

B1-018 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

From line 18 to 24:

- ~~• Member organisations have to be European except for Observers. The exact definition is in the hands of the GA.~~
- ~~• MOs have to be on national or regional level.~~
- ~~• FYEG prefers regional organisations to join forces and set up a national organisation. If two or more regional organisations of which at least one is already a full MO of FYEG join forces, the new organisation can apply as a full MO.~~

Member organisations shall:

- be European except for Observers. The exact definition is in the hands of the GA;
- be active, on national or regional level;
- subscribe to the statutes and political platform of FYEG;
- function based on democratic principles;
- consist mostly of young people.

FYEG prefers regional organisations to join forces and set up a national organisation. If two or more regional organisations of which at least one is already a full MO of FYEG join forces, the new organisation can apply as a full MO.

Reason

We wanted to align the statutes and the IRPs when it comes to membership criteria to avoid conflicts in interpretation and ease the understanding of our rules. We are adding the criteria that are present in the Statutes and adding a new one that says that an organisation must function based on democratic principles.

B1-027 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

Insert in line 27:

1.1.4 Suspension and exclusion of a MO

The EC has a right to propose the suspension or exclusion of an MO, for example if:

- no update or other contact is made between an MO and FYEG EC between two GAs,
- the MO doesn't fulfill one or more of the membership criteria
- the MO didn't pay their membership fee (see 1.1.4a)

The suspension or exclusion of an MO will be decided upon by the GA with a two third majority.

The suspension of an MO means that the organisation loses its voting rights and becomes an observer. When an MO is suspended, the EC:

1. informs the MO about their current situation via a letter explaining the consequences
2. makes all reasonable efforts to enable the MO to regain its full membership
3. creates a report on this process to be voted upon at the following GA. At the beginning of the next GA the EC presents its report.

The exclusion of an MO means that this organisation is not listed as a member organisation anymore and hence loses all of its rights within FYEG

1.1.4a (new) Suspension and exclusion in case of non-payment of membership fee

Delete from line 38 to 46:

fee for two consecutive years, the GA will vote on a suspension. ~~The suspension of an MO means that said organisation loses its voting rights and becomes an observer. If the MO is suspended the EC:~~

- ~~1. informs said MO about their current situation via a letter explaining the consequences~~

- ~~2. makes all reasonable efforts to obtain payment and enable the MO to regain its~~

~~full membership~~

~~3. creates a report on this process to be voted upon at the following GA. At the beginning of the next GA the EC presents its report.~~

Delete from line 48 to 50:

~~fee for three consecutive years, the GA will vote on an exclusion. The exclusion of an MO means that said organisation is not listed as member organisation anymore and hence loses all rights within FYEG.~~

From line 53 to 58:

MO fee by decision of the GA (see Article 5.2).

~~If no update or other contact is made between a MO and FYEG EC between two GAs, the EC has a right to propose suspension or expulsion of this MO. – In case of a suspension an MO loses its status of being a full MO.~~

~~The Expulsion of an MO means that said organisation is not listed as member organisation anymore and hence loses all rights within FYEG~~

Reason

We wanted to align the statutes and the IRPs when it comes to suspension and exclusion of an MO, to avoid conflicts in interpretation and ease the understanding of our rules.

The Statutes give the possibility to the EC to propose to the GA the suspension or exclusion of an MO based on any reason, but the IRPs only describe the procedure in case of suspension or exclusion for non-payment of Membership fee. We are splitting Article 1.1.4 into two, the first part describing the procedure of suspension or exclusion of an MO (adding an indicative list of reasons) and the second part describing the specific elements of the procedure when it is linked to non-payment of Membership fee.

B1-101 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Grön Ungdom (decided on: 07/14/2019)

Editorial hint

Happy to withdraw if considered non-substantive.

Text**In line 101:**

2.1.2 Competences~~ies~~

Reason

Fixes minor typo in the IRPs

B1-115 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Grön Ungdom and Grønn Ungdom (decided on: 07/14/2019)

Editorial hint

Add EleCom to Glossary if goes through.

The edit to the editorial board of ecosprinter in 2.1.2 is unintentional but I can't seem to add EleCom without this platform thinking that I changed it location.

Text

From line 115 to 116:

- the advisory committee, the financial control committee and the editorial [board of Ecosprinter](#)
- ~~board of Ecosprinter~~
- [the informatory elections committee](#)

Insert after line 157:

- [EleCom candidates](#)

Insert after line 173:

- [EleCom publishes information on candidates](#)

Insert in line 419:

a prep team can consult the EC in order to solve possible internal problems.

2.10 Informatory Election Committee (EleCom)

The election committee interviews candidates for all elected positions except secretary-general for the purposes of helping the General Assembly to make good choices. They

also encourage candidates, especially those from discriminated or minority backgrounds, to candidate. They are responsible for handling candidacies once they have been sent in. The election committee also prepares replacements between the GAs and other calls for positions that need to be elected by the MOs when the EC calls for that. The election committee is composed of three, five or seven individuals who appoint a coordinator internally.

The election committee shall present its information two weeks before the GA which may include, but is not limited to, information as to why a candidate may be especially desirable or undesirable for a role. The election committee does not interview candidates for or inform the GA about the election of new election committee members. The position of election committee member is not compatible with any other elected position within FYEG.

From line 499 to 500:

- Applications are ~~possible by anybody who gains the support of 2 MOs and have to be directed to the EC and/or the general list~~ received by the election committee who prepares information about the candidates for the consumption of the member organizations, the EC, and the general list. Applications are possible by anybody who gains the support of one MO.

Reason

Background:

We propose the creation of an informatory election committee (EleCom) to help MOs make informed choices at the GA. One of the main issues with pan-european organisations is that there is often little opportunity to interact on a day-to-day basis with our counterparts, and thus little opportunity to get to know the people running. MOs are today effectively blind in their choices at the GA, which our proposal would change.

An EleCom would ensure not only that candidates are suitable without skeletons in their closets, but also that we as MOs were able to make choices based upon facts and evidence about the person, not simply hearsay and their oratory skills. At the same time, the MOs would be free to vote whichever way they please, and the EleCom would not give out recommendations as to which way to vote.

Further, the utilisation of an EleCom will secure and improve representation. Also, it will enable inclusion of skilled, competent and/or experienced individuals who might be new to FYEG.

In our proposal MOs will still be able to send in support letters to the election committee, and they will also be able to make support speeches at the GA.

We understand that some member organisations may feel that our proposal weakens internal democracy within FYEG, but we do not concur. This proposal has been crafted to address the concerns of both those MOs who feel that recommendations would be undemocratic as well as those who want to be better informed in their choices and do want a repeat of the events of 2018's GA.

At the end of this document an appendix, containing comparisons of all the different models available, can be found.

Our proposal in summary:

Elect an EleCom of three, five or seven individuals at every GA, who hold and will stand for no other elected role within FYEG whilst member of the EleCom.

Empower the EleCom to receive and review candidacies, interview candidates online and speak to MOs about any info they might have on candidates for positions elected at the GA.

Empower the EleCom to provide summaries of information on candidates to the GA.

Appendix: A comparison of the options available

A. The current system

Each candidate has to have two supporting letters, one nomination letter from their own MO and one support letter from another MO.

=> *Pros*: You will know that there are people out there that support the candidate.

=> *Cons*: This is excluding for new members that may not feel comfortable with demanding MOs to write support letters for them. The system with support letters is creating thresholds that will most likely result in that less people are candidating. Member organisations do not know very much about candidates.

B. The informatory model

The election committee has the mandate to provide the MOs with information about the candidates before the GA. The general way of doing this is to provide information channels between the candidates, and to make sure the election process is as transparent as possible. In this model, all non-legal documents are provided by the candidates to the informatory election committee such as the candidates CV, motivation letter, support letters, and nomination letter. In addition, other forms of communication could be provided such as online debates, questionnaires, and articles about the candidates. In this model, the election committee don't provide a proposal to the GA.

=> *Pros*: The MOs will come prepared to the GA, which will make sure that they will vote on the candidate(s) that they prefer the most. If the MOs only know about the candidates that have asked them for support letters, they will most likely only vote for them without even thinking about the other candidates. Helps

=> *Cons*: May discourage candidates who are inexperienced or have skeletons in the closet from applying. Not able to take a holistic view of how the EC or WGs as a whole might work together or secure sufficient geographic, and other, representation.

C. The Selection model

Election committee is elected at the GA, and shall make sure to find the best candidates to represent the organisation. They have interviews with the candidates, and also interview the current EC to get to know how the dynamics have been. 3 months before the GA they send out the call for candidates, and also actively talk to people they think might be interested. When the deadline has passed 2 months before the GA the election committee goes through all candidates and make a list proposal, which they present at the GA. The candidates are also given time to present themselves and to answer questions. Any member can candidate at the GA as a counter proposal. They are also given time to present themselves as candidates. All candidates are voted upon with secret ballots. If there aren't any other candidates than the ones proposed by the election committee, the voting will be made with acclamation.

=> *Pros*: The election committee can, through investigation and interviews, make sure that e.g. the candidates work well together, that they have a lot of different skills and that there is a spread geographically but also when it comes to age.

=> *Cons*: The candidates proposed by the election committee will most probably have an advantage when it comes to the votations. If just the proposed list is sent out to the MOs, the other FYEG members will also know much more about the suggested candidates, which will give them a big advantage as well.

D. The advisory model

The advisory model is a model where the election committee has the mandate to advise the GA about the candidates. As with the selection model, there usually are IRPstated criterias the election committee should use as guidelines for their advice. In this model, the election committee interviews all candidates, check references, and provides advice for the GA about whom to elect.

They can either provide the GA with a list proposal, or give advice on individual candidates. This is very similar to the selection model.

=> *Pros*: The election committee can, through investigation and interviews, make sure that e.g. the candidates work well together, that they have a lot of different skills and that there is a spread geographically but also when it comes to age.

=> *Cons*: The candidates proposed by the election committee will most probably have an advantage when it comes to the votations. If just the proposed list is sent out to the MOs, the other FYEG members will also know much more about the suggested candidates, which will give them a big advantage as well.

E. The French model

The French Young Greens have a list election model, where candidates take the initiative to form a list of candidates for the board consisting of 5 to 13 people. One month before their GA, the lists are presented and are voted on as a whole. If there are several lists, these are in competition with each other. In addition to the list having to present a text that offers their political views and strategies for the next mandate. Each candidate have to send a cover letter on behalf of themselves.

In the case of several lists standing, the list have to gain at least 75% of the votes cast in the first round. If 75% of the votes aren't reached, there is a second round, where the list with the most votes gets at least the top three positions in the board (2 federal secretaries and the treasurer). The rest of the seats are distributed according to the largest remainder method. The French Young Greens might have one of the processes that differ the most from FYEGs current model.

=> *Pros*: Those elected can likely already work together

=> *Cons*: Punishes individual candidates who might bring something new. Complex and time-consuming.

F. The German model

The German Young Greens have a model which is very similar to FYEGs model, where they have an open call for members and no election committee. The point where the German Young Greens model differs the most, is that they don't have a real deadline for candidates.

=> *Pros*: Same as with the current system, except allows last-minute candidacies.

=> *Cons*: Same as with the current system, except allows last-minute candidacies

B1-133 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

Delete in line 133:

- ~~the Strategic Planning Committee~~

Delete in line 185:

- ~~the Strategic Planning committee~~

Delete from line 329 to 342:

~~**2.6 Strategic Planning Committee**~~

~~The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) is responsible for evaluating how the structures, procedures, activities and other central aspects of FYEG function. It also develops proposals for the MOs, GA, EC, office and other relevant bodies of FYEG to consider.~~

~~It reports to the GA (cf. 2.1.3) and may submit motions and amendments to the GA (cf. 2.1.5). The SPC is appointed by the Executive Committee after a selection process. Candidates to the SPC must submit a nomination letter from an MO.~~

~~The SPC needs to have two coordinators, at least one of them being female. These two persons are serving as contact point for people outside of the SPC, handle the SPC's internal meeting schedule and communication and reports to the EC as well as to the GA. Neither of them can be an EC member.~~

~~The SPC is divided into three subgroups: the Activity Subgroup, the Political Subgroup, and the Structural Subgroup.~~

Reason

The Strategic Planning Committee was created a few years ago with the aim of

consulting Member Organisations between GAs. Each MO was supposed to nominate three delegates to three sub-committees but in practice only very few MOs were doing it, which led to a lack of representativeness and an over-representation of big organisations. Other ways of consulting MOs (through regional chats, phone calls or forms) have proven more efficient and the SPC had become obsolete. We want to delete this structure and explore new solutions (proposals will be made in the Activity Plan 2019-2020)

B1-178 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

Insert in line 178:

- amendments and alternative amendments to the statutes, the IRPs and the political platform (see 2.1.5). After this deadline no more amendments are accepted. Only

From line 187 to 189:

- ~~have the right to submit motions, resolutions and amendments to motions, the political platform, the strategic plan, the statutes and the IRPs, bearing in mind the deadlines specified under 2.1.4~~

have the right to submit motions, resolutions and amendments to motions, the political platform, the activity plan, the strategic plan, the statutes and the IRPs, bearing in mind the deadlines specified under 2.1.4.

Alternative amendments to the statutes, the IRPs and the Political platform may be submitted, bearing in mind the deadline specified under 2.1.4. They must be in the scope of already submitted amendments. The presidency may declare an alternative amendment ineligible if its scope is different than the original amendment.

Reason

During GAs, we often face the problem that we can't amendment proposals of amendments to the IRPs or to the political platform. We also can't really discuss them in Compromise Amendments Sessions. It sometimes brought to the rejection of amendments delegates agreed on the substance but not with the exact wording or to the adoption of amendments whose wording could have been made clearer. We want to change that by introducing the possibility to submit alternative amendments (basically amendments to the amendments). To make sure delegates do not abuse that to submit last minute amendments to the IRPs including completely new proposals that delegates wouldn't have had time to discuss with

their MO, we create a safeguard that allows the presidency to declare an alternative amendment out-of-scope.

B1-229 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text**Insert in line 229:**

the treasurer and five additional members. [The Gender Quota described in Article 4.1 applies to the spokespersons.](#)

Reason

Last year's amendment deleted any kind of quota for co-spokespersons from the IRPs, assuming that the gender quota also applies to Spokesperson. We believe that it is better to write it to avoid changes in interpretation in the future.

B1-239 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text**In line 239:**

The reports presented to the EC ~~have to~~shall

Insert after line 246:

The reports presented to the GA shall include:

- the budget sheets showing final amounts for each budget line;
- a description of the different budget lines;
- an analysis of the budget report based on Gender (Gender Budgeting);
- the list of MO fees paid by each Member Organisation (see Article 5.2)

Reason

Clarification of the expected content of a financial report (including Gender Budgeting)

B1-309 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

Insert in line 309:

to the finances of the organisation to FCC throughout the year.

2.4a (new) Office

In addition to the Secretary General, FYEG may recruit additional employees for its Office.

In principle, all recruitments are made after an open and public call. The EC, in consultation with the Secretary General, may decide on a shortlist of candidates that will be asked to take part in an interview. The EC, in consultation with the Secretary General, decides on the selected candidate.

The EC member responsible for office is closely involved throughout the whole recruitment process.

The Executive Committee adopts “Guidelines and Rules to the Office” in line with legal requirements. This document is made available to all employees, especially when new employees are recruited.

Salaries are decided upon by the EC, based on the financial plans adopted by the General Assembly.

Reason

We want to include a new article on the office stating key principles concerning the recruitment procedures or who decides on salaries. We also make a reference to the “Guidelines and Rules of the office” which is a document required by Belgian Law that was adopted by the EC this year.

B1-337 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

In line 337:

The SPC needs to have two coordinators, at least one of them ~~being female~~self-identifying as woman, trans or genderqueer

From line 362 to 363:

Each working group ~~needs to~~shall have two coordinators, at least one of them ~~being female~~self-identifying as woman, trans or genderqueer. These two persons are serving as contact point for people outside of the

From line 560 to 561:

In all elected bodies there must be a minimum of 50% ~~persons who self-define as a woman or another marginalised gender.~~

of people that self-identify as woman, trans or genderqueer.

In line 563:

encouraged that people ~~who self-define~~that self-identify as ~~women~~woman, trans or ~~other marginalised genders~~genderqueer

From line 608 to 609:

least one of the two delegates self-~~defines~~identifies as ~~a woman~~woman, trans or ~~another marginalised gender~~genderqueer. Every candidate can request participation fee lowering or exception from

Reason

Mentions of gender differ in the IRPs from one article to another. During the Glass Ceiling is Not Your Limit, it was proposed to use the sentence “People that self-identify as woman, trans or genderqueer”

B1-350 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on: 07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 350:

- supporting the EC, office and prep-teams in the organisation of events and campaigns

From line 356 to 363:

A working group consists s of at least 5 people from 5 different MOs.

~~For a working group to be formed, an outline defining its topical scope, aims and working area must be accepted by the GA. Such proposals can be made at the GA by a full MO, the parting EC or an ad hoc WG.~~

~~The EC also has the possibility to form ad hoc WGs during the year that will have the right to apply for a mandate at the next GA if they wish to continue.~~

Each Working groups are formed by the Executive Committee, with a defined scope, aim, working area and timeframe. The creation of working group needs may be planned in the annual activity plan adopted by the General Assembly but the Executive Committee may also decide to create ad-hoc working groups.

Each working group shall have two coordinators, at least one of them being female. These two persons ~~are serving~~ serve as contact points s for people outside of the

From line 367 to 375:

The EC has to publish a call for interested members ~~after the GA mandating a working group. This call should be based on the content of the approved application and sent via the general list. The EC then also chooses the first members of the working group on base of their motivation letters.~~ The EC then also chooses the first members of the working group.

~~Becoming a member of a working group at a later time is possible for anybody by submitting a letter of motivation to the coordination of this group. Therefore the contact of~~

~~the coordination of a working group has to be easily visible on the FYEG homepage. The coordination of a working group is not forced to accept applicants.~~

The EC can decide if it is possible to join a working group at a later time and under which conditions this may occur.

Reason

The functioning of working groups hasn't been optimal during the last years. This is why we are proposing ways to improve their functioning. We want to encourage working groups to work on more concrete tasks, for example in relation with FYEG activities (as it was the case for the Commons and the Social Europe Working Group) or on campaigns. The timeframe of these events or campaigns doesn't really fit the current timeline of Working Groups that are created after a GA and end their work at the next GA. We also want the EC to be able to create new working groups when important topics pop up (for example on the Copyright reform last year). This amendment adds to the missions of working groups and makes the EC responsible for their creation (even if the GA can still ask the EC to do so through the Activity Plan)

B1-379 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 379:

It is recommended not to have more than four working groups active at the same time.

B1-571 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 571:

[FYEG has a safer spaces policy, an anti-sexual harassment protocol and guidelines for persons of contact \(see Annexes\)](#)

Reason

The feminist Committee has prepared three documents that we want to add as annexes to the IRPs

B1-592 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

From line 592 to 596:

Each full MO ~~is requested to~~ shall pay an annual membership fee to FYEG. This Membership fee shall correspond to 1 % of the total incomes their ~~last~~ previous year's realised budget with a minimum of 50 EUR for the EU and European Economic Area (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway) and Switzerland and 25 EUR for all other European countries.

By way of derogation to the previous paragraph, the General Assembly may decide, in duly justified cases, to lower the amount of the membership fee that a Member Organisation shall pay, following a recommendation of the Executive Committee. Requests for lowering the Membership fee shall be sent by a Member Organisation to the Executive Committee at the latest 2 weeks before the GA.

Each full MO ~~will have to~~ shall pay their membership fee for the running year on the first evening of the GA ~~in cash~~ at the latest, if it has not already been transferred earlier.

Reason

This amendment aims to clarify the rules regarding membership fee. It clarifies if the membership fees should be paid based on the revenues or the expenses of the previous year (in our proposal, the incomes). It also tells who is allowed to decide on exemptions (in our proposal, the GA).

B1-592-2 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Grüne Jugend (decided on: 07/15/2019)

Text**Insert in line 592:**

Each full MO is requested to pay 1 % of their last year's realised budget (this means only the MO's own funds and the grants from the Mother Party, outside funds like public subsidies are not included)

Reason

The definition of an MO's budget is unclear. Before 2018 FYEG defined the budget differently than it did in 2018 and 2019. With this change, some MOs had an increase of their membership fee that was more than 200% which puts the MOs in difficult situations.

This shall be clarified with this addition.

B1-596 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text**From line 596 to 598:**

first evening of the GA in cash, if it has not already been transferred earlier.-

Full MOs are requested to provide their annual budget statement for the previous year by the deadline to register for the GA at ~~this moment~~the latest. A document listing the amount of the membership fee paid by each MO and the way it has been calculated must be annexed to the financial report of the year in question.

.

Reason

This amendment proposes that the amounts paid by each MO will be part of the financial report and to ask the reports to be sent 4 weeks before the GA.

B1-598 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Jong Groen (decided on: 07/17/2019)

Text

Insert in line 598:

year at this moment.

We want to continue working on more transparency. We therefore pledge for FYEG to keep on discussing our financial situations and to make it as a long-term goal to be more open about this. This will facilitate a better mutual understanding and a more collaborative way of working of the different MOs.

B1-621 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text**Insert in line 621:**

with the treasurer.

The Executive Committee or a Prep-team, in consultation with the treasurer, may also decide to offer different reimbursement conditions to participants in order to ensure regional balance and/or to promote sustainable transport modes.

Reason

Explanation: We want to add to the article on the reimbursement of travel costs the possibility to give better reimbursement conditions to people travelling with more sustainable modes of transport. For example, travelling by train is often more expensive than flying. With a 70% reimbursement rate and a flight ticket at 100€, the participant has to pay 30€ in the end. If the train ticket costs 150€, the person would have to pay 45€ in the end. This means that our current reimbursement system doesn't encourage people to explore more sustainable modes of transport. We want to give the possibility to the EC to increase the reimbursement rate to a higher percentage rate of the reimbursement limit to avoid these situations.

This amendment also mentions regional balance, as we want to make an already-existing practice official as we already offer higher reimbursement rates to participants from non-EEA countries.

B1-759 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text**In line 759:**

The applicant ~~organisation applies~~organisations shall apply

Insert in line 765:

- by the EC that includes questions on the number of its members, age limit, list of activities, budget and all other possibly relevant information, as outlined in FYEG Statutes.

Reason

The list of information that an MO has to provide was spread between the Statutes and the IRPs. To make it easier to read, we therefore want to include the list present in the Statutes to the IRPs.

B1-796 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text**From line 796 to 797:**

- A committee for ~~a-per~~pre-selection of the candidates will be set up. The committee will consist of 4 people: a current FYEG EC member, a former FYEG Secretary Genral or office

Reason

Technical change. The position of office coordinator was renamed secretary general few years ago.

B1-837 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 837:

The Executive Committee adopts a privacy policy that shall be accessible on its website, in line with legal requirements.

Reason

Following the entry into force of GDPR, FYEG updated its privacy policy. We want to add a reference to it in the IRPs.

B1-837-2 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.4 Safer Spaces

7.4.1 Safer Spaces Policy

Safer spaces are evolving and not static. We have high expectations on how we behave towards each other in our meetings, actions and social spaces. Making a space safer means different things depending on the group of people involved as each group has different needs. This policy aims to be considered in every meeting involving FYEG, but the document should evolve as we learn and grow.

As an organisation we build social relationships inside and outside of meetings and actions. We commit to this Safer Spaces policy wherever we are together, this includes ensuring that ALL spaces are inclusive and harmless.

If someone violates these agreements a discussion or mediation process can happen, depending on the wishes of the person who was affected. If a serious violation happens to the extent that someone feels unsafe, they can be asked to leave the space and/or speak with one member of the Awareness Group. If necessary, the Sexual Harassment Protocol will be activated.

1. Respect! Racism, as well as ageism, GSRM-phobia , sexism, ableism or prejudice based on ethnicity, nationality, class, gender, gender presentation, language ability, asylum status or religious affiliation is unacceptable and will be challenged. FYEG has a zero-tolerance policy with any kind of discrimination, even though we acknowledge that there can be different levels in a breach of a safe space.

2. Be aware of your privileges! Including racial, class and gender privilege and/or less obvious or invisible hierarchies. Think about how your words, opinions and feelings are influenced and who they might exclude or harm.

3. Consent! Respect each other's physical and emotional boundaries, always get explicit verbal consent before touching someone or crossing boundaries. Don't assume your physical & emotional boundaries are the same as other people's.

4. Friendly use of language! Be aware of the language you use in discussion and how

you relate to others. Try to speak slowly and clearly and use uncomplicated language especially when non-natives speakers are involved in the conversation.

5. Don't anticipate yourself! Avoid assuming the opinions and identifications of other participants.

6. Learning; if you don't understand something, just ask. You may be directed to a book, website or skill share to learn more. It's ok to make mistakes. Please show appreciation for the hard work of others and be considerate when you offer criticism.

7. Everyone has their turn; give each person the time and space to speak. In large groups, or for groups using facilitation: Raise your hand to speak.

8. Calling out; if you have acted or spoken harmfully, even if unintentionally, expect that someone will bring this up to you. If this happens, listen and reflect on what they are saying even if you think they may be wrong. Don't try to absolve yourself of responsibility.

This policy should be expanded with specific measures and practices to promote the creation of safer spaces.

B1-837-3 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text**Insert after line 837:**7.4.2 Anti sexual harassment protocol

FYEG has a zero-tolerance policy on sexual harassment at all its events, within all its structures and during all activities. This protocol is applicable for those participating in an FYEG activity (General Assembly, Strategic Planning Committee, Working Group Meeting or any other activity), members of a Member Organization (MO), or members of an online structure of FYEG, referred to as “this organization” from now onwards in this protocol.

Anyone who is subject to sexual harassment can approach one of the designated contact points responsible for receiving complaints of sexual harassment. The Executive Committee will designate an Awareness Group for anyone presenting allegations of physical, verbal or online sexual harassment. In accordance with the IRPs, the Awareness Group will be formed by two persons from the EC who are of different genders. Additionally, every Prep - Team will designate one person to be an independent contact person in our projects. However, this person shall always inform the official contact points if a procedure starts, in the case of their absence, the main contact will be the Project Manager.

When one of these procedures is open in the organization, the EC as a whole must be informed of the procedure without details of the people involved or the presented allegations to respect confidentiality. If a case involves someone from the EC, the case will be brought to the Advisory Committee (AC). The Advisory Committee will act as contact points when a case arises, following this protocol. However, the EC will not be informed until a final decision is made.

Important note:

These procedures will follow general principles such as the privacy of the survivor, confidentiality of the process and survivor’s choice and preference. We respect the presumption of innocence of any alleged harasser which is why this procedure is in place and has been approved in the General Assembly. However, as a feminist organization, we also believe in the principle of believing the survivor and putting the burden of the proof on the alleged harasser.

This procedure might be applied to an internal case of a MO if this case is related to FYEG activity or if the people involved take part in any FYEG structure. However, we will

not be able to extend sanctions or disciplinary measures beyond FYEG. MOs can however adapt this protocol to their own organization.

When the designated people receive a complaint of sexual harassment, they shall:

1. Immediately record the dates, times and facts of the incident(s);
2. ascertain the views of the survivor as to what outcome they want, ensure the survivor feels safe and ensure the survivor is separated from the alleged offender unless the survivor wishes otherwise;
3. ensure that the survivor and the alleged harasser understands FYEG protocol for dealing with the complaint;
4. discuss and agree the next steps with the alleged survivor, informal, formal or outside complaints procedure (police, hospital, embassy, etc.), on the understanding that choosing to resolve the matter informally does not preclude the survivor from pursuing a formal complaint if they are not satisfied with the outcome;
5. keep a confidential record of all discussions. Records will be destroyed if the alleged survivor requests it, or before the change to a new EC. However, a record of sanctions and a brief description of the reason will be kept in a safe place;
6. respect the choice of the survivor;
7. and ensure that the survivor knows that they can lodge the complaint outside of FYEG through the relevant country/legal framework.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

If the survivor wishes to deal with the matter informally, the designated person will:

- Approach the alleged harasser saying that the behaviour is offensive, unwelcome and must be stopped;
- Inform the harasser that FYEG has a zero tolerance policy on sexual harassment and that disregarding this policy may result in the person's exclusion from the organization
- give an opportunity to the alleged harasser to respond to the complaint;
- ensure that the alleged harasser understands the complaints mechanism;
- facilitate discussion between both parties to achieve an informal resolution which is acceptable to the complainant, provided the alleged survivor agrees.
- ensure that a confidential record is kept of what happened;
- follow up after the outcome of the complaints mechanism to ensure that the behaviour has stopped and that there is no risk of its repetition;
- And ensure that the above is done accurately and at the latest within 10 days of the complaint being made. During events, the procedure shall take place within 48 hours.

FORMAL COMPLAINTS PROCEDURES

If the survivor wants to make a formal complaint or if the informal complaint mechanism has not led to a satisfactory outcome for the survivor, the formal complaint mechanism should be used to resolve the matter.

The designated person who initially received the complaint will communicate to the rest of contact points the opening of a formal complaint procedure. The EC will be informed of this, respecting the confidentiality of the alleged survivor and the allegations. The designated person who initially received the complaint will carry out the investigation with the assistance of the Awareness Group and the independent contact person at the moment in which allegations were presented, if any. They will help the investigator with

the analysis and decision making process. A procedure for online harassment shall be developed.

The person carrying out the investigation will:

- interview the survivor and the alleged harasser separately
- interview other relevant third parties separately
- decide whether the incident qualifies as sexual harassment within the meaning of this protocol
- produce a report detailing the investigations, findings and any recommendations
- if the harassment took place, decide what the appropriate remedy for the survivor is, in consultation with the survivor (i.e. an apology, a change of structure, suspension...)
- follow up to ensure that the recommendations are implemented, that the behaviour has stopped and that the survivor is satisfied with the outcome
- if it cannot determine that the harassment took place, they may still make recommendations to ensure proper functioning of the organization
- keep a record of all actions taken
- ensure that all records concerning the matter are kept confidential
- ensure that the process is done as quickly as possible and in any event within 15 days of the complaint being made

The general rule is to avoid the presence of the alleged harasser in those places/structures in which the alleged survivor moves. It is vital that the wishes and needs of the survivors are incorporated into the outcome of the complaints mechanism.

A data protection protocol will be developed.

OUTSIDE COMPLAINT MECHANISM

This protocol seeks to create a fast and appropriate response to allegations of sexual harassment. However, it does not seek to substitute existing regulation and legislation on this issue. We want to make clear that FYEG wants to be fully supportive with every decision of the alleged survivor.

A person who has been subject to sexual harassment can at any time make a complaint outside of the organization. Even though this organization cannot offer legal advice, the contact point(s) will accompany the person to the instance this person prefers (hospital, police, ombudsperson, law courts, embassies, etc.) if they request it.

SANCTIONS AND DISCIPLINARY MEASURES

Anyone who has been found to have sexually harassed another person under the terms of this policy may be sanctioned. Sanctions may include but are not limited to one of the following :

- Verbal or written warning
- Suspension from an elected or non-elected FYEG structure, in line with FYEG IRPs when appropriate
- Dismissal/expulsion

Depending on the seriousness of the allegations, the EC, upon request of the Awareness Group may suspend someone from taking part in any FYEG structure or activity during the duration of the process. Confidentiality of the survivor will be maintained.

In case of sexual harassment, violence or discrimination by a member of an elected body within FYEG (Financial Control Committee, Advisory Committee or Ecosprinter Board) the EC can exclude the offender after consulting the full MOs. (cf. 2.2.2). If the case arises within the EC, the Advisory Committee can exclude the offender after consulting the full MOs.

The nature of the sanctions will depend on the gravity and extent of the harassment. Suitable deterrent sanctions will be applied to ensure that incidents of sexual harassment are not treated as trivial. Certain serious cases, including physical violence, will result in the immediate dismissal of the harasser.

B1-837-4 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: FYEG Executive Committee (decided on:
07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.4.3 Guidelines for persons of contact

Read the protocol and understand every aspect

What is sexual harassment? It is unwanted behaviour of a sexual nature which:

- Violates your dignity
- Makes you feel intimidated, degraded or humiliated
- Creates a hostile or offensive environment

Sexual harassment “can include, but is not limited to”, these examples:

- Touching, pinching, stroking, squeezing, or brushing against someone
- Leering or ogling
- Making LGBTIAQ+-phobic or GSRM (Gender, Sexual and Romantic Minorities)-phobic comments and sexually suggestive signals, winking
- Sending unwanted e-mails, text messages, posting sexually-explicit jokes or content on FYEG communication channels
- Sexual comments or jokes
- Making insults based on a person’s sex or rating their sexuality
- Turning work discussions to sexual topics
- Physical behaviour, including unwanted sexual advances, touching and various forms of sexual assault
- Displaying pictures, photos or drawings of a sexual nature

Remember: Whether harassing intentionally or unintentionally, we all have a

responsibility to monitor our behaviour and respect each other. Anyone who reports an incident has the right to remain anonymous. They also have the right to feel safe and respected.

Listen and Support

It's tough to be prepared when someone tells you that they have been the survivor of sexual harassment. Remember, you can only provide support

- Support and understanding are essential. It takes a lot of courage for a survivor to share their experience;
- Try to provide a safe/non-judgmental environment, emotional comfort and support for the survivor to express feelings;
- Let them know that they can talk with you. Listen. Don't rush to provide solutions.

Believe

The most common reason people choose not to tell anyone about sexual abuse is the fear that the listener won't believe them. People rarely lie or exaggerate about abuse; if someone tells you, it's because they trust you and needs someone to talk to.

- People rarely make up stories of abuse. It is not necessary for you to decide if they were "really hurt." If the survivor says they were hurt, that should be enough
- Believe what the person tells you. It may have been difficult for them to talk to you and trust you. Unless proven wrong harassment has happened.

Reassure

? Sexual assault is NEVER the survivor's fault. No one asks to be sexually assaulted by what they wear, say or do. Let the survivor know that only the perpetrator is to blame;

? The survivor needs to hear that fears, anxieties, guilt and anger are normal, understandable and acceptable emotions;

? Remember, no one ever deserves to be abused or harassed.

Be Patient

- Don't press for details – let the person decide how much to tell you. Ask them how you can help;
- Survivors have to struggle with complex decisions and feelings of powerlessness, trying to make decisions for them may only increase that sense of powerlessness;
- You can be supportive by helping them to identify all the available options and

then help them by supporting their decision making process (here refer to the protocol).

- The survivor can't just "forget it" or just move on. Recovery is a long term process and each individual moves at their own pace

Encourage

- Encourage the survivor to seek medical attention, report the assault, and or contact a professional if needed. Remember, the survivor must ultimately make the decision as to what to do. They are the experts in their own lives. Don't push. Remember, support their choices no matter what they decide.

Respect Privacy - Confidentiality

- Don't tell others what the survivor tells you. Let the individual decide who they will tell. It is important not to share information with others who are not involved;
- If you do need to share information for their safety, get permission by letting them know what you will share and with whom it will be shared; ie. the rest of contact points in case of a formal complaint

Establish Safety

- An important part of helping the survivor is to identify ways in which the survivor can re-establish their sense of physical and emotional safety. You are a step in the process. Ask them what would make them feel safe and how you can help them accomplish this.
- If the stalking or harassment is ongoing, help them to develop a plan of what to do if they are in immediate danger. Having a specific plan and preparing in advance can be important if the harassment escalates.

Things you can say

It is hard to know what to say to a person when they confide in you. Refrain from asking a lot of questions, instead, support them with these phrases. Let the person know that you believe that they have the strength and capacity to heal.

? It's not your fault

? I'm sorry this happened

? I believe you

? How can I help you?

? I am glad you told me

? I'll support your choices

? You're not alone

B1-837-5 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Grön Ungdom and Grønn Ungdom (decided on: 07/13/2019)

Editorial hint

Replace X with a number such that it forms an annex that is a coherent part of the statutes.

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.X Annex X: Age Policy**7.X.1 Purpose**

To ensure that younger members of FYEG Member Organisations are not discriminated against on the basis of their age where no good reason exists to do so.

7.X.2 Policy

FYEG shall ensure that in application and selection procedures for FYEG events applications between 14 and 18 are not discriminated against on the basis of their age where no good reason exists to do so.

Reason**Background:**

Previous FYEG events have seen young members (14-18) deemed ineligible or less likely to be selected due to their age, a practice we see as problematic for a european youth organisation, especially as member organisations of FYEG with a majority of our members under 18. We believe that the best way to address this is to write it into the IRPs.

Our proposal in summary:

Prohibit age-discrimination due to someone being too young in participant selection procedures for FYEG events.

B1-837-6 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Grön Ungdom and Grønn Ungdom (decided on: 07/13/2019)

Editorial hint

Replace X with a number such that it forms an annex that is a coherent part of the statutes, renumber sub-sections

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.X Annex X: Intoxicating substances policy**7.X.1 Purpose**

To take responsibility as an organisation for participants and facilitators at our events and statutory meetings that are uncomfortable around intoxicating substances, be that for reasons of past trauma, sobriety, or age.

Reason**Part 1 of 3 of the Nordic intoxicating substances resolution****Background:**

FYEG is an association for Young Greens, but the average age of those active within the organisation is relatively high. This is, of course, partially due to its nature as an organisation with Member Organisations rather than members, but we believe that more can be done to make FYEG more welcoming for younger members of MOs. With this in mind, we would propose a common-sense policy on intoxicating substances in order to ensure that everyone, regardless of their age, background, or religion, is able to participate in FYEG's activities and feel like our events are a safe space.

It is not only the young that are excluded from our events when intoxicating substances are used. A sizeable minority of people suffer from trauma relating to their or a loved one's addiction or former addiction, and currently we unintentionally

exclude them. Those with beliefs that forbid them from consuming alcohol are also excluded to a certain extent - everyone should be welcome in FYEG, no matter their religion or culture!

We believe that such a policy, as set out below, will ensure that members of all ages, backgrounds and creeds are more able to take part FYEG events, and ensure that MOs are more comfortable sending people who are not able to be in environments where intoxicating substances are present.

What we propose is not radical - we understand that alcohol has in the past and continues to be an important part of the forging of social bonds between people from all over Europe that makes FYEG such an amazing organisation. We don't want to take away your evening beer by the lake. We simply want to ensure that everyone can experience that feeling.

Our proposal in summary:

To prohibit the consumption of intoxicating substances - alcohol, drugs - during scheduled content sessions during the day at FYEG events.

To ensure that when organised social events where intoxicating substances are present occur during the evening at FYEG events, alternative social events are organised that are free of intoxicating substances.

B1-837-7 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Grön Ungdom and Grønn Ungdom (decided on: 07/13/2019)

Editorial hint

Replace X with a number such that it forms an annex that is a coherent part of the statutes, renumber sub-section

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.X Annex X: Intoxicating substances policy**7.X.2 Intoxicating substances at FYEG events**

7.X.2.X All events and meetings arranged by FYEG should not permit the consumption of intoxicating substances during scheduled programme or meeting time.

Reason

Part 2 of 3 of the Nordic intoxicating substances resolution

Background:

FYEG is an association for Young Greens, but the average age of those active within the organisation is relatively high. This is, of course, partially due to its nature as an organisation with Member Organisations rather than members, but we believe that more can be done to make FYEG more welcoming for younger members of MOs. With this in mind, we would propose a common-sense policy on intoxicating substances in order to ensure that everyone, regardless of their age, background, or religion, is able to participate in FYEG's activities and feel like our events are a safe space.

It is not only the young that are excluded from our events when intoxicating substances are used. A sizeable minority of people suffer from trauma relating to their or a loved one's addiction or former addiction, and currently we unintentionally exclude them. Those with beliefs that forbid them from consuming alcohol are also excluded to a certain extent - everyone should be welcome in FYEG, no matter their religion or culture!

We believe that such a policy, as set out below, will ensure that members of all ages, backgrounds and creeds are more able to take part FYEG events, and ensure that MOs are more comfortable sending people who are not able to be in environments where intoxicating substances are present.

What we propose is not radical - we understand that alcohol has in the past and continues to be an important part of the forging of social bonds between people from all over Europe that makes FYEG such an amazing organisation. We don't want to take away your evening beer by the lake. We simply want to ensure that everyone can experience that feeling.

Our proposal in summary:

To prohibit the consumption of intoxicating substances - alcohol, drugs - during scheduled content sessions during the day at FYEG events.

To ensure that when organised social events where intoxicating substances are present occur during the evening at FYEG events, alternative social events are organised that are free of intoxicating substances.

B1-837-8 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Grön Ungdom and Grønn Ungdom (decided on: 07/13/2019)

Editorial hint

Replace X with a number such that it forms an annex that is a coherent part of the statutes, renumber sub-section

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.X Annex X: Intoxicating substances policy**7.X.2 Intoxicating substances at FYEG events**

7.X.2.X FYEG shall ensure that in instances where social activities are offered after scheduled programme or meeting time that involve intoxicating substances, other activities are also scheduled that do not involve such substances.

Reason

Part 3 of 3 of the Nordic intoxicating substances resolution

Background:

FYEG is an association for Young Greens, but the average age of those active within the organisation is relatively high. This is, of course, partially due to its nature as an organisation with Member Organisations rather than members, but we believe that more can be done to make FYEG more welcoming for younger members of MOs. With this in mind, we would propose a common-sense policy on intoxicating substances in order to ensure that everyone, regardless of their age, background, or religion, is able to participate in FYEG's activities and feel like our events are a safe space.

It is not only the young that are excluded from our events when intoxicating substances are used. A sizeable minority of people suffer from trauma relating to their or a loved one's addiction or former addiction, and currently we unintentionally exclude them. Those with beliefs that forbid them from consuming alcohol are also excluded to a certain extent - everyone should be welcome in FYEG, no matter their

religion or culture!

We believe that such a policy, as set out below, will ensure that members of all ages, backgrounds and creeds are more able to take part FYEG events, and ensure that MOs are more comfortable sending people who are not able to be in environments where intoxicating substances are present.

What we propose is not radical - we understand that alcohol has in the past and continues to be an important part of the forging of social bonds between people from all over Europe that makes FYEG such an amazing organisation. We don't want to take away your evening beer by the lake. We simply want to ensure that everyone can experience that feeling.

Our proposal in summary:

To prohibit the consumption of intoxicating substances - alcohol, drugs - during scheduled content sessions during the day at FYEG events.

To ensure that when organised social events where intoxicating substances are present occur during the evening at FYEG events, alternative social events are organised that are free of intoxicating substances.

B1-837-9 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: DWARS (decided on: 07/17/2019)

Text

Insert in line 837:

- its members.

(Amendment on amendment proposed by EC)

7.4.2 Anti sexual harassment protocol

[...]

Important note:

These procedures will follow general principles such as the privacy of the survivor, confidentiality of the process and survivor's choice and preference. We respect the presumption of innocence of any alleged harasser which is why this procedure is in place and has been approved in the General Assembly. However, as a feminist organization, we also believe in the principle of believing the survivor. This procedure might be applied to an internal case of a MO if this case is related to FYEG activity or if the people involved take part in any FYEG structure. However, we will not be able to extend sanctions or disciplinary measures beyond FYEG. MOs can however adapt this protocol to their own organization.

[...]

Reason

Whilst we absolutely believe in believing someone when they come forward with such an experience, placing the burden of proof on the alleged harasser brings very practical challenges and we urge you to reconsider this. Without an investigation from outside the FYEG that can conclude in favour or against the complaint, we cannot see how the alleged harasser can actually prove that the harassment has not taken place. For example, when two people are in a room without witnesses, how can the person that is accused actually prove that it did not occur? Also, since winking is also mentioned as a possible form of sexual harassment, how can one prove that the wink was without malicious intent?

Seen the practical implications of "placing the burden of proof on the alleged harasser", we propose to delete this statement from the protocol as seen in this amendment.

B1-837-10 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: DWARS (decided on: 07/17/2019)

Text

Insert in line 837:

- its members.

(Amendment on amendment proposed by EC)
7.4.3 Guidelines for persons of contact

[...]

- Believe
The most common reason people choose not to tell anyone about sexual abuse is the fear that the listener won't believe them. People rarely lie or exaggerate about abuse; if someone tells you, it's because they trust you and needs someone to talk to.
 - People rarely make up stories of abuse. It is not necessary for you to decide if they were "really hurt." If the survivor says they were hurt, that should be enough
 - Believe what the person tells you. It may have been difficult for them to talk to you and trust you.
- [...]

Reason

Seen as this is a guideline for the person of contact in how to approach a conversation about sexual harassment we understand that it is important to emphasize that you should believe them when they inform you of such harassment. However, this statement goes against the value that we should place concerning the right to be held innocent unless proven otherwise. According to the universal declaration of human rights article 11 everyone has the right to be presumed innocent unless proven guilty. Since this declaration is such a fundamental base for

how we treat one another and the aforementioned statement goes against this principle, we propose the deletion of this sentence. It is sufficient to state "believe what the person tells you" in this guideline.

B1-837-11 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Jong Groen (decided on: 07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.4.2 Anti sexual harassment protocol

FYEG has a zero-tolerance policy on sexual harassment at all its events, within all its structures and during all activities. ***This protocol is applicable for those participating in an FYEG activity (General Assembly, Strategic Planning Committee, Working Group Meeting or any other activity), whether they are members of a Member Organization (MO), or members of an online structure of FYEG, referred as “this organization”***

in this protocol

Anyone who is subject to sexual harassment can approach one of the designated contact points responsible for receiving complaints of sexual harassment. The Executive Committee will designate an Awareness Group for anyone presenting allegations of physical, verbal or online sexual harassment. In accordance with the IRPs, the Awareness Group will be formed by two persons from the EC who are of different genders. Additionally, every Prep - Team will designate one person to be an independent contact person in our projects. However, this person shall always inform the official contact points if a procedure starts, in the case of their absence, the main contact will be the Project Manager.

When one of these procedures is open in the organization, the EC as a whole must be informed of the procedure without details of the people involved or the presented allegations to respect confidentiality. ***We propose that if an Awareness Group will be designated, the MO’s will be informed discretely as well (or at least their respective representatives). A safe space works back and forth; from the MO’s to FYEG (if applicable) and the other way around.*** If a case involves someone from the EC, the case will be brought to the Advisory Committee (AC). The Advisory Committee will act as contact points when a case arises, following this protocol. However, the EC will not be informed until a final decision is made.

Important note:

These procedures will follow general principles such as the privacy of the survivor, confidentiality of the process and survivor’s choice and preference. ***We fully respect the presumption of innocence of any alleged harasser, as defined in article 11 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, which is why this procedure is in place***

and has been approved in the General Assembly. However, as a feminist organization, we also believe in the principle of believing the survivor and putting the burden of the proof on the alleged harasser.

This procedure might be applied to an internal case of a MO if this case is related to FYEG activity or if the people involved take part in any FYEG structure. However, we will not be able to extend sanctions or disciplinary measures beyond FYEG. MOs can however adapt this protocol to their own organization.

When the designated people receive a complaint of sexual harassment, they shall:

1. Immediately record the dates, times and facts of the incident(s);
2. ascertain the views of the survivor as to what outcome they want, ensure the survivor feels safe and ensure the survivor is separated from the alleged offender unless the survivor wishes otherwise;
3. ensure that the survivor and the alleged harasser understands FYEG protocol for dealing with the complaint;
4. discuss and agree the next steps with the alleged survivor, informal, formal or outside complaints procedure (police, hospital, embassy, etc.), on the understanding that choosing to resolve the matter informally does not preclude the survivor from pursuing a formal complaint if they are not satisfied with the outcome;
5. keep a confidential record of all discussions. Records will be destroyed if the alleged survivor requests it, or before the change to a new EC. However, a record of sanctions and a brief description of the reason will be kept in a safe place **Records will be deleted after 5 years;**
6. respect the choice of the survivor;
7. and ensure that the survivor knows that they can lodge the complaint outside of FYEG through the relevant country/legal framework.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

If the survivor wishes to deal with the matter informally, the designated person will:

- Approach the alleged harasser saying that the behaviour is offensive, unwelcome and must be stopped;
- Inform the harasser that FYEG has a zero tolerance policy on sexual harassment and that disregarding this policy may result in the person's exclusion from the organization
- give an opportunity to the alleged harasser to respond to the complaint;
- ensure that the alleged harasser understands the complaints mechanism;
- facilitate discussion between both parties to achieve an informal resolution which is acceptable to the complainant, provided the alleged survivor agrees,
- ensure that a confidential record is kept of what happened;
- follow up after the outcome of the complaints mechanism to ensure that the behaviour has stopped and that there is no risk of its repetition;
- And ensure that the above is done accurately and at the latest within 10 days of the complaint being made. During events, the procedure shall take place within 48 hours.

FORMAL COMPLAINTS PROCEDURES

If the survivor wants to make a formal complaint or if the informal complaint mechanism has not led to a satisfactory outcome for the survivor, the formal complaint mechanism should be used to resolve the matter.

The designated person who initially received the complaint will communicate to the rest of contact points the opening of a formal complaint procedure. The EC will be informed of this, respecting the confidentiality of the alleged survivor and the allegations. The designated person who initially received the complaint will carry out the investigation with the assistance of the Awareness Group and the independent contact person at the moment in which allegations were presented, if any. They will help the investigator with the analysis and decision making process. A procedure for online harassment shall be developed.

The person carrying out the investigation will:

- interview the survivor and the alleged harasser separately
- interview other relevant third parties separately
- decide whether the incident qualifies as sexual harassment within the meaning of this protocol
- produce a report detailing the investigations, findings and any recommendations
- if the harassment took place, decide what the appropriate remedy for the survivor is, in consultation with the survivor (i.e. an apology, a change of structure, suspension...)
- follow up to ensure that the recommendations are implemented, that the behaviour has stopped and that the survivor is satisfied with the outcome
- if it cannot determine that the harassment took place, they may still make recommendations to ensure proper functioning of the organization
- keep a record of all actions taken
- ensure that all records concerning the matter are kept confidential
- ensure that the process is done as quickly as possible and in any event within 15 days of the complaint being made

The general rule is to avoid the presence of the alleged harasser in those places/structures in which the alleged survivor moves. It is vital that the wishes and needs of the survivors are incorporated into the outcome of the complaints mechanism.

A data protection protocol will be developed.

OUTSIDE COMPLAINT MECHANISM

This protocol seeks to create a fast and appropriate response to allegations of sexual harassment. However, it does not seek to substitute existing regulation and legislation on this issue. We want to make clear that FYEG wants to be fully supportive with every decision of the alleged survivor.

A person who has been subject to sexual harassment can at any time make a complaint outside of the organization. Even though this organization cannot offer legal advice, the contact point(s) will accompany the person to the instance this person prefers (hospital, police, ombudsperson, law courts, embassies, etc.) if they request it.

SANCTIONS AND DISCIPLINARY MEASURES

Anyone who has been found to have sexually harassed another person under the terms of this policy may be sanctioned. Sanctions may include but are not limited to one of the following :

- Verbal or written warning

• Suspension from an elected or non-elected FYEG structure, in line with FYEG IRPs when appropriate

• Dismissal/expulsion

Depending on the seriousness of the allegations, the EC, upon request of the Awareness Group may suspend someone from taking part in any FYEG structure or activity during the duration of the process. Confidentiality of the survivor will be maintained.

In case of sexual harassment, violence or discrimination by a member of an elected body within FYEG (Financial Control Committee, Advisory Committee or Ecosprinter Board) the EC can exclude the offender after consulting the full MOs. (cf. 2.2.2). If the case arises within the EC, the Advisory Committee can exclude the offender after consulting the full MOs.

The nature of the sanctions will depend on the gravity and extent of the harassment. Suitable deterrent sanctions will be applied to ensure that incidents of sexual harassment are not treated as trivial. Certain serious cases, including physical violence, will result in the immediate dismissal of the harasser.

Reason

The three changes compared to EC amendment are underlined in bold+italic+underlined

1. We want to clarify that this protocol does not affect members of MO that do not engage in FYEG activities.

2. /

3. We want to underline the importance of one of the most vital declarations, even in potential complicated situations.

4. This due to: to protect the individual's privacy (data protection) and underline that we believe in people learning from their mistakes, burdens should not be for the rest of one's life. If judiciary consequences, due to the zero tolerance policy, the member will be limited in their engagement within FYEG, then a deletion might be postponed until the member can, due to the age restrictions, no longer engage

We, from Jong Groen, appreciate the hard and thorough work as done by all people and parties involved. We, however, would like to propose the following:

We believe that a Safe Space can only be created and facilitated if started from the organisation concerned. We want our members to feel safe, free and protected. We feel that in the current Safe Space Policy there is too much of a focus on potential punishment and setting boundaries. We request therefore to change the discourse so that this exact goal will be reflected within the IRPs. We are convinced that

people feel safe when we are supporting each other, when there is a warm and open atmosphere and where people feel equal. This should be the basis. Then you should consider the *if*; some clear boundaries, which are well-put in the proposal by the EC. This, we truly believe, is the best way to create a safe space.

B1-837-12 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Jong Groen (decided on: 07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.4.2 Anti sexual harassment protocol

FYEG has a zero-tolerance policy on sexual harassment at all its events, within all its structures and during all activities. ***This protocol is applicable for those participating in an FYEG activity (General Assembly, Strategic Planning Committee, Working Group Meeting or any other activity), whether they are members of a Member Organization (MO), or members of an online structure of FYEG, referred as “this organization”*** in this protocol

Reason

The three changes compared to EC amendment are underlined in bold+italic+underlined

1. We want to clarify that this protocol does not affect members of MO that do not engage in FYEG activities.

2. /

3. We want to underline the importance of one of the most vital declarations, even in potential complicated situations.

4. This due to: to protect the individual's privacy (data protection) and underline that we believe in people learning from their mistakes, burdens should not be for the rest of one's life. If judiciary consequences, due to the zero tolerance policy, the member will be limited in their engagement within FYEG, then a deletion might be postponed until the member can, due to the age restrictions, no longer engage

We, from Jong Groen, appreciate the hard and thorough work as done by all people and parties involved. We, however, would like to propose the following:

We believe that a Safe Space can only be created and facilitated if started from the

organisation concerned. We want our members to feel safe, free and protected. We feel that in the current Safe Space Policy there is too much of a focus on potential punishment and setting boundaries. We request therefore to change the discourse so that this exact goal will be reflected within the IRPs. We are convinced that people feel safe when we are supporting each other, when there is a warm and open atmosphere and where people feel equal. This should be the basis. Then you should consider the *if*, some clear boundaries, which are well-put in the proposal by the EC. This, we truly believe, is the best way to create a safe space.

B1-837-13 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Jong Groen (decided on: 07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.4.2 Anti sexual harassment protocol

[...]

Anyone who is subject to sexual harassment can approach one of the designated contact points responsible for receiving complaints of sexual harassment. The Executive Committee will designate an Awareness Group for anyone presenting allegations of physical, verbal or online sexual harassment. In accordance with the IRPs, the Awareness Group will be formed by two persons from the EC who are of different genders. Additionally, every Prep - Team will designate one person to be an independent contact person in our projects. However, this person shall always inform the official contact points if a procedure starts, in the case of their absence, the main contact will be the Project Manager.

When one of these procedures is open in the organization, the EC as a whole must be informed of the procedure without details of the people involved or the presented allegations to respect confidentiality. ***We propose that if an Awareness Group will be designated, the MO's will be informed discretely as well (or at least their respective representatives). A safe space works back and forth; from the MO's to FYEG (if applicable) and the other way around.*** If a case involves someone from the EC, the case will be brought to the Advisory Committee (AC). The Advisory Committee will act as contact points when a case arises, following this protocol. However, the EC will not be informed until a final decision is made.

Reason

The three changes compared to EC amendment are underlined in bold+italic+underlined

1. We want to clarify that this protocol does not affect members of MO that do not engage in FYEG activities.

2. /



B1-837-14 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Jong Groen (decided on: 07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.4.2 Anti sexual harassment protocol

[...]

Important note:

These procedures will follow general principles such as the privacy of the survivor, confidentiality of the process and survivor's choice and preference. ***We fully respect the presumption of innocence of any alleged harasser, as defined in article 11 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, which is why this procedure is in place and has been approved in the General Assembly.*** However, as a feminist organization, we also believe in the principle of believing the survivor and putting the burden of the proof on the alleged harasser.

This procedure might be applied to an internal case of a MO if this case is related to FYEG activity or if the people involved take part in any FYEG structure. However, we will not be able to extend sanctions or disciplinary measures beyond FYEG. MOs can however adapt this protocol to their own organization.

Reason

The three changes compared to EC amendment are underlined in bold+italic+underlined

3. We want to underline the importance of one of the most vital declarations, even in potential complicated situations.

B1-837-15 to INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Antragsteller*innen: Jong Groen (decided on: 07/14/2019)

Text

Insert after line 837:

7.4.2 Anti sexual harassment protocol

[...]

When the designated people receive a complaint of sexual harassment, they shall:

1. Immediately record the dates, times and facts of the incident(s);
2. ascertain the views of the survivor as to what outcome they want, ensure the survivor feels safe and ensure the survivor is separated from the alleged offender unless the survivor wishes otherwise;
3. ensure that the survivor and the alleged harasser understands FYEG protocol for dealing with the complaint;
4. discuss and agree the next steps with the alleged survivor, informal, formal or outside complaints procedure (police, hospital, embassy, etc.), on the understanding that choosing to resolve the matter informally does not preclude the survivor from pursuing a formal complaint if they are not satisfied with the outcome;
5. keep a confidential record of all discussions. Records will be destroyed if the alleged survivor requests it, or before the change to a new EC. However, a record of sanctions and a brief description of the reason will be kept in a safe place ***Records will be deleted after 5 years;***
6. respect the choice of the survivor;
7. and ensure that the survivor knows that they can lodge the complaint outside of FYEG through the relevant country/legal framework.

Reason

The three changes compared to EC amendment are underlined in bold+italic+underlined

1. We want to clarify that this protocol does not affect members of MO that do not engage in FYEG activities.

2. /

3. We want to underline the importance of one of the most vital declarations, even in

potential complicated situations.

4. This due to: to protect the individual's privacy (data protection) and underline that we believe in people learning from their mistakes, burdens should not be for the rest of one's life. If judiciary consequences, due to the zero tolerance policy, the member will be limited in their engagement within FYEG, then a deletion might be postponed until the member can, due to the age restrictions, no longer engage

We, from Jong Groen, appreciate the hard and thorough work as done by all people and parties involved. We, however, would like to propose the following:

We believe that a Safe Space can only be created and facilitated if started from the organisation concerned. We want our members to feel safe, free and protected. We feel that in the current Safe Space Policy there is too much of a focus on potential punishment and setting boundaries. We request therefore to change the discourse so that this exact goal will be reflected within the IRPs. We are convinced that people feel safe when we are supporting each other, when there is a warm and open atmosphere and where people feel equal. This should be the basis. Then you should consider the *if*, some clear boundaries, which are well-put in the proposal by the EC. This, we truly believe, is the best way to create a safe space.

C4-094 to Climate Emergency: We Can't Just Stop at Declarations!

Antragsteller*innen: Jong Groen (decided on: 08/15/2019)

Text**Insert in line 105:**

- harm the climate in an unacceptable way. These trade agreements and private investment projects can subsequently be evaluated and improved to have a lower impact on the environment. Private investment projects who have a positive impact should receive all the support they need.

Reason

All trade agreements harm the climate. We should differentiate to what extent.

C5-068 to Toward a Europe that works for all

Antragsteller*innen: Ecoloj (decided on: 08/15/2019)

Text

From line 80 to 83:

- ~~Work toward replacing the minimum wage with a Universal Basic Income system that is added on top of other social service and benefit systems to separate work from income. This has to be coupled with strong efforts to shut down tax havens and stop tax evasion and avoidance.~~

Work toward replacing the minimum wage with a Universal Basic Income system that is added on top of other social service and benefit systems to separate work from income. This has to be coupled with strong efforts to shut down tax havens and stop tax evasion and avoidance.

- Promote the idea to not raise the limit age of retirement/pension.

Reason

The retirement limit age raise again and again across Europe with the idea we live longer so we need to work longer. We must stand against the idea because we may not all be able to work in old ages and because it makes indirectly increase the youth unemployment rate.

C5-068-2 to Toward a Europe that works for all

Antragsteller*innen: EcoloJ (decided on: 08/15/2019)

Text

From line 80 to 83:

- ~~Work toward replacing the minimum wage with a Universal Basic Income system that is added on top of other social service and benefit systems to separate work from income. This has to be coupled with strong efforts to shut down tax havens and stop tax evasion and avoidance.~~

Work toward replacing the minimum wage with a Universal Basic Income system that is added on top of other social service and benefit systems to separate work from income. This has to be coupled with strong efforts to shut down tax havens and stop tax evasion and avoidance.

- Promote a decrease of the average working hours per week

Reason

Life must not be summarize exclusively by work. We all need times to deal with families duties, personal project, etc. Decrease the working hours per week will also help fighting unemployment.

C6-058 to Resolution on a European Train Network of the Future

Antragsteller*innen: Jeunes écologistes (France (decided on:
08/15/2019)

Text

Insert in line 59:

European cities, towns and rural areas

C6-092 to Resolution on a European Train Network of the Future

Antragsteller*innen: Jeunes écologistes (France (decided on:
08/15/2019)

Text

Insert in line 93:

(4.)

FYEG calls for a moratorium on the privatisation of railways companies or train lines. These privatisations often come at the expense of workers' rights working conditions and at the expense of the passengers living in rural areas and using small lines. Instead of fostering competition, the European Union should encourage cooperation between the different train companies.

(5.

C6-104 to Resolution on a European Train Network of the Future

Antragsteller*innen: Scottish Young Greens (decided on:
08/13/2019)

Text

Insert after line 105:

(5.) FYEG supports Nation-States, devolved administrations, the European Union, and a European Train Union in efforts to withdraw costs of usage from their services. FYEG also supports efforts to introduce fare-free public transport throughout Europe.

Reason

Social Justice and Environmentalism are two of the pillars of green politics. The concept of fare-free public transport makes society more accessible for everyone and in doing so will decrease personal motor vehicle usage which will decrease these emissions.

C6-104-2 to Resolution on a European Train Network of the Future

Antragsteller*innen: Swiss Young Greens (decided on:
08/15/2019)

Text

Insert after line 105:

(5.)

FYEG supports Nation-States, regional governments, local governments, the European Union and a European Train Union in efforts to withdraw costs of usage from their services. FYEG also supports efforts to introduce fare-free local public transport throughout Europe.

Reason

Short distance travel on public transport should be free, bcs people anyway move in this sphere for social activities, work, so it is an effective tool to move people from cars to public transport. When it comes to long distance travel, the user should still cover some of the costs caused, because if it was completely free it would be over-used what would a negative environmental impact

D1-059 to FYEG Political Platform

Antragsteller*innen: Vihreiden nuorten ja opiskelijoiden liitto ry
and Grön Ungdom (decided on: 07/17/2019)

Text**Insert in line 59:**

channels, political arenas and tools to succeed. Policy making based on peer-reviewed science and evidence is an effective tool to achieve these goals.

Reason

Policy making should be based on science and facts. This is even more important today, when we are facing global challenges like climate catastrophe or rise of populist parties. We need to show, that fake news and populist rhetoric are not the ingredients of good public policies.

D1-170 to FYEG Political Platform

Antragsteller*innen: Joves d'Esquerra Verda (decided on:
07/17/2019)

Text

Insert in line 170:

integral to the concept of EU citizenship. Their voice should always be heard, and thus direct participation at the European level shall be enforced and respected by institutions. Tools like the European Citizen Initiative should be reformed to make possible for citizens to actually have a say in European decisions. But we also recognize that direct participation should not be only related with signing petitions, and therefore we encourage

Reason

We needed to recognize the role that citizens play at the European level!

D1-174 to FYEG Political Platform

Antragsteller*innen: Joves d'Esquerra Verda (decided on:
07/17/2019)

Text**Insert in line 174:**

of people, cultures and identities, thus the life and development of regions and municipalities

Reason

To simply recognise different sub-state levels.

D1-549 to FYEG Political Platform

Antragsteller*innen: Joves d'Esquerra Verda (decided on:
07/17/2019)

Text

Insert in line 549:

of poverty and exclusion in European societies.

Gentrification is also a problem that affects many European cities. The phenomenon of mass tourism, together with the beforementioned unregulated housing markets, evict people from their own homes. Such a problem affect especially young people, who cannot fulfill our life projects as independent persons if we cannot have a place to live in with dignity.

Insert in line 557:

financial resources. In this way, new models of housing ownership like cohousing should be encouraged and made available to citizens. Tools that break the constant struggle between privatization and public ownership must be put forward. The only way that such changes can last in time is to build a community that can defend and act by itself.

Reason

We need to clearly say that housing is not only a problem of ownership, but also about realizing our own projects.