes Ciudadanos) explains that this sentence aims to congratulate Renew Europe for its work in the European Parliament.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether there is any opposition. There is none, so the amendment is automatically accepted.

The amendment was accepted.

- **2.21 Ending Female Genital Mutilation**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) explains that this amendment was withdrawn, and moves Congress to the final amendment.

Amendment 46 submitted to this resolution was withdrawn by the mover.

- **2.23 Freedom of Belief**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that this was not amended, and moves Congress to vote on the resolutions as a whole. He invites **Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer)** to explain

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) states that this has been a tremendous job, that resolutions have been amended and compiled, that new resolutions have been created, that all resolutions are on OpenSlides, and all amended resolutions can be voted upon in the next vote.

- **Vote on Policy Book Renewal resolutions amended as a whole (Motion)**

Vote

For- 175

Against- 0

Abstain- 6

The motion has been accepted by the Congress approving all resolutions proposed.

- **Proposal: resolutions to be archived (Motion)**

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) explains that all these resolutions were debated at the Digital Assembly, and that it was agreed that all would be archived. She is simply asking for the confirmation of the Congress.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether there are any comments on that proposal, and suggests that an open vote takes place.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) reminds Congress that if there are problems with voting, delegates should reach out to the Bureau/Staff.

Vote

For- 175

Against- 0

Abstain- 6

The motion has been accepted by the Congress approving all the archivals.

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) thanks everyone for voting, and thanks the Working Group. Many hours were spent on this, and she urges all delegates to take part in the next Working Group, which will start at the end of November. It will be tasked with cleaning up other chapters.

19. Resolutions and motions

Chapter 1: EU Institutions and Institutional Reform

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) informs the Congress that it is time to adopt new resolutions, after the order was decided in the snap vote yesterday. He explains that there are approximately two hours to adopt and approve all of these, so efficiency is important. He requests that a Bureau Member explains the procedure.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) explains that there will be a presentation of the resolution by one of the movers, then Congress will go to the amendments where the Chair will ask if anyone wants to speak in relation to the amendment. If no one has anything to say, then the amendment will be automatically adopted. If someone wants to speak on the amendment, there will be a vote on the amendment. At the end, there will be a discussion and a vote on the resolution as a whole.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that the mover of the resolution will speak first.

a. Right to Abortion by Stefania Reynisdottir (Uppreisn)

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) invites **Stefania Reynisdottir (Uppreisn)** to speak.

Stefania Reynisdóttir (Uppreisn) thanks the Congress for voting this to the top of the resolutions list. She explains that right now in Europe we are seeing attempts to roll back existing legal protections. The purpose of the amendment is to clarify the opinion of LYMEC in this regard, and to emphasise that this is taking away people's rights. She believes that this progressive and liberal stance belongs in the Policy Book.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that there are seven amendments to discuss. He has some technical issues with his computer and asks help from the co-chairs.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) is projecting the first amendment and list of speakers.

➤ **Amendment 55 by Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD):**

Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD) explains that the purpose of the amendment is to add in the exceptions to have an abortion after 22 weeks if the foetus is unlikely to survive or suffers from severe birth defects. Some defects can only be detected late into pregnancy - for example via amniocentesis, which takes a long time to get a result. It should be for the mother to decide on such a heavy burden.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) informs Congress that there was a **positive recommendation from the Working Group for this amendment.**

Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer) informs Congress that the speakers' list is being projected on OpenSlides and mentions the first speaker on the list.

Katherine Macy (Young Liberals) thanks the mover for the motion, but adds that in regard to this amendment, she is against treating people with disabilities differently. What constitutes a severe disability - does it include Autism or Down Syndrome? Many people with disabilities live long and happy lives. This amendment takes choice away from a pregnant person, and leads to pressure on women to abort. She adds that we shouldn't treat disabled people as a burden, and we must remove judgments and barriers. Abortion must always be a choice, but this amendment does not offer a choice. It's damaging to the disabled community.

Nemir Ali (Julis) states his agreement with **Katherine Macy (Young Liberals)**, and draws the attention of Congress to some additional arguments. He states that JuLis consulted with a medical student about the detection of conditions during pregnancy, and was informed that most can be detected well before the 22nd week. Moreover, by the 22nd week of pregnancy, the foetus has a 5% chance of survival, rising to 70% by the 24th week. JuLis believes that once the unborn child is capable of survival outside the body, it should be allowed to live. For this reason, JuLis supports abortion only until the 22nd week.

Franziska Brandmann (Julis) thanks the mover for this resolution, which improves the Policy Book a lot. She supports everything that **Katherine Macy (Young Liberals)** said in her intervention, saying that a line must be drawn at the point where the foetus is viable outside the womb. She questions what constitutes a severe birth defect, adding that in Germany, a condition such as Down Syndrome would be included. JuLis therefore encourages Congress to vote against this amendment.

Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD) requests a point of order, which was denied by **Rémi Guastalli (Chair)** as it was actually a point of debate, while the speakers' list was already closed.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) says there should be a vote on the amendment, as the debate is so heated.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) calls for a vote on the amendment.

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) requests a point of order on the procedure, saying that there are recommendations from the Working Groups. She proposes that Congress does not discuss amendments which have a positive recommendation, unless a Member Organisation objects to it. They can then request to have a discussion on it and re-open the vote. If an organisation does not agree with a recommendation of the Working Group they can request a point of order to re-open the debate and the vote.

Vote

For- 71

Against- 88

Abstain- 31

The amendment has been rejected.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) states that there was a mistake in the order of amendments the Congress was discussing, and that the next in line is Amendment 76.

➤ **Amendment 76 by Bastian De Monte (JUNOS)**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that this amendment has a positive recommendation from the Working Groups.

Bastian De Monte (JUNOS) offers to explain the amendment, but is not sure if he should, as there is a positive recommendation from the Working Group.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) requests that delegates only speak if they oppose the Working Group recommendation. She proposes to read the recommendation of the Working Group and if no one opposes, delegates should not put themselves on the speakers' list.

Elsie Gisslegard (CUF) states that she would like to bring attention to the fact that clauses allowing doctors freedom of conscience allows them to refuse to perform abortions on women, for example in the U.S. and Poland, even in Sweden. This is the first step to eroding abortion rights. She wants to make sure that if you are a doctor, you have to perform your duties, including abortions. She urges the Congress to vote against this.

Bastian De Monte (JUNOS) agrees that such a situation would be terrible, but that the alternative is forcing doctors to perform procedures which they do not want to - as a doctor, he cannot support this idea. Unless there is an immediate risk to life, doctors should not be required to perform procedures if it is against their beliefs. Only if it is life-threatening.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that as there is a positive recommendation, the Congress does not have to vote, unless someone is strongly objecting to it. He states that if anyone is opposing, they should raise their hands.

Elsie Gisslegard (CUF) requests a point of order, stating she opposes the recommendation and calls for a vote on the amendment.

Vote

For- 97

Against- 37

Abstain- 52

The amendment has been accepted.

- **Amendment to amendment 58 by Felix Häring (LHG)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is no recommendation from the Working Group.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) invites **Felix Häring (LHG)** to speak

Felix Häring (LHG) explains that the intention is to change the word 'religion' to belief', which summarises the concept in a broader sense.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether Jong VLD accepts the amendment?

Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD) states that he accepts the amendment.

Amendment is automatically accepted and amends the amendment 58.

- **Amendment 58 by Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD)**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that Congress will discuss the amended version of amendment 58.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is no recommendation from the Working Group.

Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD) states that it is more factually accurate to make sure the doctor is not putting any pressure on the person - he, she, or they might hold any belief about abortion, so Jong VLD wanted to make it impartial and factual.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) moves Congress to a vote on the amended version of amendment 58.

Vote

For- 149

Against- 0

Abstain- 22

The amendment has been adopted as amended.

- **Amendment 57 by Eduardo Teixeira (Jong VLD)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is a positive recommendation from the working group.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether there are any objections? There are none.

The amendment has been adopted.

- **Amendment 77 by Bastian De Monte (JUNOS)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is a positive recommendation from the working group.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether there are any objections? There are none.

The amendment has been adopted.

- **Amendment 78 by Bastian De Monte (JUNOS)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is a positive recommendation from the working group.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether there are any objections? There are none.

The amendment has been adopted.

Congress moves to vote on the resolution as amended:

Vote

For- 165

Against- 0

Abstain- 24

The resolution has been adopted by the Congress.

Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer) requests a point of order - if delegates want to see the final version, then on the right side above the resolution there is an icon with the original version and the changed version.

Ida-Maria Skytte (LYMEC Communications Officer) requests a point of order to take a screenshot of the Congress.

b. **Freedom from Rape by Stefania Reynisdottir (Uppreisn)**

Stefania Reynisdóttir (Uppreisn) explains that this resolution was written to replace resolution 2.22 in the Policy Book with the same name. The old resolution was unfocused and not about Europe - LYMEC is a European organisation and should be focusing on what we can do better. Also, it should aim to be non-gender specific - not only women but all genders. It mentions the Istanbul Convention which is important - not enough states have ratified it so far.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states there is a point of order from **Rhea Csordas (LHG)** regarding the screenshots and he asks her if she would like to take this now.

Rhea Csordas (LHG) asks **Ida-Maria Skytte (LYMEC Communications Officer)** whether it is possible to take several screenshots and not only one, because there is the struggle that there are a lot of people in the Congress and there is only a certain number on one's screen at one time. So maybe we will need two or three pages to get all the people on the pictures.

Bálint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) as a point of order suggests that this should be done quickly, so that time is not wasted. It should either be done at that moment or be put on the agenda later. He suggests deciding when to do it and to not share the screen at that moment.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that the screenshot will be done after the current discussion of this resolution. There is one amendment (66) and one amendment to the amendment to this resolution.

➤ **Amendment to amendment 66 by Alex Alvarez Valero (Jóvenes Ciudadanos)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is no recommendation from the Working Group.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether the amendment to amendment 66 is accepted by the original movers? In fact, both amendment proposals were submitted by **Alex Alvarez Valero (Jóvenes Ciudadanos)**.

Alex Alvarez Valero (Jóvenes Ciudadanos) states that Jóvenes Ciudadanos wants to thank **Stefania Reynisdottir (Uppreisn)**. JCs made this amendment and wanted to add the wording in line with the Istanbul Convention. He encourages Congress to vote yes on both.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) clarifies that the **amendment to amendment has been accepted**, and that **Stefania Reynisdóttir (Uppreisn)** as mover accepts the whole amendment 66 as amended.

Congress proceeds to vote on the whole resolution as amended.

Vote

For- 182

Against- 0

Abstain- 6

The resolution has been adopted by the Congress.

- c. **Let Taiwan be Taiwan: Recognise Taiwan as an Independent Sovereign State by Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom)**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) calls **Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom)** to the floor.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) explains that this is one of the most complicated geopolitical issues. Taiwan is independent in every way, but forced by the One China Policy to refer to itself as Taiwan. In spite of pro-independence support in Taiwan, Taiwan has not gone ahead because they know they do not have external support from Europe etc. This motion is simply a means of expressing LYMEC's support for Taiwan if it changes its identity.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) tells Congress that the speakers list is open.

Anna Komziuk (LDLU) states that LDLU is strongly in support of this resolution, and that it is extremely important for LYMEC to have its own position on Taiwan.

Nemir Ali (Julis) states his support for this resolution, as Taiwan is a liberal democracy and should be supported against the Chinese communist regime.

- **Amendment 16 by Oriol Marin Subira (JNC)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that the recommendation from the Working Group is positive.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) states that he accepts the amendment.

Congress is then asked for a vote on the resolution as amended.

Vote on resolution

For- 172

Against- 8

Abstain- 9

The resolution has been adopted by the Congress.

d. Urgency Resolution on Peace and Stability after the Nagorno-Karabakh Peace Deal by Kaspar Kannosto (Svensk Ungdom)

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that there are no amendments.

Kaspar Kannosto (Svensk Ungdom) states that the conflict has changed, and a peace deal was signed on Monday [9th November]. Taking the developments into account, the resolution's movers saw an urgent need for the EU to take a role in observing respect of human rights in the area. There is a need to monitor human rights abuses and help ensure peace, prosperity and a future for all in the region.

Carol Ayoub (Centerstudenter) states her agreement, adding that this issue has been going on since 1988, since the presence of the Soviet Union in the area. Both Russia and Turkey have other foreign interests in the area, and Centerstudenter feels that the EU is more impartial and could be doing a better job in the area.

Peter Banks (Young Liberals) thanks **Kaspar Kannosto** and **Svensk Ungdom** for writing such an important motion. He states that Young Liberals support this motion, especially as they went to observe the election earlier this year and saw the issues faced by democracies in those countries.

Gertjan Roels (Jong VLD) states that **Jong VLD** urges everyone to support this as there is a serious military escalation in Europe's backyard. Russia's presence in yet another conflict at Europe's borders. All Member Organisations and delegations should think about a position, given that the conflict remains and in the long term Azerbaijan would like to take back parts of the territory.

Kasper Langelund (Radikal Ungdom) states that everyone was in favour of the resolution, and he hopes Congress will vote in favour.

Kaspar Kannosto (Svensk Ungdom) states that he has no final comments, and that he hopes everyone supports this.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) moves to open the vote on this resolution.

Vote

For- 166

Against- 6

Abstain- 23

The resolution has been adopted by the Congress.

- e. **A better European response to Health Crisis Management by Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR)**

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) explains that the coronavirus has shown how unprepared Europe was to face a pandemic. The resolution aims to improve coordination and improve health crisis management, including by granting more competencies to the ECDC.

Irene Terrazas Negro (Jovenes Ciudadanos) states that she wishes to thank Jeunes MR for collaborating with Jovenes Ciudadanos on the recovery plans after the pandemic. JCs sees the pandemic as a catalyst to bring about a stronger European Union.

Ioana Abaseaca (USR Tineret) states that USR Tineret wholeheartedly supports the resolution.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that there are 11 amendments to this resolution.

- **Amendment 33 by Felix Häring (LHG):**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is a negative recommendation from the Working Group.

Johannes Brill (LHG) states that LHG does not want to centralise the management of the pandemic, but adds that this was discussed in the Working Group, so he does not want to re-open the debate.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that because of the negative recommendation a vote is necessary.

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) agrees that a vote is necessary.

Vote

For- 90

Against- 57

Abstain- 37

The amendment has been adopted.

- **Amendment to amendment 17 by Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is no recommendation from the Working Group.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) explains that the amendment to the amendment was proposed by **Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR)**, and that JuLis proposed the original amendment.

Nemir Ali (Julis) says that JuLis agrees with the amendment to the amendment

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) states that Jeunes MR accepts the amendment to the amendment and agrees with JuLis.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that the **amended amendment 17 will be accepted** as there is no need to vote.

➤ **Amendment to amendment 18 by Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR)**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) informs the Congress that this amendment to the amendment was submitted by **Jeunes MR**

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) adds that JuLis do not agree with the amendment to amendment.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that first the amendment to amendment will be voted on.

Vedrana Gubic (Chair) agrees with **Rémi Guastalli (Chair)** that the amendment to amendment will be voted on.

Vote

For- 118

Against- 31

Abstain- 29

The amendment to amendment has been adopted.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) then calls for a vote on the amendment as amended.

➤ **Amendment 18 (as amended) by Nemir Ali (Julis)**

Nemir Ali (Julis) states that the amendment is in response to the problems of Spring 2020, where some EU countries had problems taking care of their own Covid-19 patients, and other Member States did not offer as much support as they could have.

Vote

For- 133

Against- 35

Abstain- 14

The amendment as amended has been adopted.

➤ **Amendment 75 by Josep Monraba (JNC)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is a positive recommendation from the Working Group.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that since there are no comments on the amendment, it is **automatically adopted**.

➤ **Amendment 45 by Ellinor Juth (Svensk Ungdom)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is a negative recommendation from the Working Group.

Ellinor Juth (Svensk Ungdom) explains that Svensk Ungdom wants to remove a specific sentence because it appears contradictory, as it mentions spreading resources equally, but also to Member States with greater need. She also questions who decides which Member State is in need. The resolution doesn't make it clear.

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) expresses regret that the resolution appears ambiguous, and explains that issues were addressed during the Working Groups and the voting was unanimous. The aim of the resolution was to tackle the health crisis in general, and it is important that the resolution is broad in terms of its scale - recognition of the fact that different countries and regions are facing different challenges.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that there are no more speakers.

Ellinor Juth (Svensk Ungdom) thanks **Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR)** for his clarification, saying it is a shame she was not present at the Working Group.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) informs Congress that it is time to vote.

Vote

For- 81

Against- 66

Abstain- 43

The amendment has been adopted.

➤ **Amendment 19 by Nemir Ali (Julis)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) explains there is no recommendation from the Working Group.

Hieronimus Eichgrün (Julis) states that he recognises the same problem as the submitter of resolution, namely the need to increase the robustness of healthcare supplies and pharmaceutical supplies. However, the state does not need to play such a big role - it is important to place trust in free trade and free exchange. He cites the example of cooperation between US companies and German pharmaceutical companies - saying that the free market provides the best solutions. He states that we should also be striving to make sure we are independent from autocracies when depending on medical supplies. The EU traded medical equipment with China - but should not be dependent on communist regimes.

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) clarifies that Jeunes MR want to defend the free market. However, the pandemic has highlighted that the lack of domestic companies producing supplies was a big problem, which led to European governments fighting over masks and other supplies. Jeunes MR is not opposed to buying these products in other countries - it should be a good thing for companies to flourish in the EU, and we should be able to buy products from outside the EU too. U.S. - German collaboration is an example of how liberalism should work. Jeunes MR encourages delegates to vote against this amendment.

Nemir Ali (Julis) asks how medical industries in Europe should be re-industrialised? He states that this will happen organically, ideally in response to demand. According to this amendment, there would otherwise be a need to force or incentivise companies to come to Europe, which he does not see as a positive thing. The only situation in which that would be a good option is if the only suppliers are in countries like China, in which case subsidies might be necessary for national protection.

Hieronimus Eichgrün (Julis) states his agreement with **Nemir Ali (Julis)**, and adds that it would be good if pharmaceutical production in the EU increased, and that he trusts the free market. If there is demand, the market will deliver. He states that we should not rely on failed planned market solutions, and that Europe must avoid falling back into ways of old where national governments try to regulate production. He encourages Congress to support the amendment.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) informs Congress that it is time to vote on the amendment.

Vote

For- 114

Against- 43

Abstain- 31

The amendment has been adopted.

➤ **Amendment 20 by Nemir Ali (Julis)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) explains that there is a negative recommendation from the Working Group.

Nemir Ali (Julis) states that this pandemic started in a wet market in Wuhan, and urges delegates to google that and then vomit into a bucket. He adds that these markets are horrible and that the world is lucky that so far only coronavirus has emerged. He adds that these markets exist in other countries too, and that general human-animal contact is the problem here - for this reason, he urges Congress to support the amendment.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) points out that the same few speakers keep making points, and asks for only one delegate per organisation to speak to ensure more discussions can take place.

Hieronimus Eichgrün (Julis) explains that he lived in China for ten years, and that the wet markets there are cruel and inhuman, with no hygienic standards at all. He is surprised that there are not more zoonoses. He states that about 26,000 viruses have been identified which are at risk of transmitting to humans, and that the practice of wet markets must be curbed soon.

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) says that google images may not be the best way to understand the situation, although he acknowledges that we should certainly be vigilant to these markets. However, the main purpose of the resolution is to discuss health crisis management in the EU generally. The problems raised by JuLis should be brought up in another resolution.

Alice Schmidt (Julis) points out that the EU is installing a system to manage future crises. However, she adds that a prevention system is also necessary to prevent recurring pandemics. She says JuLis believes this is relevant to the resolution as a whole, and that the resolution should demonstrate an understanding of why prevention is important.

Elsie Gisslegard (CUF) states that it is important that we invest in and look at our relationship with animals in the EU too, and mentions the poor animal husbandry in European mink farms which have led to recent culls. She adds that pointing only at China is not useful, especially in this resolution, which is not about animal rights. She further adds that Centerstudenter submitted a good resolution on animal welfare, but that it won't be discussed because it didn't rank highly enough in the snap vote.

Vote

For- 67

Against- 107

Abstain- 17

The amendment has been rejected.

➤ **Amendment 21 by Nemir Ali (Julis)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) explains that there is a negative recommendation from the Working Group for this amendment.

Nemir Ali (Julis) states that the EU cannot do it all alone - we are in a globalised world. Organisations like the WHO do provide necessary support - however, the WHO has become a propaganda arm of the People's Republic of China - just repeating the Chinese government's messaging, and insisting that the virus cannot be spread between humans. The WHO did this, bowing to pressure and influence from China, who threatened to withdraw all information at all. He adds that the WHO must be reformed and strengthened against any political influence, and that a stronger WHO will help prevent future pandemics.

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) states that he doesn't disagree that LYMEC should work on the WHO's role in the management of the crisis. He explains that this is an amendment which Jeunes MR carried from JNC. He notes that bad political influences have been at play in the WHO, and it is the job of liberals to do the contrary. Political influence is not, in essence, bad. As liberals we should not be against lobbying and influence - that is the liberal way to do politics. He encourages delegates to vote against the amendment

Oriol Marin (JNC) states that he agrees with Alexandre and asks delegates to vote against the amendment, adding that political influence is the WHO's only weapon in the fight against the pandemic. For example, in the USA, the Trump administration did not follow the WHO recommendations and the US has the highest deaths and cases figures.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) reminds delegates that there should be only one person speaking per organisation, and asks if the interventions are really necessary from another person from the same organisation?

Alice Schmidt (JuLis) states that she would like to re-emphasise JuLis' position, and asks Congress to look at the start of the pandemic. Then, the WHO was supportive of China's policies, because China was misleading about their infection figures. Moreover, the Secretary General is highly supportive of China. There is no transparency and no delegates who have visited China to investigate what really happened. The WHO must see health, not politics, as its guiding principle.

Lukas Johannesson (Centerstudenter) states that most people agree that the WHO did a bad job, but that this does not mean that the EU has the moral high ground. He adds that it is necessary to work together in the WHO - but the EU is not the right forum.

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) requests a point of order, saying he thought only one person per organisation was supposed to be speaking.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) reminds Congress he will close the speakers list soon.

Alice Schmidt (Julis) requests a point of order, saying that these rules cannot be found in the statutory or Congress rules, and should thus be voted upon.

Rémi Guastalli reminds the Congress that as the Chair, he retains the discretion to decide how the Congress proceeds. He warns delegates to stop filibustering and reminds them that time is short. He calls for a vote on the amendment.

Vote

For- 76

Against- 91

Abstain- 17

The amendment has been rejected.

➤ **Amendment 22 by Nemir Ali (Julis)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is a negative recommendation from the Working Group.

Nemir Ali (Julis) urges Congress to look at the timeline of the pandemic, specifically the fact that officials did not communicate anything to the outside world, in contravention of WHO rules. Communication began only on 30th December 2019 and then the information was incorrect. The WHO were not told the disease could be transmitted from human to human. China gave late and incorrect information. The WHO thus issued bad recommendations about closing borders. Countries that closed borders like Taiwan did well. Violations of international law led to the pandemic and allowed the virus to spread around the world. Sanctions should be applied as the virus has affected the whole planet.

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) states that Jeunes MR has a really big problem with this - they truly believe in resolutions that tackle specific subjects which can be easily implemented. Concerning the issue of China - Jeunes MR has an issue with the fact that in one sentence with 15 words the amendment is asking the EU not to do any investigations, but just to sanction. He adds that evidence is needed about what exactly China has done wrong before sanctions are used. He adds that this debate is more relevant to the resolution on China, rather than this resolution about public health management.

Oriol Marin (JNC) says he would also ask the delegates to vote against this amendment. He argues that 'mishandling' is a broad term, and that there are plenty of governments which have mishandled the pandemic, and sanctioning China alone is disproportionate. EU governments have made mistakes, as have American and African and other governments.

Umberto Masi (LLJ) says he would like to speak for the amendment. He asks what the most important value for liberals is? Truth and respect for international law. When a state acts in a way that conceals information, liberals must stand against this. He argues that this amendment

does not diminish the rest of the resolution and that it is important to show that transgressions should be dealt with accordingly.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) calls for a vote on the amendment.

Vote

For- 71

Against- 99

Abstain- 16

The amendment has been rejected.

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) thanks everyone who has worked on this resolution, and adds that even as amended this is a really important resolution for the EU, as Covid-19 is only the first of many public health crises.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) calls for a vote on the resolution as a whole as amended.

Vote

For- 158

Against- 26

Abstain- 3

The resolution has been adopted by the Congress.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) proposes that we do two other resolutions only, as it is now 17.30 and the Congress should end.

Marina Sedlo (LYMEC Policy Officer) makes a point of order and explains that resolutions do not automatically go to the next congress, they need to be resubmitted next time if not addressed.

- f. **Tackling Cyber Attacks: Security of a Modern Era** by the **Working Group on Security and Defence**.

Ines Holzegger (LYMEC Outreach and Cooperation Officer) states that as the Bureau Member responsible for coordinating the Working Group on security and defence, the Group felt there is a need in the 21st century to take a clear stance on cyber security and that LYMEC is lacking such a policy. This resolution is the result and she looks forward to hearing the discussion.

Cyrille Amoursky (LDLU) greets the Congress, and says that he would like to support this motion, explaining that in times of pandemic especially it is important to enhance cyber

security. Countries like Russia often launch attacks and when everything is digitalised, it is important to enhance security.

➤ **Amendment 34 by Louise Thomsen (Venstres Ungdom)**

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) asks whether there is a recommendation on the amendment?

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is a positive recommendation from the Working Group.

There are no objections made so the **amendment is accepted**, and Congress votes on the resolution as a whole and amended.

Vote

For- 159

Against- 6

Abstain- 6

The resolution has been adopted by the Congress.

g. **European Railway Authority by Abel Hartmann (JD)**

Abel Hartmann (JD) yields his time to **Nikki Fredriksz (JD)**

Nikki Fredriksz (JD) introduces the resolution, saying that climate change is a defining challenge and that we need to rethink our mode of transport through the continent. Europe is highly urbanised, and therefore suitable for such a network, but coordinated investment is needed, and negotiations are complex. Moreover, there are problems with existing infrastructure. A European railway authority would help solve these problems.

➤ **Amendment 50 by Alex Alvarez Valero (Jovenes Ciudadanos)**

Vedrana Gujic (Chair) states that there is no recommendation from the Working Group.

Abel Hartmann (JD) states that both amendments have been accepted (**including Amendment 51 by Ellinor Juth - Svensk Ungdom**)

Oriol Marin (JNC) asks what the procedure will be if the delegates don't accept the amendment and adds that the amendment ought to be voted on.

He argues that interterritorial solidarity and investment as suggested in the first amendment is not the best way to promote this type of infrastructure. He adds that the main goal of this resolution was to promote train over plane travel to reduce CO2 emissions. He further argues that policy should aim to change habits, not arbitrarily change railways and that we are condemning future generations with poor investment decisions.

Abel Hartmann (JD) states he is happy for this to be removed.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) states that he will move to a vote on the amendment.

Irene Terrazas Negro (Jovenes Ciudadanos) states that JCs agrees with JNC, and she thinks this amendment is just taking into consideration that countries are differently sized, and that interterritorial solidarity is an EU principle which should be respected.

Vote on amendment 50 takes place.

Vote

For- 109

Against- 50

Abstain- 23

The amendment has been adopted.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) then calls for a vote on the resolution as amended (with both amendments 50 and 51).

Vote on resolution as amended

For- 141

Against- 26

Abstain- 10

The resolution has been adopted as amended by the Congress.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) invites JuLis to tell him in private if they have a problem with something that has happened.

Alice Schmidt (Julis) requests a point of order, saying that JuLis were open minded to the Chair's idea, but the rules say that there should have been a vote about that and it should have come from Congress.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) remarks that no one is opposed, so it's a simple majority. He adds that this is not to prevent debate but just to keep things moving.

Alexandre Servais (Jeunes MR) requests a point of order: the decision of the chair must be protested immediately after the decision was taken according to the rules.

Rémi Guastalli (Chair) thanks everyone for their contributions, and states that the incident is now closed. He adds that since there is not time to finish all the resolutions and Member Organisation reports, Congress will be closed. He adds that this is his last day as International

Officer of Jeunes Radicaux, and he would like to thank all the friends he has met including Danica, who first brought him to LYMEC. He closes by saying that he can't stress enough how important solidarity and friendship is, and yields to **Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President)**.

Antoaneta Asenova (LYMEC President) thanks Remi and the participants for participating in this Autumn Congress, which allowed us to have actual policy discussions, even though not everything was discussed. Technology can never replace human interaction and contact but we have done a good job. Thank you to the Chairs, to the Secretariat in the office, and thank you to the representatives from Member Organisations and their dedication - after spending another Saturday on LYMEC.

We will soon be launching a twinning project, please also keep an eye on the LYMEC website. We also thank Renew Europe and ELF for their technical support, including allowing us to play the trial of the ELF Cards Against Humanity game. Thank you all - I would have loved nothing more than to see you all in person, but at the end of the day, togetherness is what LYMEC is all about and I hope to see you in Spring.

Bàlint Gyévai (LYMEC Secretary General) states that Congress is now closed.

Congress ends at 18 h 00 CET.