1. **Opening of the General Assembly**

Board Member Nora Kleibel opens and introduces the 40th General Assembly of OBESSU.

Nora welcomes everyone and thanks the sponsors for the General Assembly: the City of Vienna, the Ministry for Education and Women, the Austrian Student Union and the Public Transport Authority of Vienna. Nora gives the floor to the representative of the City Council of Vienna to welcome everyone to Vienna.

The Roll call is made, and voting cards are distributed in alphabetical order to the organisations present. Yellow cards are given to the Member Organisations (MOs) with the right to vote, and white cards to the Candidate Organisations (COs) with the right to speak, according to the payment of the Annual Financial Contribution.

First Roll Call:

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS (not present), UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not presents), VSK.

18 MOs present, 3 COs

2. **Election of the Chairperson**

The Board proposes Andreas Berger, former Monitoring Committee (MC) member of OBESSU to be the Chairperson of the GA.

The General Assembly approves the Chairperson by acclamation.

The Chairperson welcomes the delegates and briefly shares his experience in OBESSU.

3. **Election of the minute taker**

The Board proposes Estel Buch, OBESSU Project Officer, to be the minute taker of the General Assembly.

The General Assembly approves the minute taker by acclamation.

4. **Legality of General Assembly and adoption of the Agenda**

For the General Assembly to be legal, 50% plus 1 of the total number of OBESSU members have to be present. At this GA 21 Organisations are present, which satisfies the legality criterion. Furthermore, all deadlines leading up to the GA were kept. No protests are made known and therefore the Chairperson confirms the legality of the General Assembly.
There are no comments concerning the Agenda.

Proceed to vote the approval of the agenda

In favour: 14
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1

The Agenda of the General Assembly is approved.

5. Adoption of the Internal Regulations

The Chairperson introduces the Internal Regulations of Statutory Meetings.

Proceed to vote:
Agree: 14
Against: 1
Abstentions: 0

The Internal regulations for the General Assembly of OBESSU are adopted.

The Chairperson explains the procedure to speak during the GA and the signals for direct reply and technical point.

6. Election of the Ballot Committee

The Chairperson explains the role and function of Ballot Committee and how it works. Three persons are needed for the Ballot Committee. LH proposes Stefan Frederiksen, AKS proposes Dora Jandl and DGS proposes Mads Waedegaard.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 15
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Ballot Committee is elected unanimously

7. Voting right for Member Organisations failing to pay the Annual Financial Contribution

The voting process is explained: according to the Statutes, only Member Organisations which have paid the Annual Financial Contribution (AFC) have the right to vote. There are seven Member Organisations present that have failed to pay the AFC. These are: EEO, LMS, MAKOSZ, UdS, UNL, USO, and CNE.

One delegate from each organisation has the chance to explain why their organisation has failed to pay the AFC on time. The General Assembly will vote after each organisation has presented, on whether to grant the right to vote/speak. To pass, a simple majority is needed.

The organisations concerned make a brief explanation and the Chairperson opens the floor for questions or comments.
63 FSS: Asks for a secret ballot for this voting as they consider it can be a delicate voting.
64 The Chairperson welcomes UDS which has just arrived. UDS also makes a brief statement.
65 The floor is open for Questions and Answers.
66 Some organisations ask questions related to the delayed payments and the organisations concerned reply
67 with an explanation.
68 The Chairperson explains the procedure to vote.
69 Roll Call to hand out the ballot papers
70 AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, DGS, DOS, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UNSS, VSK
71 Now we have 15 organisations with the right to vote in the room. A simple majority will be enough to grant
72 the right to vote to each organisation.
73 The Chairperson reads the names of the organisations and the ballot committee will collect the votes.
74 AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, DGS, DOS, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNSS, VSK
75 The ballot committee leaves the room with the secretary general to count the votes.
76 The Ballot Committee comes back with the results:
77 EEO is granted the right to vote by 10 in favour.
78 LMS is not granted the right to vote because the only obtain 7 votes in favour.
79 UDS is granted the right to vote by 13 in favour.
80 MAKOSZ is granted the right to vote by 9 in favour.
81 Now we have 18 MOs with the right to vote.
82 The Chairperson calls the vote to give CNE the right to speak.
83 Proceed to vote:
84 In favour: 18
85 CNE is granted the right to speak.
86 Now we have 18 MOs with the right to vote and 3 COs with the right to speak.

87 8. Adoption of minutes from the Extraordinary General Assembly and Council of
88 Members 2013
89 The Chairperson explains that the minutes where sent out in time. There are no comments or questions
90 about the minutes of the Extraordinary General Assembly and Council of Members 2013. The minutes are
91 adopted by acclamation.
9. **Speaking rights for extra delegates**

The Chairperson explains that there are some organisations with more than two delegates and, according to the internal regulations, the General Assembly has to vote on who has the right to speak.

There are no comments or questions.

**Proceed to vote to have unlimited number of speakers:**

- In favour: 18
- Against: 0
- Abstentions: 0

*Carried*

Therefore each delegation can have an unlimited number of speakers.

10. **Guests present at the General Assembly**

We do not have any guests now. The voting is postponed until we have guests joining the General Assembly.

11. **Presentation of the report on the Extraordinary General Assembly and Council of Members**

The rapporteur Martina from UDS who could not be present at the GA has proposed Maria Rodríguez (CANAE) to read the report of the ExGA and COMEM 2013.

There are no questions or comments.

12. **Presentation Activity and Impact Report 2014**

The Board presents the Activity and Impact Report 2014 that was sent out to all organisations.

**Highlights**

- Permanent observers of the CoE structure CDPPE
- Daniele Di Mitri in the steering committee of EUCIS-LLL
- Successful campaign on Social inclusion in education “Education we have a problem”
- Translation of the Manual for School Students in Macedonian and Georgian
- Participation in the European Youth Event in Strasbourg

**Structures and Participation**

- YFJ Education WG
- YFJ Taskforce on Post-2015
- EC ESL TWG/Stakeholder WG
OECD WG on School Resources
CoE Steering Committee Education Policy and Practice
EC Advisory Council on Vocational Training
UN Youth Advocacy Group on Global Education First Initiative
EUCIS-LLL Steering Committee

Policy and Advocacy
50 External Representations
Meetings with major political parties in the European Parliament
Close contact with all relevant institutions

School Student Structure Development
24 Member and Candidate organisations from 19 European Countries
Contact organisations in 22 countries
4 Study visits

Events
Training Course for International Officers, December 2013, Brussels
Joint Study Session with IGLYO, March 2014, Budapest
Education in Crisis, June 2014, Rome

Youth Policy
Vote@16
Structured Dialogue
UNESCO Youth Forum

Human Rights
Social Inclusion Campaign
Study Session in March.

Global issues
Post-2015
YAG
OECD WG

VET
ACVT of the EC
WG from OBESSU
ExtRep
Citizenship Education

- Summer School 2013
- NECE Conference
- EPEP “School Students' Europe 2019”

Commodification of education

- World Congress European Access Network
- Education in Crisis

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions. CANAE congratulates the Board for the work done in the past two years. They consider the advocacy and political work to be highly positive. Also, they thank the effort put into internal communication with MOs. They highlight the Study Visits as a good tool to make organisations involved in OBESSU. They ask if there has been the debate to join other international platforms as UNESCO.

SAKKI asks for the reasons behind the decision to abolish the VET Policy Officer position in the Secretariat. The Board replies:

- We plan to expand our advocacy work. We are now in the middle of writing the application to become members of UNESCO. Also, we would like to become closer to the European Youth Forum (YFJ) and that is why we plan to run for the Board elections, if OBESSU GA ratifies the decision.
- After a reflection process, the decision to abolish the VET Policy Officer position was made with the intention to move the political power to the Board. We realised this position on the Secretariat had become very political.

DGS asks if there are specifics and concrete papers, resolutions and documents as outcomes of all the activities and projects from the past year to share with their members. The Board replies:

- We try to have the impact evaluated in the impact report. Some examples are the report on Early School Leaving done by the EC where governments where represented. We did not put our name, but it has a school student focus. Other examples are the participation of OBESSU on the UN preparation of the guidelines on Education for Global Citizenship through our direct participation in YAG. We have also contributed on two policy papers of the YFJ: on Citizenship Education and Quality Education.
- We were invited to the revision to the recommendation of UNESCO on technical and vocational training. We are at the working group on the OECD and raised our concerns about PISA and finally, we cooperated with the OESC with an input on the communication: Opening up education where we had an audition to give our inputs.

Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

Now we have 18 MOs with the right to vote and 3 COs with the right to speak.
13. Report of the Secretary General

Office

- We have moved to a new office that is in a very good location and close to our partner organisations at European level.

The staff

- Rasmus – Secretary General
- Estel – Project Officer
- Giorgio – Communications and Membership Officer
- Paolo – Financial Manager

What:

- The Secretariat is in charge of the operational work of OBESSU, in close cooperation with the Board (Statements/reactions; meetings with partner organisations; training events; contact with prospective M0s)
- Applications and reports
- Logistics of events
- Administration
- Finances
- Communication

Communication

- Internal communication with member and candidate organisations.
- External communication: webpage, newsletter, social media

Finances

- Compared to last year, the finances are much more stable.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions. SAKKI asks about the lobby role of the secretariat. The Secretary General replies:

- The Secretariat does not do any lobby work because it is a political role done by the Board. Only if there is an event that the Board cannot attend, the Secretariat might go on behalf of them.


Financial report on 2013

The secretary General, Rasmus Aberg, explains the structure of the financial report 2013 and makes the summary of the year.
2013 was a good year and we got all the projects that we applied for.

We received the operating grant from the EC.

The balance was positive with 38€. We would love to have a surplus every year but it is very difficult to achieve this objective since the EC rules state that you are not allowed to have a surplus when getting an operating grant.

The highest amount of incomes came from the EC operating grant (150,000€) and the contribution of projects from EC and CoE.

When it comes to expenditure the biggest amount are the staff costs, employer charges (called ONSS) and travel costs.

As a summary, it was a relatively good year and there were no dramatic issues happening.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions. FSS asks about the different concepts of the financial report (difference between mailing and communication and between transportation and travel costs). SLL asks whether OBESSU has any buffer at this moment. DGS encourages OBESSU to prepare a simplified budget for the next GA to make it more understandable. Also, they ask what percentage of OBESSU’s budget is spent on projects and activities. The Secretary General replies:

Mailing costs are costs for postal costs (like sending out packages and letters), while communication costs are related to phone, Internet, copying, etc. Regarding the difference between transportation and travel, the Secretary General is not 100% sure.

OBESSU has a buffer in various ways, for example through a “social fund” to protect staff members against an eventual bankruptcy, in accordance with Belgian legislation. We wish the buffer could be bigger.

CANAE wants to know what is the advanced payment in the balance sheet. If we are going to receive the money expected as travels? And how does the per-diems system works. Finally, they want to know what the exceptional charges are.

When the Board member started, OBESSU gave them an advanced payment (“Board loan”) for them to pay for their travel expenses and avoid the need to use their personal money. At the end of their mandate, they will give it back.

All the travel payments are to be received in the next months.

Per-Diems are received by the Board and the Secretariat in case they are travelling for OBESSU events and in case they do not get their meals covered by the organiser.

Exceptional charges include the money that was stolen from the old office and money that we had to pay back to the European Commission for the YOUVET project.

LH would like to know how many hours are the employees hired for and ASUBIH asks for what are the AFC used for.

Officially the Secretariat is hired for 37 hours per week, but the employers work many more hours. Furthermore, the Secretariat does not get any payment for extra working time.
The money for AFC goes to the core budget and it is used for all the OBESSU expenses.

The Board explains that from their points of view, the results that we get from the Secretariat is much more worthy than the salary they get and they would like to be able to offer better salaries in the future.

**Budget 2014**

Rasmus explains that the rules have changed a little bit compared to last year because of the new Erasmus+ Programme from the European Commission.

Projects are: Education in Crisis (EiC), European Youth Foundation Work Plan 2014 (EYF WP 2014) and the Summer School Estonia (continued from 2013).

For EiC we received a grant from the EYF but unfortunately we did not get a grant from the Italian Ministry. Regarding the EYF WP 2014, we organised a Training for Trainees and two study visits (and we will have a third one in Latvia). The final activity of the Work Plan will be Right to Representation (R2R), from which we are waiting for an answer from the Flemish National Agency to get cofounding from the European Commission. We are also working on another application for the Europe for Citizens programme from the European Commission.

In general, the situation is a lot better than it could have been regarding the amount for projects.

It is difficult to plan how the year is going to finish because we are still waiting for project grants. Regardless of this, this will be a good year because we have had half of the year with only two full time Secretariat members.

The Chair opens the floor for questions.

CANAE acknowledges that in the last months we have seen some project grant applications rejected and encourages OBESSU to work hard for them. CANAE asks for the reasons why there has been a reduction on the amount for the operating grant.

ASUBIH asks for the reason why there is not the General Assembly in the budget.

LH points out that is strange to be approving a budget for €40,000 less than 2013.

Maribel Social, a social fund from Belgium will cover Giorgio’s salary for the next years.

Regarding the failed grant applications, with Erasmus+ the programme has changed and now we have to apply for our projects to the National Agencies and this makes it a little bit complicated because we are not in contact with them and we do not know what they want. An example can be the one with Summer School in Slovakia this year. This is the reasons why we are looking for other sources for the funding.

The reduction of the amount on the operating grant in was a decision by the EC, after negotiations with the Parliament and Council. The reduction is a pity, but it could have been much worse. We hope it will increase in future years.
The General Assembly is in the budget but not as a separate project. It is included in lines 22 and 23. (It is also for the COMEM later this year)

The reasons our budget is smaller than last year is because of the reduction of the operating grant. It should be emphasised that the budget is always an estimate and that it can change in the future.

SAKKI asks whether we have considered how OBESSU is going to manage if the general budget is the same amount as this year and we have three full-time employees.

First of all, we hope the European Commission will increase the amount again. But even if this will not be the case, we have the possibility to lower some of the expenses that we have.

SLL asks if OBESSU has expected to have sponsors during this year and for which amount.

We have had sponsors for this GA but we have not decided what are we going to get in the future, but it is an idea we want to keep working on in non-funded activities or projects.

There are no more questions or comments so the Chairperson calls for the vote to adopt the Budget 2014.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
The budget 2014 is adopted.

FSS asks when the AFC will be adopted this year.

The annual financial contribution was adopted for 3 years and it is adopted automatically with the adoption of the budget.

The Board takes the floor and thanks the Secretariat for the hard work. There have been some struggles and issues going and they have been great.

15. Report from the Working Groups and the Pool of Trainers

European Parliament Elections Platform “School Students’ Europe 2019”

- Political platform for the Parliament elections of 2014.
- Timeline: Policy paper from GA Haapsalu, first toolkit (Autumn 2013), advocacy work started (autumn 2013), second toolkit (spring 2014), public debate at the European Youth Event (EYE).
- Policy paper: made in cooperation with the MOs, through questionnaire and discussions, three clear topics were selected.
- Advocacy: SMART goals were set, effort was put in planning the meetings, the presented demands received a positive response and the social media mentions were successful.
- MOs: toolkits for MOs were planned, more encouragement should have happened to MOs.
- There was an event on Facebook and the EYE debate with ESU.
- Impact: MOs’ response was low, in general there was a low engagement with the EP elections.
- SMART goals were met: institutional relationships between OBESSU and political parties.
Possible next steps: meeting with the future CULT committee, follow up with political youth organisations, post-election debates.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions and comments.

CANAE wants to congratulate for the Working Group and apologise for not being very active.

Pool of Trainers

- We have a Pool of Trainers at use for the member organisations. It includes trainers and facilitators with different levels of experience and it was created with this idea.
- It is generally working well.
- Members of the pool can benefit from going to different external trainings.
- The biggest project of the pool is to work on the OBESSU “enlargement project”, where they take an active role in the study visits to candidate and partner organisations.
- Trainers are very interested to come to your trainings.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions and ASuBiH asks how they can have a study visit to their organisation.

- Study Visits belong to the EYF Work Plan 2014 and they are already set. If any member organisation is organising a training or activity, they can always ask someone from the pool to go there.

Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

We have 18 member organisations in the room, and 4 with the right to speak. The simple majority remains at 10.

Social Inclusion Campaign Taskforce

“Education we have a problem!” Campaign

Topics covered:

- Costs of education
- “Education snobbery”
- Special needs
- Ethnic and religious minorities
- Gender identity and sexual orientation

Timeline

- Launch in October 2013 in Brussels with many partner organisations
- Organisational fair before YFJ COMEM (November 2013, Thessaloniki)
- Input session at the TCIO (December 2013, Brussels)
- Closing of the Campaign at the EYE (May 2014, Strasbourg)
- Online initiative (October 2013 - February 2014)

Outcomes and results:

- Case study on hidden costs in education
- Guidelines on social inclusion in education
Visibility and influence: (Increased influence)

- SIRIUS stakeholder meeting on teachers with migrant background, March 2014
- Speaker at IGLYO resource launch, January 2014
- Conference on homophobic and transphobic bullying in schools, June 2014, Athens
- The role of VET in making education more inclusive, November 2013, Vilnius

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions and comments. ASuBiH wants to know where the pictures that MOs sent to the Secretariat for the campaign are and SAKKI asks who the targets of the campaign were.

- The pictures people sent are included in a Facebook album.
- We had two main aims: First one was for MOs to spread the campaign at national level and it was up to the MOs to pick up what they thought was relevant. The second one was to bring up the topic at European level. It was a starting point to show what Inclusive education is and if the guidelines are approved, it will be a next step.

16. Report of the Monitoring Committee

The Monitoring Committee (MC) compiled this report that is presented by Kristen Aigro. The MC is composed by Kristen, Alvaro and Ville.

How do they work

- They started only being two (Ville and Kristen) and it was complicated to get things done.
- They did not have any references and they had to decide on how to organise themselves and their work.
- They worked via skype and whatsapp
- One meeting in Sarajevo
- Visit to the COMEM
- Skype meetings

Events

- Not very monitored because they could not attend all the events, and only have feedback from participants.
- Events are a strength of OBESSU

Statutory meetings

- Improvements like: policy corners, online pre-meetings and gender balance on rapporteurs.
- There has been a change to separate the GA, there was a concern, but most of MOs are here.

Board

- The MC is very satisfied with the Board’s work
They have been through many changes (new Secretary General, new Board member), but they kept things going.

**Secretariat**

- They have been working very hard, with a lot of changes in the organisation.
- There has been a lot of changes, but the organisation is strong and the membership officer is an important new position and we think it is an improvement.
- The Board has been helping the Secretariat a lot when they were understaffed.

**Workplan**

- The summer school is the only think that has not been done, because of the lack of funding.

**Advocacy and communication**

- There seems to be a problem when we send out calls or surveys to MOs, it is a problem from the organisations side but also it should be investigated further how to encourage participation.
- OBESSU has a really good reputation with partner and other organisations.
- Improvement: presence in new structures and to new organisations.

**Political Platform**

- There have been 74 points of the PP followed out of the 81 demands that one can find on the document.

**Working Groups and Pool of Trainers**

- The Working Groups have been less effective as the motivation is not that high. This is something that needs to be looked at.
- The PoT has a good reputation.

**Structure development**

- Some MOs left OBESSU but there are some new members coming in.
- Something new: Affiliate Organisations that opens the door for new organisations and more countries and students in Europe.

**Finances**

- Generally the budget has been observed as it was adopted.
- The Board has internal regulations and everything has been followed.
- There are cash-flow problems, due to delays in payments of grants.
- 92% of income was from an outside source.
- The new Erasmus+ programme has brought some insecurity compared to previous years.
- The report of the external auditor was approved, so finances are in good shape.
The overlapping mandate system

- The system started last year.
- It is in motion now but there are pros and cons.
  - Cons: It does affect a lot of the team work (portfolio). It creates a problem with the team spirit.
  - With the new election, next year GA we will elect only 1 person, which will create a problem.
- Suggestion from the MC: the Board that will be elected decides that one of the people resigns after one year. Otherwise we will not be able to put the overlapping mandate in motion.

The Chairperson invites the Board to leave the room and opens the floor for questions and comments.

DGS suggests that if in this GA MOs only elected 5 members in next GA they could elect 3 people more and it would put into run the overlapping system. SAKKI asks if there is a big thing to do by the Board or the Secretariat and SIF asks for clarification when talking about the insecurity produced by the new Erasmus+ programme.

- This election system would work. But the MC has realised that a Board of five works better than a bigger one. But this is also an option.
- Changes with the Board and secretariat: The big change now is the overlapping mandate and to make it work. We will have the first results now with Luke continuing and going from there we will see.
- More help will be needed from the MOs at their national level as OBESSU will only be able to apply to National Agencies and it will not be so easy.
- From the report of the Board and Secretariat it is difficult to say if they have to make any major changes. We are happy on how the Board has been working and things right now are going well.

SLL asks if they found something important for the MC and what would you do differently and if they created any kind of regulations for the MC work that are going to pass to the new MC. EEO asks if there is a way to make the Board and the MC work more transparent. SIF asks if they see more pros or cons with the overlapping mandates.

- The MC tries to communicate with the members. They did not get a lot of inputs, but it is interesting when getting them. It is also interesting to be next to the Board and Secretariat and also be there for them for help they might need.
- The MC is an advisory body and tries to make sure that things work. We try to see the things MOs do not see and provide an overview of what has been going on.
- We will give a number of documents to the new MC so they do not have to start from scratch.
- The Board has been transparent on what is necessary and all this information is out there. They have an external representation spreadsheet that is public, but there might be other ways to think on how to communicate this information to the members because it seems that is not reaching the MOs.
The MC does not have a really straightforward answer. In theory is a good idea in case of big changes, but it is difficult because it creates a gap between old and new members and slows down the work.

LH asks what do the MC thinks OBESSU can do to improve at the financial level. CANAE asks whether the MC should meet more often and have a bigger budget assigned to them. AKS asks on the method the MC used to contact MOs, if there is a set method or it is based at a personal level.

The MC job is to point out what is not working properly. The Secretariat is working on it and the only thing to say is that the MOs should be active and help when applying to their countries.

The Statutes say that MC should meet twice a year and attend all the events and this did not happen. Much more could be done but if finances are difficult, we cannot always be there. In the ideal conditions, yes the MC should meet up at least twice per year and participate in all events.

We did not have a proper overview of the MOs. The contacts were made more informally and had not been managed.

SIF asks if the MC think the Board should have done something differently or that could be improved. ISSU asks on what could be done to avoid the difficulties at the beginning of the mandate of the MC.

The MC has the impression that internally not all Board members are happy with their portfolios and it has also happened with the enlargement of the team. There is a problem there and it will happen again with the overlapping mandate. It is important to think how are the portfolios being distributed and it has to be the team who discusses it.

We did not receive much information from the previous MC. The previous MC and the new one did not agree on the role of the MC so they had to start from scratch. Also, the Board was not happy with the old MC work.

CANAE asks for the MC report in advance to be able to evaluate the work.

You will receive a document as soon as possible.

The Board is welcomed back in the room and the Chairperson updates them that the GA wants to hear their opinion on the overlapping mandate.

CANAE asks for the personal opinion of each of the Board members about the overlapping mandate.

Dejan: In theory it makes perfect sense but unfortunately it slowed down the pace of the work, and it was a little bit difficult. Nevertheless, it is fair to still give it a shot. It was not the most efficient process, but he would not cancel it.

Luke: Agree with Dejan that it works well in principle. It does make sense to have a process to ensure a proper handover to continue from the old and new. But it practice things do not work as easily as thought. It is hard to evaluate now that we have only had the first part and not the second with the new Board.

The Board has to ensure to make a new group and group dynamics.

Nora: The overlapping mandate has been a topic in my OBESSU life. It wasn’t the easiest thing, but with every change there are always positive and negative things. In theory is a good thing, to have
some kind of insurance that there is a process to pass on the information. It is hard for the group dynamics, but this has happened before also when people resigned. The problem is that is loose in the Statutes and they are very open on this matter. Maybe if you GA decide to carry this one, take into consideration on clarifying the guidelines to implement this.

- Daniele: Looking back at the history, the process was not really smooth and the result was that there were only people elected for 2 years and in the last elections there was only 1 candidate running. There was a failure on the lack of candidates and not clear guidelines on how to implement the overlapping mandates. We need to see in the future how it works or if there are more problems.

- Dasa: If we want to make it work, there has to be a fixed number of Board members. The Board of OBESSU is its face and this is something stable, and once you get to know this faces, and this is a strong thing. If there is the overlapping you can have too many faces leaving and coming in every year.

- Ida: We have to bear in mind that we are only halfway to implement it. Even though you have the people working, every time you have someone new, you have to redistribute workload and portfolios. Every 6 months we have been having elections and it has been a mess. I agree with the idea but so far it did not work.

There are no more questions or comments from the GA.

The Chairperson gives the floor to Nora that explains how the policy corners will work. This should not replace the discussion that is going to take place on the plenary of the GA.

### 17. Policy Corners I

- Workplan 2015-2017
  - SAKKI, FSS, SLL Amendment
- Development Strategy
- Amendments to the Statutes

The Chairperson welcomes everyone again after the break. He explains that organisations can present urgent motions and resolutions and that the deadline is tomorrow morning at 9h.

He also informs that LMS has paid their membership fee and therefore they will be given the voting card at the next Roll Call.

### Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

Now there are 19 organisations present with the right to vote and 3 with the right to speak and the simple majority is 10.
18. **Candidate Status of UNEL**

The Chairperson explains that by decision of the Board there are two candidate organisations and now the GA will decide if they ratify the status of Candidate Organisation of UNEL.

UNEL delegates take the floor and present their organisation.

The Board explains the reasons why they gave the status of candidate organisation to UNEL.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions.

DGS asks on how large the rate of students they represent is.

- UNEL: it is difficult to say. It is not really clear to know how many people. We work more as a platform and we do not insist on fees. We want to open participation to more people on our activities, but our main focus is to be as representative as possible and to be as inclusive as possible.

LMS asks if they work with school councils and CANAE wants to know if students join UNEL directly or if there is a regional structure in the organisation. They also ask on how they make the difference between school students and university students.

- UNEL: There are structured bodies as school councils and we have worked with them in the past for instance on some campaigns. We also have members on our body that are at school councils.

- We do not structurally make a distinction between school students and university students, they have the same rights, but interests might be different. Usually the events are more attended by school students because they are in the country.

- We used to have regional organisations in the past but we had a split many years ago that took the regional committees. Luxembourg is so small that there is no need to create these regional structures.

There are no more questions and the Chairperson calls for the vote to ratify the Board decision to give UNEL the status of Candidate Organisation of OBESSU.

**Proceed to vote:**

- In favour: 18
- Against: 0
- Abstentions: 1

The GA ratifies the decision to grant UNEL the status of Candidate organisation.

19. **Discussion and voting on proposals and amendments I**

**Work Plan 2013/2014**

Amendment #1 (UDS, AKS, UNL, CANAE)

Line 224
Add: “It is important to remember the historical meaning of the 17th of November for school student organisations, which is not always known and taken into account.

In 1941, the International Students Council declares for the first time the 17th of November as the “International Day of the student”, because of on that day happens very important facts for the national student movement.

On the 28th of October in 1939, during the occasion of the anniversary of the independence of Czechoslovakia, students and teachers of the University of Prague were demonstrating against the Nazi regime and for independence. The Nazi regime responded with harsh repression of the event and on that occasion they killed the student Jan Opletal. On 15th of November, on the occasion of the funeral of Jan Opletal, students turned the funeral procession in a demonstration against the Nazi regime. A few days after the event at the University of Prague repression became was much harder: many buildings were closed, thousands of students and teachers were arrested and 9 people amongst them were executed without a trial on the 17th of November.

And yet, on the 17th of November 1973, at the peak of the Greek revolt against the dictatorship of the colonels, a tank bursted at the University of Athens repressing the student revolt.

It is in 2004 that during the World Social Forum, an international students meeting attended by international associations was organised and launched the 17th of November as a day of commemoration and international action.

The International Day of the students has a long history of contents and global actions. From mere commemoration of the day it has become a way to continue to raise the voice of students from around the world and to bring attention to issues such as Quality in Education, rights and democracy.

If it is true that education systems are different from country to country, it is also true that the student struggles are often highly interconnected. Even today, students face huge problems such as access to education and the cost of it.

With this day we remember student movement of the past, but we want to remember too that students have to be themselves an important part of the decision making process also in the present.

For this reason, this year OBESSU wants to invest on the day of 17th November and bring it in the context of the economic crisis on education.

OBESSU believes that the best way to make this process inclusive for all MOs is to use the policy paper Education in Crisis and the resolution from the omonim event held in Rome, as international platform of the day. OBESSU is also going to promote, on the basis of that document, an international call of action for the 17th of November, which could also involve school student organisations that are not part of OBESSU at European Level, and extra-European ones to create a global students cooperation on these themes. Moreover we believe we should be able to work closer on this occasion with the European Students Union, always keeping in mind that struggles for education are not sectoral, but should be able to give a complex
and complete picture of society, that cannot abstract from the material conditions that students all over Europe live every day in and outside educational institutions.”

After: “of the Light on the Rights Documentary”

UDS: the sense of the amendment was that we thought it would be very important to stress the day of 17th November to keep struggling for school student rights. The amendment goes through the history until now. We think it would be very interesting that all organisations stressed it.

There are no comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 13
Against: 2
Abstentions: 4
Carried

Workplan 2015-2017

Daniele and Dasa from the Board of OBESSU present the Workplan 2015-2017

The Chairperson explains that first we are going to open the floor for discussion about the Work Plan and then present and discuss the amendments. Finally, we will vote for the Workplan.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions and comments.

SLL asks if there is a budget for all this Working Groups and if they will be ad hoc working Groups.

➢ Each Working Group will run for a year and not all together. There is still no budget, but if we approve them, we will include them in the budget.

SAKKI exposes their concern for the fact that there is not going to be a VET Working Group foreseen in 2015.

➢ The idea is that it starts again in 2016 and this was a decision taken to prioritise the Working Groups in 2016. Not everything done by OBESSU has a Working Groups and it does not mean that the work on this topic will stop.

CANAE asks for more spaces for debate with the MOs on the process of making the new Workplan. The involvement in the discussions has depended only on the people attending events and not within MOs. They also call to MOs to think how to translate the Workplan to their national realities. They also propose to establish a system to revise the objectives during the implementation of the Workplan as its objective might change during the implementation years. They also have the question why there is no WG in 2017. Finally, they ask for the possibility to have an editable version of all campaigns and materials so they can translate it to their languages.

SLL asks what the Board is planning to do to make the PoT more usable for the MOs.
SAKKI insists on the importance VET is taking at European level and wonders how the Board is going to do it without a VET policy officer or a Working Group.

➢ For the moment there is no way planned to revise the WP, but the way how it was envisioned was for it to be flexible and not rigid and to adapt to the needs of the next GAs and COMEMs.

➢ True, there is not WG, but this is another occasion to take notes for the future. This was a complicated process to create a work plan for such a long period of time and putting all the needs together. You are welcome to propose changes to the WP in the future.

➢ Up until now it was not possible to share the editable versions of all our materials because they were done by an external graphic designer. Now with Giorgio in the office we will be able to do it.

➢ The PoT was created at the previous WP and it was implemented a bit more than a year ago and now in the last year we extended it and made it bigger with the study visits and the training. It is been this year that we have been working on it. We feel it is important to keep it, but to keep for the new Board to work on it and how to make it better.

➢ The Board took a very conscious decision to change the role of the former Policy Officer and to ensure that the political roles are taken by the Board and not by someone in the secretariat. VET will remain important for OBESSU in the future as well. Also, keeping the VET WG might not mean to lower the work load for the Secretariat or the Board.

Amendment #1 (FSS, SLL, SAKKI)

Lines 135 and After 173/174

**ADD:** ADD “Member Organisation Forum “AFTER ...“Working Groups,”

ADD ” Member Organisation Forum

The Member Organisation Forum is an online discussion platform created for the member organisations and Board of OBESSU. The main aim of creating the Member Organisation Forum is to improve the internal communication and transparency of the organisation and to increase the exchange of ideas and knowledge between member organisations. The Member Organisation forum also works as a pilot for using more internet-based solutions in creating the policy work of school student unions.

**AFTER:** “...outcomes of Education in crisis.”

FSS: We wanted to tackle the issues about internal communication in OBESSU. There have been some earlier issues in communication between MOs between events and between the Board and MOs. We think this will help.

The Chairperson opens the floor for debate.

LH asks if they have thought about who would be the moderators and control the discussions in the Forum.
FSS: To make it easy to launch we made the amendment flexible to give space to the Board to decide the best way to implement it.

UNEL shares their previous experience with online forums and they point out that in general these spaces are not used and people end up using email or Facebook. It is critical because people have to specifically log in to a new platform.

SAKKI: We discussed the kind of Forum it should be, but we wanted to give the idea and develop it within OBESSU in the future.

DGS asks on the access rights to the forum.

SIF point out that it might not be as effective as we would like if people are not logging in. But we could have a system where people could upload their amendments and discussions there.

FSS insist that they haven’t really thought of it, it is still very open.

UDS sees the point of looking for a solution to communicate between MOs but they are concerned about who will have access to it. They are also worried that online platforms might substitute the face-to-face meetings.

DGS insists on asking who is going to decide who is going to be in the platform. For them we are voting on the idea that can be great, but it is still only an idea.

UNSS: It is a great idea but it is floating in the air because it is not concrete.

SAKKI: About who should be in the forum: for them it does not matter who is there, it says that MOs will give their knowledge in there. There can be different understandings on how to do it. The idea behind it is that every MO will impact in there.

UNEL asks for Candidate organisations to be included in the amendment.

FSS: the Board in OBESSU are the ones deciding how to do things in practice. In practice the discussions could be divided with the technicians. We can solve the practical matters if we are creative.

DGS suggests to vote against the amendment and to create a Facebook group to solve the problem.

ISSU points out this might exclude people that are not on Facebook.

ASUBIH does not see the point to create a new Facebook group.

SLL stresses there are already lots of Facebook groups but in a way it is better to develop another option for that.

SIF: we should not think on how we do it, but just vote and go from there.

There are no more comments or questions, thus the Chairperson calls for the vote on the proposal.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 16
Against: 0
Abstentions: 3
Carried

Amendment #2 (CANAE)

ADD:

“Conference: School methods 2020

Decision makers often try to improve education by law changes. However, they sometimes forget that one of the main factors for educational quality is not in the hands of the law, but in schools and teachers: the methods. Whereas other sectors (such as medicine) change their techniques day by day as soon as research discoveries emerge, teaching methods evolve too slowly. Many teachers keep giving their lessons the same way they used to 50 years ago, and they are reluctant to implement innovations that pedagogy research finds out. New methods could boost school students’ motivation, improve attention to diversity and help students to take the most advantage of their individual skills.

At this event, we will compare what methodologies are used in our countries and invite experts in innovative teaching methods. We are going to discuss all these inputs in order to come up with the recommendation School methods 2020. This paper will compile new methods that should be implemented in our schools by the end of the decade.”

AFTER: “…legality and peace, vote at 16.”

CANAE: There are efficient experiences from all of our countries. We think OBESSU has not discussed enough about this topic and we think it could be interesting and important to discuss it now.

The Chairperson opens the floor for debate.

ASuBiH supports this amendment. All Countries face this problems and it is important to tackle.

DGS asks how it works with having an extra conference with the budget.

FSS supports it 100% and it is a very important topic for them. There is very few people lobbying about this kind of topics and it is very important for OBESSU to speak about it even if we have to change the budget.

LH supports the amendment and they think it is interesting to share experiences and best practices. Also, in Denmark there are a lot of networks working on this so it would be easy to get funding.

➢ Rasmus clarifies that we do not have a budget for this because there is no budget for 2016. He explains how it works in case it is approved.

UNSS supports this amendment but it would make sense if we included teachers or professors at the conference.
There are no more questions or comments, thus the Chairperson calls the vote.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 19
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

Carried

All the proposed amendments have been discussed and voted upon. Therefore, the Chairperson calls for the vote on the whole Workplan 2015-2017.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 18
Against: 1
Abstentions: 0

The Workplan 2015-2017 is approved by the GA.

Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO(not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

Now there are 18 organisations present with the right to vote and 3 with the right to speak and the simple majority is 10.

Development Strategy 2015-2019


The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion.

LH asks if their amendment to the statues will affect the development strategy. They also express their disagreement with the point concerning the consistency of the statues.

Board: The amendment in case is carried will not affect the development strategy because they are separate documents. If a MO wants to change the Statutes, there are the procedures to follow it. We propose to find a way to find other documents for ad hoc changes that do not need to change the Statutes at every statutory meeting.

LH: From their point of view it is critical that MOs have the opinion that the Statutes should not be changed. It is very democratic that you can change the Statutes.

DGS points out that there are no amendments past on the development strategy and they do not understand how can a document overrule the Statutes.

Board: explains the Statutes are the governing paper of OBESSU and any amendments can be proposed but the Development Strategy is saying that as a platform we should be careful how often we change the Statutes, not that it cannot be changed or not. The strategy is saying that we should be reconsidering what we put in the Statutes.
DGS: From their point of view, the way how is written the document is very unclear.
LH does not agree with the wording. MOs should consider if amendments are necessary or not on the spot and not before.
Board: From their perspective the phrasing is showing the aim, not that it is obligatory. We are not prejudging any amendments to the Statutes. All amendments will be welcomed and discussed. We are drawing attention to the point on how we handle amendments.
UNEL: Wants to support the Board. It is anyway on the group proposing an amendment to convince the GA that it is necessary. This is very deeply thought through. It is not preventing people to proposing changes on the Statutes. If we change Statutes so often, it can challenge the consistency of the documents.
CANAE thanks the Board for the development strategy. From their point of view the document lacks more concrete points on how to evaluate the strategy and they propose to discuss further indicators and measurable objectives at a COMEM.
SLL agrees with CANAE, but what they would have liked to see first a draft to be able to input during the elaboration process.
CANAE thinks the strategy should be approved now, but the evaluation method should be further developed at the next statutory meeting.
DGS generally opposes the idea of a 5 year strategy because the picture might change. From their point of view we have many documents that we are changing all the time. For them a 2-year WP is enough.
UNEL thinks is a really good idea to have a strategy because it is flexible to adapt in the future. It has important goals. They agree that there should be accountability.
UDS appreciates the work that has been done. They believe a WP is very different from a strategy document. The WP is binding and it is a programme, the PP includes the values, and we need a strategy to guide us. At national level we might not need it because you are there every day. Thus, being a European organisation, we should follow some of the tendencies that are being followed at the European level. It is better to give a longer perspective.
UNSS can agree that is too many documents and it can be little bit confusing, but it is good to have long term aims, because when you change the Board that often, if you do not have a document like this it is difficult to forget the aims.
CSU agrees with UDS. The development strategy can be a fundament document that builds the organisation. This document should be accepted.
Board: The purpose of the document is to ensure the improvement of the organisation (the others make sure the organisation runs). On how we monitor and evaluate, we had the discussion but the idea was that it did not make sense to create arbitrary numbers, but leave it open to the interpretation of the MOs to decide how would we would like to hold the Board accountable.
CANAE points out that MOs are the ones who are going to choose how to implement the development strategy.

Board: The Board creates the strategy but the question on how to do it is also a responsibility for the MOs to interpret. MOs should be the ones deciding on the indicators.

CANAE asks again on the evaluation of the implementation, and also wants to know what we are going to do with the Workplan, as it should include the steps to fulfil the objectives.

Board: There is no planned way on how to evaluate the development of the Workplan and we welcome everyone to give us some ideas.

About the WP, we do not see a contradiction between the two documents. The Development Strategy together with the Workplan will help the Board, the MOs and MCs on thinking how to run the organisation.

We would have liked to see more amendments as there are so many concerns about the document.

Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

Now we are 19 organisations with the right to vote and 3 with the right to speak. The simple majority will be 10.

As there are no further comments or questions, the Chairperson calls the vote to approve or not the Development Strategy.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 10
Against: 2
Abstentions: 7

The Development Strategy 2015–2019 is approved.

Statutes

Amendment #1 (SLL, SAKKI, FSS)

Line 393

**ADD:** “d) At each Board meeting, the Board will elect a Chairperson, rotating between all Board members, who is responsible for:

- coordinating the work of the Board until the next Board meeting
- monitoring the Board’s tasks to ensure they are fulfilled
- chairing the next Board meeting”

**AFTER:** “c) The Board will have a Board meeting at least three times a year.”
SAKKI: We think this could make the organisation better reachable externally and internally. From our point of view, it would mean an improvement.

The Chairperson explains the procedure to discuss the amendments 1, 2 and 3 and opens the floor for debate.

UDS would prefer to have the word Chairperson or coordinator instead of President. From their point of view, the creation of the Chairperson would mean that someone in the Board would have more power and be more important than the others and would give a wrong message of what OBESSU is. If this person would be the one representing the organisation externally, we have the example that without a Chairperson it can also work. If this person has to deal with internal communication, they do not see the need of calling in president. If we need an external press person, they suggest having a communication portfolio. Furthermore, they do not see the point on giving remuneration to this person in the future. From their point of view, OBESSU must highlight and recognise does who do not have more skills to speak, and we should be school of activists.

FSS points out that the amendment does not include the word president.

DGS says it has the word President.

UNSS does not agree with it. If you have a president you have a hierarchic structure and a person having more power within the Board. From their point of view, all Board members should be equal to operate the best way.

VSK recommends to vote against this amendment because we have a very well functioning Board and do not think that there is the need for a president. Being a Board member already means a lot of work. Also, for external communication, they agree on having a communication and press portfolio.

CSU are concerned if there is a suitable person that could cover the 19 countries and people and if he/she would be able to represent all the students.

DOS thinks that OBESSU has been without president for almost 40 years and it is been working properly. The Board represents all the organisations and a person alone cannot represent them all.

DGS expresses that it is important to pass this for the quality of the ethos of the organisation, because it will help with the external way of acting of OBESSU.

AKS thinks it is important that the MOs criticize the work of the structures of the organisations but they do not agree because they do not think it is democratic that the Board decides who this person is, and because there is already people responsible for external relations within the Board. They believe that OBESSU is about the member organisations and not the people. A Board therefore is more representative and they believe is the responsibility of the MOs to cooperate to reach the media.

AKS also proposes the secret ballot for the voting.

LH is against the amendment and would like to question the Board on how they would feel being a member of a Board with a Chairperson.
UNEL thinks that having a president would invite hierarchy and populism and create a constant campaigning. They think that having a Board fully support the aims of the organisation and are against the amendment even though they cannot vote.

FSS supports the secret ballot. They think their organisation always tries to develop OBESSU. They are not trying to create any hierarchies and the idea is to get more structured and get the OBESSU works more fluent and easy going.

SIF would like to hear the Board opinion on the matter.

VSK do not agree that having a president would make OBESSU a more professional organisation. They think we have an organisation that is giving responsibilities to 5 people and it is more democratic than giving it only to one.

DGS does not believe that it is going to be more populists. They think OBESSU could have someone to go to the press and make our picture better known at the European level. It would contribute to the European situation of the media.

The Board does not support the amendment because they do not see how this would work in OBESSU. From their point of view, national and European organisations are very different. Board members come from MOs with very different structures and we have a network that is very different, that is why we need equal and shared responsibilities. Board members are volunteers, and it would be very impossible for this person to coordinate the whole work of the platform on a volunteer basis. All Board members have their own portfolios and they monitor and speak up about them at the Board meetings. They all have their own areas of expertise and one of these portfolios is media and Public Relations because there is no European media to face to. They have a rotating system to chair the meetings. Furthermore, from their point of view they do not think that the Board electing the president is a democratic process.

VSK expresses their fear is not that the president would take populist points of view, but they think it is more democratic to have an equal Board. The chair has more prestige and more strength, but the chair can only attend one on six meetings and it would also affect the prestige of the other Board members.

AKS reminds everyone that we are at European level and that there is no such thing as European media, it is more the MOs task at national level. Organisations need to adapt to the structures that we have.

UNSS thinks that if we vote for this amendment, we should also change the monitoring obligations, and we could not do it until the next GA. The Board thinks it is not necessary.

Board stresses that OBESSU has a communication officer and a public relations Board member.

DOS thinks that OBESSU goals should not only be to be on the media.

SAKKI thinks there is something really bad in an organisation if the president is going to be the boss. The president is responsible for but does not mean that he/she has to do everything. So it can be done by anyone.
UNEL does not see what the president is supposed to be doing a part from the press tasks. There is no European press per se. We could work on the press releases and work with the MOs on this. MOs can do this.

Statement to the minutes: SLL proposes that the speaking list will be closed.

There are no further comments or questions and therefore the Chairperson explains the voting system by secret ballot.

**Roll Call**

AKS, ASUBIH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

We have a second roll call to collect the ballots:

AKS, ASUBIH, CANAE, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNSS, VSK.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 7
Against: 11
Abstentions: 1

The amendment #1 is not carried.

Amendment #2 (SLL, SAKKI, FSS) (only if previous amendment is passed)

Line 393

Replace:

“e) At every Board meeting the Board will decide on a Board member who conducts the next Board meeting.”

FOR:

“e) At every Board meeting the Board will decide on a Board member who hosts the next Board meeting.”

The amendment is not discussed as the previous one was not carried.

Amendment to Statute Amendment #1 and #2 (UDS)

Line 393

Add:

“d) At each Board meeting, the Board will elect a Chairperson, rotating between all Board members, who is responsible for:
coordinating the work of the Board until the next Board meeting
monitoring the Board’s tasks to ensure they are fulfilled
chairing the next Board meeting”

AFTER:
“c) The Board will have a Board meeting at least three times a year.”

The amendment is not discussed or voted upon as the two previous amendments were not carried.

DAY 2, Sunday
The Chairperson welcomes everyone back.
Roll call
AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.
There are 18 organisations present with right to vote and 3 with the right to speak.
The Chairperson explains that we will continue the discussions about the Statutes that yesterday was not finished.
Amendment #3 (LH)
Line 33
Add:
G) To promote new teaching methods in learning and promote healthy teaching environment.
LH thinks that this is a big problem in Denmark and also in other northern countries, that teaching methods are not inclusive. They think OBESSU should promote this and to have it in the Statutes means more than just having it in the Workplan.
There are no comments or questions.
Proceed to vote:
In favour: 17
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1
Carried

20. Vote of Trust YFJ Candidacy
Nora explains that during the last two years OBESSU has used the European Youth Forum (YFJ) to speak up and now we want to engage even more, by running for the Board. The current Board of OBESSU thinks it is more democratic and transparent to first discuss it with the GA and therefore they propose Dejan Bojanić.

Dejan explains his personal engagement with the YFJ. He has been involved in the task force for the UN and the Structured Dialogue and in a couple of meetings. He explains the motivations to represent OBESSU in the YFJ.

The main ideas we want to focus during the candidacy are:

- Strengthen education. We do believe we are among the main stakeholders on education. They have been focusing a lot on NFE, but formal and informal education has had enough space in the YFJ.
- Education for Citizenship. Our expertise can contribute on how vote@16 is implemented. We think OBESSU is one of the main experts in this issue.
- Critical approach to youth policy. Sometimes the YFJ only advocates to have youth everywhere and only making policy for policy.
- Focus on social inclusion. So far the YFJ has focuses only partially, and we think there is no HR related initiative from the YFJ.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion.

DGS would like to stress the need to change the vision of young people as lazy and selfish.

Dejan: We agree, and it is important because in the last GA we already approved a position on this so it should be one of priority areas.

LH asks how this will be connected with the new OBESSU Board.

Nora explains that when OBESSU engages with other platforms, we usually do it with former Board members because it is too much work and we do not want any of the new Board members to be taken by other responsibilities rather than focusing on our platform. What is clear, though, is that one of the main points of the new Board will be to decide on the communication between Dejan and them. In the YFJ, candidates run in the name of the member organisation. So this candidacy is a candidacy of OBESSU and not of one person. Therefore, we should all feel ownership of this position and the ties with the YFJ. It would be beneficial to talk with the NYC and other organisations you are involved with, to explain them that we are running.

UDS thinks it is a good step forward in the European scenario and they hope that the GA will give a vote of trust today. We should firmly stand for the fundamental ideas we believe.

As the YFJ, they have been doing a lot of things on the Youth Guarantee, we should also benefit from the work they are doing. In this sense, they remind that it is important to keep the contact with the Board of OBESSU.

DGS asks how many people are running, how is composed the YFJ Board and what are our chances.
Dejan explains that normally there are approximately twice as many candidates as places. He explains the two pillars of the YFJ (INGYOs and NYCs), and that we will have to convince the people from INGYOs. We do not by default get support by members, but we have to candidate a lot and in the past years it has been a little more difficult.

CANAE asks if there are any other educational organisations running for the Board.

Board explains that so far we only know that AEGEE is going to run for Vice-President.

CANAE proposes to have more coordination with NYCs in order to have more impact in education. If we are elected, we could do a real work in education at national level.

Board also sees the need to better coordinate and work with the NYC.

ISSU ask for how long OBESSU has not been in the YFJ Board.

Board explains that Luca Scarpieio was a former OBESSU person but was in the YFJ through the Italian NYC, not through OBESSU. The last one was in 2004.

There are no more questions or comments, thus the Chairperson calls for the vote of trust to Dejan Bojanić as OBESSU candidate for the YFJ Board.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

OBESSU General Assembly gives their trust to Dejan Bojanić unanimously.

21. Policy Corners II

The Chairperson explains how the policy corners will work.

- Guidelines (Social Inclusion/LGBTQ-Inclusive)
- OBESSU “crib sheet” on the Post-2015 Agenda
- Education in Crisis Resolution
  - Board amendments
- Amendments to the Political Platform

Roll call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO(not present), VSK.

There are 18 organisations present with right to vote and 3 with the right to speak.

22. Presentation CSU

CSU delegates take the floor and present their organisation.
The Board explains the reasons why they gave the status of Candidate Organisation to CSU.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions.

AKS asks about the inclusion projects of the organisations and why there are so few women in their structures and activities.

SAKKI asks if they also represent VET students.

DGS asks for how long they have existed.

CSU: We exist only for one and a half year and we started with the “dubbing project”. When finished, we are starting other projects. We are a very young organisation, and we are establishing so we do not have social inclusion projects.

For the women, it is true that in the Board we have only one girl, but we spoke about this in the GA, but there were only two candidates and one was elected to the Board. We have women in the Secretariat and in the next GA we hope there will be more people.

We only represent high school students. We cover all HGS, but also VET, but the majority of members, are from HGS. The problem is that we do not know student councils from VET schools.

The Board explains that OBESSU organised a study visit to Check Republic, and we realised of the lack of students and VET, but this is what it is about to be in OBESSU, to get to know other organisations and structures and get new ideas.

There are no more questions or comments and the Chairperson calls the vote to ratify the decision of the Board to grant the status of Candidate Organisation to CSU.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The GA ratifies CSU as a Candidate Organisation.

23. Discussion and voting on amendments and proposals

Guidelines on social inclusion in education

Ida presents the guidelines and explains the background of the paper and the process that we have followed.

There are no questions or comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The GA adopts the Guidelines on social inclusion in education unanimously
Guidelines for inclusive education: Sexual orientation, Gender Identity and Gender Expression

Luke presents the guidelines and explains that this is a revision of other guidelines that were created in 2007. It is a joint document between OBESSU and IGLYO.

The Chairperson opens the floor to questions and comments:

FSS explains that with a partner organisation they launched a project and created a guide book and materials that can be used to promote the papers.

LH expresses that they are against this proposal and therefore will vote against it.

SIF explains that guidelines are only guidelines that can be followed or not.

AKS expresses that OBESSU is a European platform and LGTB people are discriminated in many countries, and we should fight for everyone.

LH explains that if they accept it, they will lose members. For them, the changes that we are including are against what they want to represent.

AKS insists that OBESSU is a platform and they believe we have to represent all school students, especially does that face discrimination.

UDS does not understand what the discussion is about. This is an outcome of an event, where all member organisations expressed the need of sexual education in school. This is not compulsory and we are a European organisation and we believe this. We are providing a tool, that we can decide to translate or not.

DGS thinks that if we lose members we are losing representativeness and for them it is not acceptable.

AKS asks why we should be losing members if we defend LGTB people.

LH thinks that this is not the focus that matter to their members.

SAKKI do not think the conversation is going anywhere.

AKS explains these guidelines are not forcing anyone to have a campaign on the topic. Even though it is not on the media, there is this problem everywhere. They do not understand why some organisations are against it, because it is only a guideline.

UNEL stresses that it is a guideline, not a policy paper.

LH expresses they cannot support the changes. If they do not like some parts, they do not see the point of voting it.

VSK statements of the minutes: proposal to close the speaking list.

Procedure to vote to close the speaking list:

In favour: 16
Against: 1
Abstention: 1

The speaking list is closed and the last speakers are added.

FSS thinks it is ok to agree to disagree sometimes. It is important OBESSU stands up as HR defenders sometimes but the organisation situations are very different and it is ok that organisations use the documents as they consider. We should consider documents as working tools.

UNEL expresses they would like to hear a discussion on the content of the document.

The Board explains that we are not adopting/rejecting a policy paper. We are discussing guidelines that have been existing for almost 10 years and we updated them with IGLYO and bring them to the GA for the sake of transparency, to ratify them.

There are no other comments or questions, therefore the Chairperson calls de vote to ratify the Guidelines.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 15
Against: 1
Abstentions: 2

The Guidelines for inclusive education are ratified by the GA.

OBESSU “crib-sheet” on the Post-2015 Agenda

Dejan explains the document and the background of the global work.

There are no comments or questions; therefore the Chairperson calls the vote to adopt the OBESSU “crib-sheet”.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The GA adopts the OBESSU “crib-sheet” on the Post-2015 Agenda unanimously

Amendments to Education in Crisis resolution

Daniele explains the background of the amendments.

Amendment #1 (OBESSU Board)

Lines 28

Replace: “This leads to a less skilled workforce and many students”

For:

“The obstacles in accessing higher education have left many young people”
Board: We thought it would be better with this wording.

There are no comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

Amendment #2 (OBESSU Board)

Lines 30-31

Replace: “insist that free education is a right which must be guaranteed to all.”

For:
“insist that education is a human right which should be accessible for all. This means there should not be any official fees for education, but also that hidden costs in education need to be abolished.”

Daniele: It is a clarification of what we mean by free education. We thought it was important to stress this clearly.

There are no comments or questions.

Proceed to voting:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

Amendment #3 (OBESSU Board)

Lines 33

ADD: “The rise of far right hate is a worrying trend that is caused by general dissatisfaction in society in times of austerity and the policies of far right movements and parties are aimed directly at certain vulnerable groups.”

AFTER: “in Europe.”

Daniele: This is not referring to a political area, but a way of thinking called far right. These movements are acting in a very intolerant, ignorant and exclusive way and we think it is important to take a stand on this issue.
The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion:

DGS does not think it is related to education and they do not think OBESSU should take a stand in society in general.

UNEL expresses that we were talking before about social inclusion and LGBT and they also think it is related because far right movements are the ones discriminating others. Far right is rising, that is why we have to fight them.

AKS expresses that it is one of AKS’ principles to take stand on things happening in society and we have to name the far right ideology because is the ideology that is discriminating others. They express the hope that other organisations will take a stand.

DGS explains there are left ideologies that are also discriminatory. There are other ideologies that are discriminating other people. From their point of view, we should stand for a wording not pointing out ideologies.

LH agrees with DGS. They think we should not say far right but “groups discriminating other people”. They understand AKS, but they think it is not OBESSU’s job to say so.

UNEL does not that it would be more precise to call them groups. From their point of view we should name things by their names. From their point of view OBESSU is a political organisation, taking political statements, and education is very political. They think we are being afraid of calling the problem by its name and that we should not fall into political correctness.

FSS expresses that in the OBESSU Statutes it says that we work promoting equal access to education and far right movements are a threat to equal access to education.

DOS thinks OBESSU has to react to what’s happening in Europe and since the last elections, there is a huge rise of far right movements across Europe.

UDS agrees that OBESSU is not a political party, but they think it is a political organisation, otherwise our document would not be called Political Platform.

DGS expresses there has been a raise on far left movements, too.

The Chairperson proposes to close the list of speakers acknowledging the importance of the discussion.

Proceed to vote on closing the speaking list:

In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The speaking list is closed and the last words are added.

CANAE agrees with UDS.

FSS thinks all MOs can basically agree on this topic but they wonder why there was no amendment to the amendments.
DGS explains they did not have the time to discuss that they completely agree against far right hat but that they do not agree on the wording.

LH is independent from political parties and if they say far right, they say that they are on the left and it can affect their finances.

SAKKI completely agrees with DGS and brings up that we can write far right parties in all our documents but still it would not change anything.

There are no more comments or questions; therefore the Chairperson calls the vote to include or not the amendment.

Proceed to voting:
In favour: 11
Against: 6
Abstentions: 1
Carried

Amendment #4 (OBESSU Board)

Lines 34–35

Replace: “minority groups and call for all possible measures to be taken to ensure that the equal rights of minority groups and immigrant communities are recognised in education.”

With: “disadvantaged social groups and call for all possible measures to be taken to ensure that the equal rights of minority groups, immigrant communities, LGBTQ+ people and other groups at risk of being excluded, are recognised in education. As the economic crisis can lead to growing gender gaps in society, it is also important to emphasise and promote gender equality in education.”

Daniele: the amendment specifies the “at-risk groups”.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

DGS explains they think the original wording was good and there is no need to change it.

ASuBiH explains we discussed this amendment in Rome with representatives of most of the member organisations.

AKS explains that women are paid less than men and have fewer opportunities and they have been more affected during the crisis.

LH agrees with DGS. They think we should have more time for discussion.

DGS explains in Rome we did not know anything and they had a different mandate. From their point of view women are not disadvantaged. Women and LGTB are minorities and not disadvantaged. They would like to see specific studies to be put forward to us.
UDS explains there is no minority in women and that disadvantages is that society is giving rules and norms that bring them. Someone is disadvantaged when she has to sign a paper stating that she has to resign if she gets pregnant. From their point of view we do not need data, we know that it happens and if we do not assume this, we do not know what we are doing.

DOS supports the amendment.

There are no other comments or questions; therefore the Chairperson calls the vote to accept or not the amendment.

Proceed to voting:

In favour: 14
Against: 2
Abstentions: 2
Carried

Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO(not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO(not present), VSK.

There are 18 organisations with the right to vote and 3 with the right to speak.

The Chairperson explains there is a written petition by LMS if it is possible to stream the GA for their Board members. The Chairperson proposes to deal with it as it will be treated as guest people.

LMS explain they just had the Summer School and people were very interested in OBESSU. So they were very interested and would like to see what OBESSU is and see what is happening in here.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried: welcome to everyone watching the GA online

Amendment #5 (OBESSU Board)

ADD: “We are concerned by the various forms of commodification of education currently taking place, above all: the widespread trend of comparing the educational performance of different countries through standardised tests. This leads to a one-sided education, focusing more on narrowly measured educational outcomes than the learning process itself and the individual development of learners.”

Before: “Education is an investment...”

Daniele: We feel it is important to add something on commodification and standardisation because it is an alarming trend in education in Europe.
There are no comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

Amendment #6 (OBESSU Board)
Lines 55

ADD: “top”
Before: “priority”

Daniele: it is a wording amendment.

There are no comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

Amendment #7 (OBESSU Board)
Lines 55

ADD: “and never cut its budget”
After: “education”

Daniele: an addition to the sentence.

There are no comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

Amendment #8 (OBESSU Board)
Lines 59
Replace: “Equal rights and access for immigrants and native students”

With: “Equal rights and access to education for all, with special support for immigrant students and other disadvantaged groups”

Daniele: There are more groups that should have equal access than just “immigrants” and “native students”, but it is still important to separately mention the inclusion of immigrant students.

There are no comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

Amendment #9 (OBESSU Board)
Lines 63

ADD: “to ensure the participation of young people in society”

After: “youth forums”

Daniele: It is also a wording amendment.

There are no comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

Political Platform

Amendment #1 (AKS - UNL - UDS - CANAE)
Line 325

ADD: “OBESSU defends human rights and condemns every organization and movement that supports racism, homophobia, transphobia, misogyny and class discrimination. Everyone has the right to be free and respected by all people: we have to remember the past, when far-right ideologies created war, murder and pain in Europe. In the last years, many parties and movements have gained votes in national and European elections by promoting far-right ideologies. This is a threat to the freedom of European citizens, and every institution and organization that defends human rights has to break those movements. Schools and School student unions must recognize this threat and also recognize their responsibility to inform school students, to advocate diversity and equality under all circumstances, to support antifascist
campaigns or projects and carry them to schools.”

After: “Thus, school must fight all forms of segregation and discrimination”

UDS: We believe this amendment is important and it should not be undertaken its importance. Our values are against the values that these far right movements are promoting. It is to create a safe space for everyone in our platform.

VSK explains political neutrality is a very important principle in their organisation. They fully understand the meaning but political neutrality is a case for words, and in this case it is not really very carefully worded. They think we have to be careful in OBESSU with our political neutrality, to be more representative to all school students.

DGS thinks the language is very aggressive and it is not really fitting. They also agree with political neutrality and would like to keep the wording as it is. From their point of view OBESSU is an interest organisation, but not a political organisation.

AKS understands where the neutrality comes from but an organisation that stands up for equality and solidarity is already taking political statement. They think the problem with this discussion is not that we do not agree on the words, but the arguments here are more on organisations not being sure if we should take a stand on certain hate speech movements. Organisations in OBESSU should read the political platform again and decide if they really should be in this platform.

UNEL noticed there seems to be a problem with the agreement on language. Therefore, they recommend having debates or creating an agreed language to discuss these topics. But from their point of view, as interest defenders of certain groups, we are defending some ideologies, so we cannot separate them.

DGS thinks it is really important that we discuss the content of the amendment. It is how much our organisations want OBESSU to be a political platform, and of course society is reflected in society. But in DGS this is a society analysis and we do not think it is something that should be in the Political Platform.

VSK thanks the clarification from DGS and explains we should disagree with these ideologies and movements but we should not have in our political platform that we are against these movements.

LH cannot support this amendment because in their organisation they are only doing education politics and they cannot go further than that. The debate should be on the content of the amendment.

AKS asks for the Board’s opinion.

UNEL agrees that we have mandates from our organisations, but they would like to invite everyone to take the discussion in their organisations. If we engage in education politics, we have to have a stand on how far do we take this debate in our organisation so MOs do not see this debate as their mandates, and some do.

Luke, on behalf of the Board, explains that the Board is in favour of this amendment. They see there is a clash on political and organisational culture of organisations on what should we do. The European level is a different arena than the national. At the European level we engage on youth policy issues that go further than only related to education. Furthermore, the values presented here are the ones from OBESSU and they
apply to the current political situation in Europe. We should be against all these movements that challenge our values. We are a political organisation, with a political mandate that does political work.

VSK agrees that we have to take action against these political changes in Europe, but they still believe that wording is a little bit aggressive and that the way it is now is already enough.

There are no further comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 6
Against: 9
Abstentions: 3
Not Carried.

Amendment #2 (AKS – UDS – UNL – CANAE)

Line 347

ADD: “- a school community and learning environment which take clear positions against racism, homophobia, transphobia, misogyny and class discrimination and offer no place for anti-human rights movements, neofascist ideologies or supremacist mindsets”

Before: “- cooperation between school and local networks engaged with social issues.”

AKS: We believe OBESSU must speak out against current far-right hate rise and state clearly its relevance to school students and school student unions.

LH thinks the amendment is unintentionally discriminatory because we are saying there should be no place for anti HR movements, but what we actually do is to exclude them and we cannot educate them, then.

DGS would like to criticise that organisations create a number of very similar amendments. They also state they have the same arguments as on the other amendment. They believe it is unnecessary and aggressive.

UDS would like to remark this amendment is only explaining how the educational context should be. Saying neo-fascist ideology is not the same that far-right. It is an absolutely unacceptable behaviour and we think it is not exclusive, because we are going to include everyone in a HR approach.

FSS proposes to close the speaking list.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 12
Against: 3
Abstentions: 1

The speaking list is closed and the last organisations on the list are added.

SIF thinks there is no exclusion in the amendment. From their point of view, if anyone has a problem excluding anti-HR movements they cannot agree with that. The amendment it is about excluding ideologies and movements towards people and individuals.
VSK thinks this amendment is better in a way we are describing ideas that are harming students, there are no people offended. For them this amendment is acceptable and they can support it.

AKS thinks we should never welcome neo-fascist ideologies and that it is not about school students but ideologies discriminating people.

UNEL thinks maybe using left and right concepts it is not the best wording. For them it is a discussion about tolerance, intolerance, etc. and they think this whole dichotomy makes us change our discourse. The think we are talking about not allowing a platform for exclusionary propaganda. If we mean an inclusive environment, you can not include ideologies that discriminate people. From their point of view, we have to be brave and get over the fear to be politically defined.

LH explains their plan is to make a fully working democracy and ask if we should include violent anti-fascism ideologies too.

There are no more comments or questions; therefore the Chairperson calls the vote.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 9
Against: 6
Abstentions: 3
Carried

Amendment #3 (AKS - UDS - UNL - CANAE)

Line 155;165

ADD: “Therefore higher education should not be linked to any fees or entrance restriction. Nowadays lots of universities in Europe raise entrance fees and set limits of students in the university courses, selecting them by entrance tests, graduation vote, exams outcomes or personal background. This presents a barrier for many students, especially for the less privileged.

OBESSU believes that all students must have the possibility to choice freely about their future and to study what they dream.”

After: “...preventing students from accessing higher education.”

ADD: “OBESSU therefore believes that”

BEFORE: “...higher education entrance criteria should be flexible and aim at encouraging as many school students as possible to continue with an additional level of education..”

AKS: It is important to state clearly that higher education should not be linked to any restrictions of any kind (fees or tests). We think that OBESSU should stand up against it.

SLL explains that all the member countries are different in the admissions processes and that for them, entrance tests are part of their culture, and they agree with it. There should be a way to make sure people that get into university can follow the studies.
DGS explains they are going to abstain because they think it is a wrong procedure.

UNEL feels that this is a good amendment, because entrance exams are just like standardised testing, and are not an accurate image of students. They support demanding more flexibility when it comes to entrance to university.

ASuBiH agrees with the fees part but they do not understand how universities would make sure to not be overcrowded.

AKS believes that there is no need to have criteria to get into university. There should be investment so there is enough space for all young people that want to get as much education as they want to and it should be as easy as possible.

LMS asks how it would be possible. From their point of view, there would be a lot of people that would want to go, but it might not have enough space for everyone and they ask themselves how would this decision be made and the selection done.

UDS explains that the Political Platform is something that we demand and it should not be overly concrete. For them, if we say that everyone has equal access to education, all educational institutions should provide it. They understand member organisations worries, but they believe this is the place where we can dream.

UNSS thinks that without the tests some universities would remain empty and they could lose experts.

CSU thinks this proposal is out of mandate because we are school student unions and we cannot focus on university education. For them, there are no simple solutions when it comes to access to higher education. From their point of view, we should approve more realistic goals to improve the system gradually and entrance restrictions and fees are fictions from some realities.

AKS thinks it is essential that we have a position on the transition from higher education to university. It is important that we have aims and objectives. The ideal situation that we should demand is that there are many quality universities, with no access restrictions.

There are no more comments or questions; therefore the Chairperson calls the vote.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 7
Against: 6
Abstentions: 5
Carried

Amendment #4 (AKS – UDS – UNL – CANAE)

Line 155;165

ADD: “Student grants should be guaranteed as an additional support, especially to those with lower socio-
economic background.”

After: “...requirement for continuing their education.”

2)165
ADD: “- Accurate student grants to enable everyone to continue further and higher education”

CANAE: We should demand student grants as support for those who are most disadvantaged.

There are no comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 15
Against: 0
Abstentions: 3
Carried

Amendment #5 (AKS - UDS - UNL - CANAE)

Line 155;165

1)155
ADD: “Higher education should always be a responsibility of the public state and never be given into hands of private companies in order to ensure high quality education for all.”

AFTER: “requirement for continuing their education”

2)165
ADD “- Higher education to be owned by the public state to ensure same chances for everyone”

LH expresses that they do not have the mandate to approve this. From their perspective, it is about higher education and they will not vote for it.

DGS does not agree with the amendment because they consider it is two proposals in one. Furthermore, they explain in Denmark there are self-owned schools and education is still free.

CSU considers it is far beyond our mandate; it is unrealistic and it goes against constitutional law at least in Czech Republic. They do not see such a long Political Platform, and add more and more to it all the time. They think it is a utopian vision and it is not realistic.

AKS insists they think this is not beyond our mandate, because many school students might go to university, and if there are many privatised universities, it can be really hard for school students to access this higher education. We can only ensure access to education, if the state is responsible for higher education.
CANAE explains that our political platform is made of our goals and objectives and although it could seem utopian, that is what we aim to get.

There are no further comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 5
Against: 3
Abstentions: 10
Carried

Statement to the minutes by LH: It is noticeable that at the political platform amendment #5, 10 of the Member organisations abstained. Furthermore, it its LH’s opinion that there should be an opportunity to ask the MOs who abstained whether they need more debate before the vote or if they abstained for political or technical reasons. Also, we would like to have the possibility to vote again if needed.

24. Adoption of new official OBESSU address

The Secretary General explains that we have moved the Secretariat office to a new address and that the General Assembly has to adopt the new official address:

Rue de l’Industrie, 10
B-1000 Brussels (Belgium)

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
The new official OBESSU address is adopted unanimously.

Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL(not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO(not present), VSK.

We have 18 MOs with the right to vote and 3 COs with right to speak.

25. Election of new Board members

The Chairperson introduces the Statutes that determine that the General Assembly have to decide on having a Board of 5 or 7 members, and opens the floor for discussion:

FSS proposes a secret ballot for this vote.

UDS speaks in favour of a Board of 5, mainly for budgetary reasons. The Board should be able to meet as much as possible.
DGS agrees with UDS. They would like to know how much money would cost to have 7 members, and propose that in the next election the GA decides to have 7 members to implement the overlapping mandate. They do not have strong opinions on the overlapping mandate, but they think it is a bad idea to have only one person overlapping as we have the situation now.

AKS are also in favour of a Board of 5 because communication is easier and more efficient as they do not live in the same city.

DOS supports a Board of 7.

FSS asks the current Board on the workload.

CANAE is also in favour of a team of 5 people, because communication and coordination of the team is easier. They think probably not all the candidates we have today will be elected and they do not agree on having a meeting every half a year to add people to the Board. They think the Board should be elected today.

UNSS thinks it is better to have a Board of 7 for the workload. They think it would work better.

The Secretary General explains that the biggest change with regards to the budget would be the cost of Board meetings, which would be approximately 6000€ more expensive per year with a Board of 7 compared to 5.

Dasa explains that when it comes to the workload, it depends on the time of the year, portfolios and events so it is really difficult to answer this question.

Ida explains that the current Board did a lot of things, which means a lot of work and that they have had 6 Board members.

LMS thinks a 5-people Board is the best option.

Roll call to hand out the ballots.

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL(not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO(not present), VSK.

There are 18 MOs with the right to vote.

Roll call to vote.

The Ballot committee and the Secretary General leave the room.

The ballot committee comes back with the results.

There were 18 valid votes.

In favour of a Board of 5: 11
In favour of a Board of 7: 7

The GA decided to have a Board of 5 people, so there will be elections for 4 new Board members.
The Chairperson explains that as there are two candidates from the same country, according to Internal Regulations (Art. 7.23 and 24) there is going to be a vote on whether the GA is going to vote on having 1 or 2 candidates from the same country.

UNSS asks for a secret vote for all of the votes regarding this procedure.

The Chairperson explains how the procedure will work and opens the floor for discussion.

ASUBIH stresses the need to remember that delegates represent their organisations.

The Chairperson calls the vote to decide if the GA will vote on having two candidates from the same country. The vote will be by a simple majority.

Roll call to hand out the ballots.

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL(not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

There are 18 MOs with voting rights.

Roll call to vote.

Ballot committee leaves the room with the Secretary General.

The ballot committee comes back with the results.

There are 18 valid votes.

In favour: 16
Against: 2
Abstentions: 0

The GA decided that they want to vote on whether they want to have two candidates from the same country or not.

The Chairperson gives 1 minute to each of the candidates to present why they want to run. Then he will open the discussion with the MOs and afterwards there will be the voting on whether both candidates can run or not.

The two candidates, Oona and Karolina Lang give the speech for one minute.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion:

VSK thinks MOs should let them both run because the MOs are organisations and not countries and if some of us want a balance depending on geographical background we should take that into account when doing the actual election for the Board.

CANAE thinks only one of them should run for the Board. OBESSU Board should represent different countries. Therefore there should not be more than one person from one country.
SIF explains that the Board of OBESSU represent us. MOs decide who is in there and who should be in there.

They understand the arguments for diversity, but they think MOs should focus if the candidates are capable even if they are from the same country.

ISSU thinks both candidates are individuals and they should be given the chance to run.

VSK hopes MOs notice that we choose the most qualified members regardless of any other balances.

There are no more comments or questions; therefore the Chairperson calls the vote on allowing or not both candidates to run for the Board elections.

Roll call to hand out the ballots

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

Roll call to vote.

The ballot committee leaves the room and comes back after some minutes.

There were 18 valid votes.

In favour: 14
Against: 4
Abstentions: 0

The GA decides that both candidates will be able to run.

Roll call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

The Chairperson explains there has been a proposal from LH, DGS, LMS, DOS and ASuBiH to suspend Luke Shore as Board Member of OBESSU. The Chairperson proposes to include this point on the agenda for discussion and organisations have to vote if they agree or not in including the point.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 14
Against: 3
Abstentions: 1

The point is included in the agenda of the GA.

The Chairperson also proposes to stop the live stream for this point of the agenda.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 17
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1

The GA agrees on ending the streaming.
LH talks on behalf of all the organisations who proposed the suspension. They call for a suspension of Luke Shore as a Board Member, because when the GA was having the discussion about far right movements, he was tweeting about it in a way that could be considered offensive. For their organisations this is not an acceptable behaviour.

Luke: First I would like to apologise for what I did, and for any insults or calls to any organisations. I will make sure it never happens again.

After a discussion between the delegates, the Chairperson proposes to close the speaking list

15 in favour
2 against
1 abstention.

The speakers list is closed

FSS: Asks for a secret vote.

Roll Call to hand out ballot paper

There are 18 organisations with the right to vote and 3 C0s with the right to speak. The quorum for the question is 2/3, so 13 organisations. There are 3 possibilities: “Yes” in favour of the suspension, “No” against the suspension and “-” for abstention.

Nora reads the Statutes to clarify the terms of the suspension and the procedure afterwards.

Roll call to collect the votes.

The Ballot committee and the Secretary General leave the room and come back with the results.

In favour: 3
Against: 10
Abstentions: 5

The suspension has not been carried.

SLL, SUS, ISSU statement for the minutes: There should be a warning for Luke.

VSK proposes to stop the live stream because it could have a bad influence.

LMS proposes to continue the streaming.

The Chairperson proposes to vote it at once if anyone has anything against, and opens the floor for discussion.
VSK is sorry for slowing the GA but they think the livestreaming is something very new, but it is having a bad influence and also social media in total. They think OBESSU should have a policy on social media as well for the next statutory meeting.

DGS thinks it is good for the transparency for the organisations to see what is going on in the GA.

DOS does not have anything to hide.

VSK neither do they do but there are heated discussions and if you are in personal in the debate, it can be easier to understand the tone of the GA, but we think that some people can have the wrong impression of this GA.

The Chairperson proposes to close the speaking list.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 17
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1.

The speaking list is closed and the last words are added to the list.

SAKKI thinks live stream is really nice, but we did not plan it beforehand, therefore we should not do it if there is someone against it.

CSU thinks this should be discussed in our MOs, we still have a big agenda ahead of us and we should focus on that.

LH would like to continue streaming.

CANAE would like to continue the streaming but they can understand the position of VSK, and they are not sure we should continue, that is why they will abstain. They propose to study this further in future statutory meetings.

There are no more comments or questions and the Chairperson call the vote on continuing the live stream.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 7
Against: 8
Abstention: 3

The GA decides to not continue the livestream

The Chairperson explains that usually Board candidates leave the room but as there are candidates that are the only representatives of their organisations the proposal is that all candidates stay in the room for the candidates speech but that all candidates leave the room only for the Q&A.

There is no organisation against it.

The procedure is as follows: Each candidate will be given 5 minutes to present him- or herself. After each presentation, the delegates can ask questions to the candidates.
There are 6 candidates:

- Oona Heiska from SLL
- Hrefna Osk from SIF
- Karolina Lang from FSS
- Brendan Power from ISSU
- Matic Matjašič from DOS
- Giuseppina Tucci from UDS

The Chairperson proposes that we do the presentations by alphabetical order starting from Z:

- Giuseppina Tucci from UDS presents herself

The Chairperson invites the candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

VSK: What kind of Board member profile would you describe yourself and what can you offer?

CSU: On what are you interested in educational system itself? What are your proposals regarding education?

DOS: You are more like a social liberal, what did the GA choose on and amendment against your opinion? How are you going to defend it?

Giuseppina:

- I covered various positions, I have been a Board member and a Secretary General, I have organisation skills, but human and solution oriented. I try to ease the work as much as possible and try to look always for consensus. I am described as the mum.
- I come from a school student union where was responsible for lobbying at the Ministry of Education for the last 6 months. I have an idea of a framework of the right to study and welfare for Europe. I do not have a perfect system in mind because all of them have good points. But I would resume it with quality education, free access, and safe environment, free materials.
- I do not like to label myself; I stand for what the organisation thinks is right. If the mandate is from the organisations, I would represent the organisations.

ESCU: With whom do you see yourself on the Board?

CANAE: Will you be willing to resign from the Board at the first Board if we need it to implement the overlapping mandate? What can you offer to this Board team? If you had to choose a Pokemon, what would you choose?

LH: What do you want OBESSU to interfere on the labour market?

Giuseppina:

- I do not really want to say names but I want to share this experience with activists willing to share, motivated and willing to learn.
If MOs asked me so, I would resign from the board; but I believe this should be a transition mandate for the overlapping mandate work. If MOs ask for it, I would do it. But I prefer to stay for the full mandate.

Knowledge on the VET systems (I have been a VET WG member for the past 3 years), I have a lot of competences on gender issues, I have good lobbying and advocating skills, and the competences will depend on the portfolios.

I do not know Pokemon, but I like a turtle.

The question is very tough: we should defend the education and educational system from bad influence. We stated that education should be free and with any influence on the curricula and we should be able to sit on the table with the people deciding curricula, and we should play a crucial role on that.

SUS: What changes would you like to do? Where do you see OBESSU in two years?

SIF: What would be your field of interest? Name your three obstacles.

CNE: What can OBESSU do to help develop democratic school student structures in non-democratic countries?

Giuseppina:

- Make OBESSU an organising bureau and no longer a network of experiences. This is where I would ideally see OBESSU in 2 years. Also, I see a lot of candidates and overlapping mandate, and a functioning WP and strategy.
- I am afraid of flying but I can do it, but I can still do it; I am very strict in a lot of things; I am impulsive; and my English needs to improve.
- I would like to have the VET portfolio, the Early School Leaving and the labour market; and we should investigate more on LGBT.
- We have a big problem on exporting democracy on other organisations. We should find cooperation on a global level. I believe in “think globally and act locally”. We should always keep in mind that we should keep the personal based approach.

ASuBiH: Giuseppina was a great host in Rome for the event “Education in Crisis”, and made our needs come true. She is a really great girl.

There are no more questions; therefore the Chairperson welcomes back all the candidates in the room.

Brendan Power from ISSU presents himself.

The Chairperson invites the other candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

SUS: What is your added value? What makes you better?

CNE: How can OBESSU directly link its MOs?

CANAE: We would like to know your previous work on advocacy and lobby at national and international level? Could it affect your work in advocacy the fact that you are shy?
Brendan:

- I can bring a new perspective and passion.
- This is something that we should talk with the Board.
- I was a member for the local council for youth, lobbying for local and national issues.
- I suppose I am shy, only when I am around new people but I could grow.

SIF: What would be your interest in the Board? What do you think has been missing when it comes to communication between OBESSU and its MOs?

SLL: which Pokemon would you be and why?

CSU: How would you change the education system at European level and what and how would you improve the education system at national level?

- I have not thought of any particular portfolio. It should be a decision to take with the Board.
- A lot of MOs see OBESSU as an event provider only and we should act as a network for problem solving.
- Regular and consisting communication.
- Picachu because it has a lot of colours.
- OBESSU has a major role on changing education at European level. Continuous assessment.
- At national level we have a one day evaluating system and other systems could be a better way.

AKS: During discussions of amendments, did not you participate on the discussions because your organisation did not have an opinion? What are the reasons?

ASuBiH: Do you have free time to dedicate to OBESSU?

DOS: What’s the biggest project you have done so far?

Brendan:

- In ISSU I do not have an executive position and I did not receive many mandates so I did not feel to express my own thoughts and not the organisations’.
- In September I will start college and I will have time and willingness to dedicate it to OBESSU.
- As educational officer in ISSU, we reviewed the transition year system. A project that lasted 18 months involving consultations.

AKS: You signed the warning for Luke, how would you handle the situation with him if you would join the Board?

- It was not personally against Luke but for his actions. I consulted with my organisation and they thought of making the note for the minutes and as it was already done by SLL, I thought it was the best way to do it.

CANAE: Seen all the CV of candidates, we as CANAE think he has done a very hard advocacy and lobby work before coming here and we think it is so important for a Board member. He has experience in campaigning
and implementing projects, so for us he has a very interesting profile. In the past ExGA, we did not elect Lukas, a person from OBESSU with a similar profile, and we think we should now elect Brendan and not lose his profile.

There are no more questions; therefore the Chairperson welcomes back all the candidates in the room.

Matic from DOS presents himself.

The Chairperson invites the other candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

FSS: What is your biggest achievement in your school student union?

CNE: Have you established quality standard indicators for your possible mandate?

Matic:

- I have been involved in activism 2.5 years. My biggest achievement was a fund were we raised 9000€ for disadvantaged people.
- My first OBESSU event in Budapest, but also in Estonia and in TCIO in Brussels.
- My goal is that we should improve this organisation. There is a conference in Vilnius and it will be very interesting and we will have to make new goals. There are lots of documents. We need to follow them and get new ideas.

SIF: Which portfolio would you like to have in the board?

CSU: What are your main priorities regarding education and educational systems?

CANAE: We have seen you joined your organisation the previous year? What can you offer to the OBESSU Board? Could you be willing to resign the OBESSU Board in order to implement the overlapping mandate? Do consider that you have enough experience in team working?

Matic:

- I have more experience in organisation skills, I think this could be my portfolio.
- There is still a whole board, a GA and OBESSU and we have a political platform. Three would be my priorities: quality education, free education, inclusive for all.
- I joined DOS 2-3 years ago, I worked in the committees and joined the MC in DOS and then elected in the Board of DOS for 6 months.
- We still cannot see the pros and cons of the overlapping mandate. I cannot say my opinion now.
- I lead many projects in DOS, one of them is the national school student conference where we hosted 3 MEPs. All my work in DOS is team work.

AKS: Could you describe the world that you are aiming for in 5 words? During the GA, your organisation was taking part in the discussion but it was not you talking, why?

SLL: Could you clarify how could OBESSU documents be improved?

SUS: What is quality education for you?
Matic:

- Peace, equality and friends.
- We read the amendments, and discussed them in the Board and if we had comments, we made them.
- OBESSU make a lot of documents all of year, but some organisations we only get them on email and it is not implemented at the national level.
- Inclusive for all, free, and we should experiment with new teaching methods and change something. Even if we make a mistake we should try.

AKS: Why was Klemen talking and not you? AKS expected the candidates to speak during the GA.

SUS: You have never been involved in a prep-team or WG. Do you see yourself doing it now?

CSU: Do you think OBESSU should revise its documents?

The Chairperson wants to propose to close the list to give space for other candidates.

Matic:

- Klement is our president, I decided not to participate and also because I was nervous.
- I led this conference that was similar to an OBESSU event and I am sure I can do it.
- I also mention this in the letter. OBESSU could make a short summary of documents to send to organisations and also to contextualise them for each of the countries.

The Chairperson welcomes the candidates back in the room.

- Karolina Lang from FSS presents herself

The chair invites the other candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

VSK: We hope we can see Karolina in the Board. I hope this will not badly affect it. If both Oona and Karolina are in, we do not see a problem. I hope it is about quality of candidates.

AKS: We think it is really cool that you mention social inclusion in your speech because we are very interested.

UNSS: OBESSU is not perfect and I wanted to ask you what is the best think that OBESSU is doing good and what would you change?

Karolina:

- The best of the best is giving European School Students a voice at European level. School Students are underrepresented.
- The change would be to increase the participation of the MOs and give them the space to be more active in the decision making of OBESSU. We proposed the online forum and I am hoping to be able to discuss it with MOs.
SIF: What would be your preferred portfolio?

CSU: As OBESSU has many goals, what concretely should be changed at European level when it comes to education?

SUS: How can do the experience as a president benefit OBESSU?

Karolina:

- I am very interested in social inclusion and HRE and Citizenship Education.
- The participation question is a really hot topic, and of course, the economical crisis and the cuts of education.
- Being a president of a national school student union I've done everything from lobbying at the parliament to running to a train to get to a media interview, to being in a school in the middle of nowhere on school student rights.

CANAE: You take active part in a political party. How could it affect on OBESSU non-partisan position?

DOS: Why it is more about us than about you?

Karolina:

- I am a member of the education committee of the Swedish-speaking Finns’ Party of ALDE. As an OBESSU member I would be driven by OBESSU agenda and not by my political engagement and this engagement it is not against our values as OBESSU. I stand for HR.
- I think is important as a Board member not to be driven by my personal agenda, but giving a voice to organisations.

CANAE: Will you keep on being an active part on this party?

Karolina:

- If it is not a problem, yes, I will. I am only involved at the local and national level, not at all at the European level.

There are no more questions or comments and the Chairperson welcomes back all the candidates.

CANAE: Could you describe your previous experience in your organisation? Would you be willing to resign from the Board in order to implement the overlapping mandate?
Hrefna:

- I was really interested on how the work was done during the Study Session in Budapest, and the second one was in Rome where I got to know how it works and I have ideas on how to improve them.
- I have experience at the local level in Iceland.
- The current Board is wonderful. We are lacking communication between Board and MOs and I think this is the most important thing.
- I considered it; I would run for a year instead because getting the overlapping mandate working it is very important.

CSU: What would be the first think that should be changed in education?

SUS: What is your added value?

UNSS: How would you deal with the situation to defend something you do not stand for personally?

Hrefna:

- I would lobby for mandatory sexual education across Europe because it could promote gender equality. I want to promote democracy.
- I've been working in this for a very long time. I was so determined that I paid my own way here and I've always felt that there is change needed in the educational system. I've always been very stubborn and professional and looking for the best solution and not the easiest one.
- It is super important that the values of OBESSU come first than my opinions.

SUS: What would you do to stop an MO to leave OBESSU?

DOS: Public or private education?

Hrefna:

- Communication is the key, and we should talk to this organisation and ask for what kind of changes should be done; but above all, we have to keep OBESSU values.
- I feel a combination of both is the best result. Public education we need to have at all times, we cannot really ban corporations and companies to fund their own schools, working in cooperation with the government. So finding a balance.

There are no more questions and the Chairperson welcomes the candidates back into the room.

- Oona from SLL presents herself

The chair invites the other candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

VSK: We think it is not a problem to have a problem having two people from Finland, what do you think?

Which Pokemon would you be?

SIF: What would be your preferred portfolio?
SLL: We expected the candidates to be actively involved, why did not you take a more active role during the GA?

Oona:

- Karolina and I are different, we have different opinions and it should not influence the work on the Board.
- Cat Pokemon, cute and cuddly but dangerous.
- I am very much into youth politics. I’ve also been involved at the Finnish National Youth Council.
- I was very active yesterday. As a candidate I do not want to repeat points. I rather keep silent if I do not have anything to add.

CSU: What are your main goals regarding education systems?

UNSS: OBESSU is an NGO, if it would be helpful for OBESSU, would you transform it into a governmental organisation?

CNE: How can you work to improve the transparency of OBESSU?

Oona:

- For me, I’ve been a lot involved in participation and democracy. I am strong at this.
- I would be against to be a governmental organisation because it would change the purpose of the union.
- It is a hard question. It also starts with the MOs, that we should encourage MOs to share our work and get the work at the local level, because it is really hard to get to the local level from the European level.

FSS: As Karolina, you are also active in a political party, how would it affect your work in OBESSU?

DOS: What did you change in the education system in your country?

AKS: In which party are you involved?

Oona:

- I am a member of the Finish Coalition Party (center-right) and their agenda is: Education is really important, hard work, civilisation. Doing your best to develop ourselves. I think my involvement would not affect my political work in OBESSU because there is a political platform to guide us and I am not in a Board or anything, I have only been to two events. My commitment to the party is not that big.
- There was a demonstration one year ago about the student grant being cut in Finland; we came together with the other organisations.
- In upper-secondary schools, I was involved in the work on how you choose your courses.

CANAE: Could you explain more your engagement with the party? Will you continue your involvement if you are elected?
Oona:

- I have been a member for one year and been in 2 events (two regional meetings), and I am not planning to get more involved if I am elected. When I was a member of SLL board, I did not go to any of the party activities. I would not be active.

The Chairperson welcomes back the candidates and explains how the vote will work.

CANAE: For us it is very important that Board members of OBESSU do not have any responsibility in political parties.

Roll Call to handout the ballots

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

Now we have 18 organisations with right to vote in the room and 3 COs with speaking rights.

Roll Call to vote

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

There are 18 organisations present and we need 10 organisations.

The Chairperson asks the current Board members if they want to remain in their position as there were only three people elected but none of them wants to stay. There will therefore be an Extraordinary General Assembly (ExGA) with new elections in the end of the year.

There were 18 valid votes

- Oona: 15
- Hrefna: 4
- Karolina: 6
- Matic: 9
- Brendan: 10
- Giuseppina: 15

Oona, Brendan and Giuseppina are elected as new Board Members.

The Chairperson asks the elected Board members if they accept the votes and they all do.

Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

There are 18 organisations present and we need 10 organisations.
Statement to the minutes from UNEL, DGS and LH: We think it is wrong to announce the exact amount of votes on the individual candidates in front of everyone.

Statement to the minutes from DGS and LH: We think it is wrong to clap your hands right after the publishing of the elected candidates without out saying that we are also clapping for the candidates who were not elected.

26. Monitoring Committee elections

There are 5 candidates to the Monitoring Committee. As only two of the candidates are present, the Chairperson proposes to not have questions and answers, to make it fair for everyone. There are no objections from the GA.

- The video presentation of Jenni Lang from SAKKI is played.
- The video presentation of Elsa Lengeler from USO is played.
- Nora Kleibel from the Board of OBESSU presents herself.
- Larissa Nenning from AKS presents herself.
- The video presentation of Sasa Pesic from UNSS is played.

The Chairperson explains the voting procedure.

Roll call to handout the ballots

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO (not present), ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL, UNEL, UNSS, USO (not present), VSK.

We have 18 organisations and there is only the need of 10 votes to get elected.

Roll Call to vote

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH, LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL, UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK.

The ballot committee comes back to the room with the results:

There were 18 valid votes cast.

- Jenni: 6
- Elsa: 13
- Nora: 16
- Larissa: 5
- Sasa: 12

Elsa, Nora and Sasa are elected as Monitoring Committee members.

The Chair person thanks all candidates for running for this position.
27. Any other business

Rasmus thanks the leaving Board and presents are given.

Statement for the minutes from FSS: FSS encourages the MOs to consider to the next OBESSU statutory meeting a secret ballot when deciding who has the right to vote and speak of the Member organisations failing to pay the annual financial contribution. This is to ensure a sensitive way of dealing with a delicate matter for some member organisations.

SIF on behalf of Kristen from the MC thanks the Board and a video is played.

LH: We thought it was unfortunate with the sometimes negative tone of the debate. It was not nice to be in the room, and for next GA we should think of stopping the debate. We should have some more fruits or food, and we should have more breaks. We would nevertheless like to thank you for a nice GA.

VSK raises the idea on having a policy on digital matters or social media for future debates.

UNEL: Thank you to the GA for accepting us as a Candidate Organisation. Also thank you to the outgoing Board for driving us through this experience. We also insist on the need to create an agreed language for the discussions.

CSU: Also thank you for accepting us as candidate organisation.

Board: thanks to the Chairperson and to AKS for organising everything and helping us.

28. Closing

The Chairperson closes the 40th General Assembly of OBESSU.