

I2 A1

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

Insert from line 675 to 677:

budget with a minimum of 50 EUR for the EU and European Economic Area (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway) and Switzerland and the United Kingdom and 25 EUR for all other European countries.

I2 A2

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

From line 17 to 19:

~~One can not be a candidate MO for more than 3 years without applying for full membership. After 3 years;~~
A candidate MO must wait 2 years before applying for full membership, but must apply for full membership latest at the GA 3 years after it was granted its candidate MO status. If the candidate MO is not applying for full membership in the third year of candidate membership, the EC can propose the suspension or exclusion of the candidate MO.

Reason

Right now the IRPs only state how long a candidate member organisation can MAXIMUM be a member, but it says nothing about how long it needs to be one (in practice, it's a year because they can earliest apply for full membership at the following GA). We want to change the candidate membership to two years.

I2 A3

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

From line 194 to 195:

- Candidacies are published
- ~~Candidacies~~ EC recommendations on candidating (full or candidate) MOs are published
- EC recommendations on exclusion and/or suspension of MOs are published

Reason

Right now the IRPs do not state anything clearly about when the EC needs to publish recommendations on candidacies of MOs or recommendations to exclude/suspend MOs. Normally, these recommendations have been published at the same time with the candidacies. We want to formalise this in the IRPs.

I2 A4

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

Insert after line 366:

- providing general or specific mentorship for EC members on an individual needs basis.

Reason

Clarifying the mentoring role we want the advisory committee to have.

I2 A5

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

Delete in line 131:

- ~~mandates the working groups~~

Reason

This proposal is to make this part of the IRPs more in line with the part on working groups. It is the competence of the executive committee to accept/reject/suspend/exclude working groups as stated under 2.7 Working Groups.

Amendment for I2

From line 490 to 491:

3.4.1 electoral system FYEG uses a Single Transferable Vote (STV) electoral system with a standard droop quota. Mathematically, this is the next integer larger than $V / (n+1)$ when V = the total number of valid votes and n is the number of positions available. Specifically recommended is the Scottish STV system.

3.4.12 Principles

From line 499 to 501:

3.4.23 Procedures 1 – The candidates who have reached the **quota (i.e. election threshold (an absolute majority) threshold**)[Space]are elected.

From line 506 to 512:

~~2b – If one or more candidates are ineligible to be elected due to quota regulations, these candidates are removed from the election. The ballot-papers that ranked this/these candidate(s) as their first (remaining) preference are redistributed according to their second preference. The process is then restarted (1).~~ 2c2b – If one or more candidates have reached the election threshold, that/those candidate(s) are elected in order from highest to lowest vote count. The process

From line 514 to 518:

~~2d2c – If no candidate reaches the threshold in this way, the candidate with the lowest amount of votes is removed from the election. The ballot-papers that ranked this candidate as their first remaining preference are redistributed according to their second preference. The process is then restarted (1).~~

2d - If, following the calculation of the election result, one or more candidates is elected who is ineligible due to quota regulations, these candidates (who had the least number of votes) are removed from the pool of candidates and the entire election is recalculated. That is to say, the election is recalculated, and each time the ineligible candidate would have received a preference vote, the vote instead goes to the voter's next preference. 3.4.34 Exceptions

Insert after line 598:

3.7 Tiebreakers 3.7.1: Tiebreakers on points of substance In the case of a tie between two points of substance, the vote shall be held again. If the result is once again a tie, the body voting may choose to vote once more, table the discussion to later in the meeting, or decide by some form of chance. Note that this paragraph is not intended to apply to ties between “yes”, “no”, or “abstain” where some point of substance requires a majority to pass. 3.7.2: Tiebreakers relating to elections If the tie occurs between two candidates in an election, and only one may be elected, a vote shall be held to decide between them. If the result is once again a tie, the body voting may choose to vote once more or decide by some form of chance. At any point during this, either candidate may choose to withdraw.

Reason

There are three problems with the current system. **The quota is stated as an absolute majority**, which is both unusual and makes electing multiple people (for example, in Executive Committee elections) impossible without creatively interpreting the IRPs. This is because there are only two ways of redistributing votes; (1) redistribute “left-over votes” of threshold-passing candidates; (2) if there are no threshold-passing candidates, eliminate the candidate with the fewest votes and redistribute their votes. If you interpret absolute majority correctly as a majority of all votes cast, then only one candidate at the very maximum could ever be elected under this system. Any EC would then just consist of one (un)lucky, very powerful and burnt-out person. If you ‘creatively’ interpret it, assuming that whoever wrote this section of the IRPs wanted this system to work, an ‘absolute’ majority of left-over votes creates a strange voting system where you just elect the person with the highest number of remaining votes until all slots are filled. We’re not quite sure what such a system is, other than a) objectively bad and b) a strange implementation of multi-member first-past-the-post maybe? This is why FYEG has never actually used this system*; instead always using a droop quota, the most common quota used in STV systems. We would recommend codifying this practice in the IRPs. All STV systems that we know of use either “Hare” or “Droop” quota. The Hare quota is calculated by dividing the number of valid votes (V) by the number of seats (i.e. V / n), while the Droop quota is the number of valid votes divided by the number of electable positions plus one (i.e. $V / (n+1)$). The Droop quota is standard, and widely considered to be better than Hare. To illustrate that, we do not know of any political systems that actually use Hare instead of Droop (other than Hong Kong where it was [introduced by the Chinese government for evil reasons](#)). If you really want to read more about the comparisons, [here](#) is a riveting Wikipedia page on the matter. **The IRPs do not define which STV system to use, but they should.** For the sake of consistency and transparency, we suggest naming which STV system to use. Specifically, we suggest the use of the Scottish STV System. This is because (i) the rules are relatively simple (for STV, that is) , (ii) they produce proportional representation, (iii) the rules are comprehensively defined in Scottish Law, and (iii) it is used in the political system of at least one member organisation. For a more comprehensive explanation of Scottish STV, read [this blog by Opavote](#). An alternative system is Meek STV. Although it’s considered “the creme de la creme of STV counting rules”, Meek is both VERY complicated and (because of that) almost never used. The only exceptions we know of are in New Zealand and some Stack Exchange forums. For more on Meek, [read this](#). **The IRPs suggest for the gender balancing mechanism to be used in the middle of the vote redistribution**, which has a distorting effect and is impossible with any technology we are aware of. This one is kind of technical, so hang in there people. Our IRPs require at least 50% of people on each body that has more than one person to “self-identify as woman, trans or genderqueer”. The way of following FYEG’s gender quota (see box) means that the balancing mechanism happens during the redistribution. Basically, once the quota is reached (for example, 4 cis men are elected to a body of 8 people), the remaining candidates who are excluded by this quota (e.g. cis men) are removed and their votes redistributed. This is a nice idea but really complicated to execute. **There are two alternative options:**

1. **Use the gender balancing mechanism BEFORE the election.** This basically means doing two separate elections - one for people who are not female, trans or genderqueer to reduce them to an admissible quota. We consider this not to match the spirit of the IRPs.
2. **Use the gender balancing mechanism AFTER the election.** We believe this is closer to the spirit of the IRPs, while being practical. This would mean we calculate the result of the election on whatever software being used, and check if the result is incompatible with the gender quota. If it is, (e.g. 5 cis men elected to a body of 8 people) we eliminate enough candidates of that gender that is incompatible with the gender quota, starting from the bottom of the list to ensure the quota is respected, before re-running the election software.

There is no tiebreaker in the IRPs. One of the quirks of any STV system, especially when there are only 100 or so votes like in FYEG, is that ties are possible. In order to avoid any possibility of ambiguity, we would recommend adding some listed way of breaking ties, which could also be used to decide between

competing counter-amendments, etc. We would recommend, for simplicity's sake, explicitly stating that a tiebreaker vote between two candidates would be held, and if this was again a tie the GA could choose to either vote again or let it be decided by chance.

I2 A7

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

Delete from line 641 to 642:

- Participants ~~below 16 and those for whom it is forbidden by domestic laws~~, shall not consume alcohol or illegal drugs, and one shall not offer any to

From line 649 to 653:

- FYEG shall ~~look into organising~~not organise sessions and parties in ~~other places than those~~places where the consumption of alcohol consumption is central, such as bars or clubs;
- Members of the Executive Committee and the prep-team shall lead by example and abstain from ~~excessively~~ drinking alcohol and from using illegal drugs during an event. Additionally, two people, from either the Executive

I2 A8

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

Insert from line 673 to 675:

Each full MO shall pay an annual membership fee to FYEG. This Membership fee shall correspond to 1.5 % of the total incomes of their previous year's realised budget with a minimum of 50 EUR for the EU and European Economic Area (Iceland,

I2 A11

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

From line 999 to 1001:

the IRPs, the Awareness Group will be formed by two persons from the EC who are ~~of different genders~~ woman and a transgender or a non-binary person. Additionally, every Prep - Team will designate one person to be an independent contact person in our projects. However, this person shall

Reason

The Awareness Group should be formed by two persons from the EC: a woman and a transgender or a non-binary person. As victims of sexual harassment are mostly women, it will be easier for the victim to talk to a person who have probably experience the same thing. It will also be easier for the victim to talk to a person they can identify with. Moreover, cisgender men are not in the best position to decide whether an incident falls into the category of sexual harassment or not, especially when it is an ambiguous situation. The protocol should also add the possibility to call for an external mediation if required. In some situations, there can be a conflict of interest. For instance, if people of the Awareness Group know the people involved and cannot have a neutral decision. An external mediator could make a more neutral decision.

I2 A12

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

From line 308 to 309:

The Secretary General is elected for a ~~two~~three year mandate at the GA. (cf. 3.4) For requirements for the application cf. 7.2.3.

Reason

A two-year mandate is a short time for such an important position that oversees the office and works directly with the EC. Extending to three years will allow the Secretary General to become well acquainted with the role and also provides more stability for a person employed by FYEG.

I2 AA2

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

From line 17 to 19:

~~One can not be a candidate MO for more than 3 years without applying for full membership. After 3 years,~~
A candidate MO must wait 2 years before applying for full membership, but must apply for full membership latest at the GA 5 years after it was granted its candidate MO status. If the candidate MO is not applying for full membership in the fifth year of candidate membership,the EC can propose the suspension or exclusion of the candidate MO.

Reason

Alternative Amendment to I2 A2 in order to maintain a bit of flexibility.

Amendment for I2

From line 490 to 491:

3.4 Election of candidates

3.4.1 Electoral system

FYEG uses a Single Transferable Vote (STV) electoral system with a standard droop quota. Mathematically, this is the next integer larger than $V / (n+1)$ when V = the total number of valid votes and n is the number of positions available. Specifically recommended is the Scottish STV system. 3.4.12 Principles

From line 499 to 501:

3.4.23 Procedures 1 – The candidates who have reached the quota (i.e. election threshold (an absolute majority) threshold) are elected.

From line 506 to 512:

~~2b – If one or more candidates are ineligible to be elected due to quota regulations, these candidates are removed from the election. The ballot papers that ranked this/these candidate(s) as their first (remaining) preference are redistributed according to their second preference. The process is then restarted (1).~~ 2c2b – If one or more candidates have reached the election threshold, that/those candidate(s) are elected in order from highest to lowest vote count. The process

From line 514 to 518:

~~2d~~2c – If no candidate reaches the threshold in this way, the candidate with the lowest amount of votes is removed from the election. The ballot papers that ranked this candidate as their first remaining preference are redistributed according to their second preference. The process is then restarted (1).

2d - If, following the calculation of the election result, one or more candidates is elected who is ineligible due to election threshold regulations, these candidates (who had the least number of votes) are removed from the pool of candidates and the entire election is recalculated. That is to say, the election is recalculated, and each time the ineligible candidate would have received a preference vote, the vote instead goes to the voter's next preference. 3.4.34 Exceptions

Insert from line 597 to 598:

Results will be announced within one week after the closing of the vote and include detailed information.

3.7 Tiebreakers3.7.1: Tiebreakers on points of substance

In the case of a tie between two points of substance, the vote shall be held again. If the result is once again a tie, the body voting may choose to vote once more, table the discussion to later in the meeting, or decide by some form of chance. Note that this paragraph is not intended to apply to ties between “yes”, “no”, or “abstain” where some point of substance requires a majority to pass.

3.7.2: Tiebreakers relating to elections

If the tie occurs between two candidates in an election, and only one may be elected, a vote shall be held to decide between them. If the result is once again a tie, the body voting may choose to vote once more or decide by some form of chance. At any point during this, either candidate may choose to withdraw.

Reason

Alternative amendment to I2 A6: In 2d - Changing "quota" into "election threshold" to have a clear distinction between the quota for election and the gender quota.

I2 AA12

Internal Rules of Procedures

Application

Amendment for I2

Insert from line 308 to 309:

The Secretary General is elected for a two year mandate at the GA. Candidates who already held this position cannot be reelected. (cf. 3.4) For requirements for the application cf. 7.2.3.

Reason

We are in favor of a longer mandate for the Secretary General and we agree with the justification put forward by the Executive Committee. However, we believe that it is also important to encourage change in the organization and to allow new people to run for this essential position. We fear that new people may be discourage to run if the outgoing Secretary General applies for a second term.

R1 A1

Green Space Policy

Application

Amendment for R1

From line 28 to 32:

mainstream, the space industry still has a lot of catching up within this area. But last year ~~SpaceX made a~~ breakthrough was made, when ~~they launched~~ the first astronauts were launched on a reused rocket. ~~“Both NASA and SpaceX”~~ NASA contend that reusable spacecraft are crucial for making the space industry more affordable. The concept is not new; for years, the space

Reason

We propose not to give credit to corporations and focus on the general thought of the sentence.

R1 A2

Green Space Policy

Application

Amendment for R1

Insert after line 65:

Corporations should be accountable for the space pollution they are making, as well be accountable for the destruction of space discovery potential, especially with global systems like Starlink. Therefore, we demand that every global scale project is implemented in collaboration with scientists not to reduce the scientific potential in space discovery.

Reason

Many organizations and scientists have claimed issues with starlink, e.g., here is the NASA warning:
<https://interestingengineering.com/nasa-starlink-warning>

R1 A3

Green Space Policy

Application

Amendment for R1

From line 37 to 38:

international partners to establish a requirement for rockets to be reusable and completely recyclable ~~by 2035~~as soon as possible.

Reason

Only the 1st stage is currently possible with SpaceX tech and the chance that rockets will be fully reusable by 2035 is just extremely unlikely, I would even argue impossible. Also, the reusable boosters have not been used further than Mars orbit. This needs to be changed so it fits the current scientific possibilities.

R1 A4

Green Space Policy

Application

Amendment for R1

From line 60 to 64:

These are everything from dust to pens and broken satellites that are as big as buses. ~~Which usually moves at about 27,000 km/h.~~ In the worst case, it could be that in the future we will not be able to postpone things into space because there is too much rubbish in the way - the so-called ~~Keppler~~Kessler syndrome. Already today you need to plan launches for clusters of space debris. That is why we

Reason

Speed is depending on the attitude and the speed is irrelevant in this sentence. Also it is the Kessler syndrome

R1 A5

Green Space Policy

Application

Amendment for R1

Insert from line 63 to 65:

there is too much rubbish in the way - the so-called Kepler syndrome. Already today you need to plan launches for clusters of space debris. In order to reduce the amount of defunct and functional satellites and, therefore, reduce the current and future space pollution, we must make all scientific data collected from these satellites open-source. That is why we propose:

Reason

We need to address the root of this problem, not only the consequences.

R1 A7

Green Space Policy

Application

Amendment for R1

Insert from line 8 to 9:

it's the logo of a company on the side of the spacecraft that lands on Mars with humans, or if it's a flag that represents humans and not money.

Space exploration has clear scientific and cultural benefits but we also acknowledge that it is enormously resource-intensive which makes it very attractive to private individuals and companies. All space exploration should only be done when necessary, especially if private companies are involved, and has to serve the public interest. Space is not a playground for billionaires.

Reason

Adding this paragraph to make it very clear that space exploration has to be of public interest and not capitalistic reasons from billionaires and companies.