



Frankfurt 2010

turning europe inside out
european youth parliament

RESOLUTION BOOKLET

64th International Session of the
European Youth Parliament in
Frankfurt am Main, Germany

July 30th – August 8th, 2010

European Youth Parliament

Europäisches Jugendparlament in Deutschland e. V.
Sophienstraße 28-29
10178 Berlin
Germany

Phone: + 49 (0) 30 2 80 95-155
Fax: + 49 (0) 30 2 80 95-150
E-Mail: info@eyp.de
www.eyp.de



Programme of the General Assembly

Friday, August 6th 2010

- 10:00 – 11:00 Opening of General Assembly
- 11:00 – 11:45 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Constitutional Affairs I
- 11:45 – 12:00 Coffee break, Reception
- 12:00 – 12:45 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Foreign Affairs
- 12:45 – 13:30 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs II
- 13:30 – 14:30 Lunch
- 14:30 – 15:15 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Transport and Tourism
- 15:15 – 16:00 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Culture and Education
- 16:00 – 16:15 Coffee break
- 16:15 – 17:00 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs I
- 17:00 – 17:45 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety II

Saturday, August 7th 2010

- 09:30 – 11:00 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy
- 10:15 – 11:00 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs II
- 11:00 – 11:15 Coffee break
- 11:15 – 12:45 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs
- 12:00 – 12:45 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Human Rights
- 12:45 – 13:45 Lunch
- 13:45 – 14:30 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety I
- 14:30 – 15:15 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs I
- 15:15 – 15:30 Coffee break
- 15:30 – 16:15 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development
- 16:15 – 17:00 Motion for a Resolution by the Committee on Constitutional Affairs II
- 17:00 – 18:00 Closing Ceremony



Procedure of the General Assembly

General rules

The wish to speak is indicated by raising the committee placard. The authority of the board is absolute.

Procedure and time settings

Presenting of the motion for the resolution (operative clauses, friendly amendments)

3 minutes to defend the motion for the resolution

3 minutes to attack the motion for the resolution

Points of information

25 minutes of general debate

3 minutes to sum-up the debate

Voting procedure

Announcing the votes

Friendly amendment

Last minute modifications of a resolution in order to improve it. Amendments are to be handed in on a specific form (distributed to the chairs) two resolutions before the resolution in question.

Point of information

Request for a brief explanation of the meaning of specific words and abbreviations. Note that translations are not points of information.

Point of personal privilege

Request for a delegate to repeat a point that was inaudible.

Point of order

A delegate feels that the board has not properly followed Parliamentary procedure. The placard is used by chairpersons after a request from a delegate.

Direct response

Once per debate, each committee may use the Direct Response sign. Should a committee member raise the Committee Placard and the "Direct Response" sign, the board recognises them immediately.

The direct response sign is used to contribute to the point made directly beforehand.

- Resolutions -



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS I

More than 150 years after the Paulskirche Assembly and the democratic uprisings across Europe: with a low voter turnout and the democratic deficit on the one hand and the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty for a European Citizens' Initiative on the other, how can Europe make the participation of its citizens more effective and influencing?

Submitted by: Ben English (IE), Friedericke Fischer (DE), Barbara Halla (AL), Michal Kucharski (PL), Moonika Lepp (EE), Elina Mantrali (CY), Simone Passeri (IT), Kati Pärn (EE), Marjuska Pennanen (FI), Jakub Rybka (CZ), Lucas Somville (BE), Anna Staab (DE), Diogo Tapada dos Santos (PT), Kyriakos Toulgaridis (GR), Tiago Correia Machado (Chairperson, PT)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Believing democracy to be the most effective form of citizen participation,
- B. Noting with approval the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty in relation to the transparency of and accessibility to all European Union (EU) documents,
- C. Congratulating the recent efforts made by the European Commission (EC) with regard to the implementation of the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI),
- D. Viewing with appreciation the positive effect of civic bodies, such as non-governmental organisations (NGOs), on the development and realisation of democracy,
- E. Fully aware that the feeling of European identity has been previously hindered by disharmonious relationships amongst European countries,
- F. Deeply concerned about the declining voter turnout in past European Parliament elections which, if continued, could pose a serious threat to the democratic legitimacy of the Union,
- G. Believing that insufficient information about and a negative portrayal of the EU are the main reasons for the aforementioned trend,
- H. Further believing the lowering voter turnouts to be strongly connected to a lack of interaction between Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) and their constituents,
- I. Alarmed that the majority of EU citizens perceive the EP to be a powerless institution,
- J. Regretting the lack of transparency and accessibility concerning EU Treaties and the effect this may have on citizen participation,
- K. Recognising that the existing amount of bureaucratic paper work involved in democratic processes broadens the gap between the EU and its citizens,
- L. Deeply conscious of the difficulties encountered by citizens in the enforcement of the ECI,
- M. Contemplating the low levels of knowledge among the majority of citizens concerning the EU, its functions and political structures,
- N. Having examined the potentially positive effect which the internet could have on citizen participation in the EU;



1. Calls for an increase in the amount of information given to EU citizens through education in schools, universities and local centres;
2. Encourages local discussions with MEPs and/or their representatives, where EU citizens can learn about the importance of their role;
3. Further encourages a process of feedback between MEPs and their representatives with a view to increasing the effectiveness and relevance of the participation of citizens in these discussions;
4. Expresses its hope for an increased effectiveness in the participation of citizens through the provision of information to all households in conjunction with a coordinated media campaign, which are both to be:
 - a) domestically overseen by the EU Representation,
 - b) reviewed at regular intervals;
5. Emphasises the need for more frequent interaction between MEPs and their constituents through regular clinics, thus enabling citizens to better understand the role of their representative in the EU;
6. Calls for additional interaction between civic bodies such as NGOs, political parties, think-tanks and foundations, *inter alia* and the citizens of the EU, which will give rise to the effectiveness of the participation of the latter;
7. Urges the reform of the ECI to incorporate:
 - a) the increase in the time required to register an initiative to two years,
 - b) the establishment of a maximum period of one year, wherein the EC must decide to either reject or register a proposed initiative,
 - c) the provision of a practical support service to the organiser of an ECI;
8. Endorses the effective implementation of the reformed ECI by the EC under Art. 290 of the Treaty of Nice;
9. Has resolved to increase dialogue levels between NGOs and EU citizens with regard to the provision of information about the ECI and their ability to act under this initiative;
10. Emphasises the need for continued simplification of EU Treaties and documents in order to make them more accessible, transparent and user-friendly;
11. Calls for the establishment of an online voting system for EP elections, aimed at raising the levels of voter turnout across the whole EU;
12. Recommends the EU introduce and finance an 'Internet4U' scheme with the purpose of widening participation in the abovementioned areas and initiatives, regardless of individual, financial circumstances.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Putting ideas into practice: With the creation of the positions of President of the European Council and High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, how can Europe maximise its influence in world politics?

Submitted by: Valeriia Cherednichenko (UA), Claire Conachy (UK), Deniz Kartepe (TR), Lillian Liu (SE), Alexander Müssig (DE), Ilias-Marios Oikonomou (GR), Eoin O'Leary (IE), Lorenzo Parrulli (IT), Milan Petit (NL), Oleh Plakhtiy (UA), Rémi Rivoal (FR), Ana-Marija Simunic (HR), Maria-Cristiana Teodorescu (RO), Era Tushaj (AL), Boudewijn Vijfhuizen (NL), Cecilia Pellosniemi (Chairperson, FI)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Having regard to:
 - i) the Treaty on European Union (TEU),
 - ii) Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU),
 - iii) the Proposal from the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR) on the European External Action Service (EEAS),
 - iv) the opinion of the European Parliament (EP) on the EEAS,
 - v) the consent of the European Commission (EC) on the EEAS,
 - vi) the Council Decision establishing the organisation and functioning of the EEAS (Council Decision, 26.07.2010),
- B. Recalling the core values of EU foreign policy, as stipulated in Art. 21(2) TEU and Art. 208 TFEU,
- C. Noting with regret that the EU has a complex and unconventional way of organising its external representation and diplomacy,
- D. Alarmed by the EU's overrepresentation and underperformance on the international stage,
- E. Recognising the need for the EU to have a more unified and influential voice in global politics,
- F. Fully aware that the EU's representation varies according to policy areas, institutions, interests and identities,
- G. Reaffirming the need for the EU institutions and member states to be more cohesive in the field of foreign and security policy,
- H. Aware of the following changes brought about by the Lisbon Treaty (TEU, 01.12.2009) in the field of foreign and security policy:
 - i) the creation of the position of President of the European Council (Art. 15 TEU),
 - ii) the creation of the position of High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR, Art. 18 and 27 TEU),
 - iii) the creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS, Art. 27 TEU),
 - iv) the transformation of the EC Delegations into EU Delegations,
- I. Recognising the President of the European Council to have a representative function, and the HR's mandate to be of executive nature,



- J. Noting with regret that not all EU member states are equally committed to making the EEAS a successful institution,
 - K. Realising the inexistence of common standards for the employment of civil servants of the EEAS,
 - L. Realising the need to have trained and well-educated people to be involved in the creation of a new generation of EU diplomats,
 - M. Supporting the initiative of the 2010 Belgian Council Presidency of pre-appointing the EU's representatives for all upcoming summits and fora,
 - N. Conscious of the concerns over the democratic legitimacy in the EU's foreign and security policy,
 - O. Bearing in mind the sovereignty of the EU member states;
-
- 1. Calls for the effective implementation of the changes of the Lisbon Treaty and the Council Decision of 26.07.2010;
 - 2. Endorses the role that the presidents of the different EU institutions play on the international arena;
 - 3. Urges the EU member states to fully support the EEAS;
 - 4. Invites the EU institutions with a foreign policy mandate to grant their employees the possibility for inter-institutional exchange(s) in order to increase the consistency and common understanding of foreign policy matters;
 - 5. Further invites the EEAS to create learning possibilities for youngsters by means of internships and cooperation with university programmes with a focus in the field;
 - 6. Encourages an EEAS-specific concours to be put into place after the EEAS has entered its operational phase in 2013;
 - 7. Confirms trade and development policy to be vital diplomatic tools for the Union;
 - 8. Calls upon the further deepening of the EU's extraordinary capacities and competences in the fields of civilian missions and peacekeeping;
 - 9. Trusts the 'esprit de corps' of the EEAS to actively represent the core values of the Union as established in Art. 21(3) TEU and Art. 208 TFEU;
 - 10. Recommends the future presidencies to pre-appoint the EU's representatives for international summits and fora, in order to avoid future confusions in the field;
 - 11. Encourages the EU to take an active and unitary role on the international stage by means of:
 - a) effective coordination under the EEAS framework,
 - b) making use of the unifying role of the President of the European Council and the HR,
 - c) drawing on the connections of the individual member states, and
 - d) taking greater leadership in the initiation of international summits;
 - 12. Calls upon the Union to strive for an EU seat in international bodies;
 - 13. Invites the EU member states to take advantage of the EU delegations in order to maximise its diplomatic power;
 - 14. Recommends the gradual integration of consular and administrative services of the individual member states and the EU Delegations in third countries;
 - 15. Calls for the reduction of member states' diplomatic representation, whenever it is more effective under the EEAS auspices;
 - 16. Urges the creation of a link between the EEAS and Members of the European Parliament, in order to ensure the representation of the European citizens in the EEAS.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND MONETARY AFFAIRS II

The future of the financial markets in the 21st century: What actions should Europe take in the current process of financial market regulation reforms?

Submitted by: Lucy Bradfield (IE), Feyrielle Chilot (FR), Ksenia Eremeeva (RU), Pedro Estorninho da Mata Ribeiro (PT), Camillo Fiorito (NL), Florentin Glötzl (AT), Nadzeya Kudrautsava (BY), Oleksandr Kutereshchyn (UA), Karin-Liis Lahtmäe (EE), Piotr Filip Micula (PL), Karoline Anna Marie Otte (CH), Joanna Kulpa (Vice-President, PL)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Recognising that despite the Financial Services Action Plan (FSAP), no common policy exists regarding financial regulations within the European Union (EU),
- B. Noting that the causes of the current financial crisis include:
 - i) deregulation of financial markets,
 - ii) loose credit conditions,
 - iii) lack of credibility of rating agencies,
- C. Noting with regret that rating agencies lack independence due to their ownership structure and external influences,
- D. Observing that the complexity of some financial instruments prevents consumers from correctly estimating the risks involved in their purchase,
- E. Aware that financial instruments can be traded in two ways:
 - i) on exchange (trading on regulated markets),
 - ii) over the counter (trading directly between financiers),
- F. Alarmed by the fact that 90% of derivatives are traded over the counter which makes the transactions less transparent,
- G. Referring to Central Counterparty Clearing House (CCP) as an intermediary platform that facilitates the transactions between parties and reduces the complexity of market organisation,
- H. Fully aware that large sums of money were allocated to bank bailouts without the establishment of preconditions on how to spend the provided financial support,
- I. Alarmed that potentially harmful speculation is perceived as attractive because of relatively quick and easy profit;



1. Recognises the necessity for the gradual implementation of a common financial market regulation policy;
2. Recommends for the pace of implementation of the aforementioned policy to vary according to the economic situation of the country in question;
3. Supports the establishment of common, basic principles concerning credit conditions in the EU;
4. Calls for the establishment of the European Rating Agency (ERA), which would compete with private agencies and thus raise the rating standards;
5. Further requests ERA be composed of independent experts from member states;
6. Urges the EU to impose regulations obliging financial institutions to provide all information and explanation on financial products to the consumers;
7. Recommends the implementation of CCP in all member states in order to:
 - a) ensure regulated and supervised transactions leading to greater stability and transparency,
 - b) reduce the complexity of the transactions,
 - c) secure that all transactions are fulfilled even in case of a default by one party;
8. Further recommends the CCP evaluate the risk of financial products concerning the amount of necessary capital required as a guarantee;
9. Believes that commercial and investment banks should separate in order to reduce the possibility of consumers losing their savings as a result of a risky investment policy of a bank;
10. Proclaims that only commercial banks should be supported by governments in case of bankruptcy, with the spending of the provided capital to be controlled by the state;
11. Supports the efforts of the EU to reach a global agreement on the financial transaction tax.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT AND TOURISM

Balancing the need for individual mobility with sustainability: How should the EU strategy for supporting public and private transport look like?

Submitted by: Rūta Austrina (AT), Mehmet Can Burdu (TR), Sophie Debrunner Hall (CH), Despina Dimitrakopoulou (GR), Thomas Finch (UK), Ursula Ilo (EE), Manuel Leithner (AT), Boaz Manger (NL), Edoardo Mestieri (IT), Cristina-Andreea Moraru (RO), Jan Nedvídek (CZ), Dionysios Pelekis (GR), Ewa Pudłowska (PL), Olga Pushkareva (RU), Lacina Koné (Vice-President, FR)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Realising the widespread lack of public transport infrastructure and public transport funding in the European Union (EU),
- B. Concerned that the dearth of public transport networks infrastructure has led the public to rely heavily on private transport,
- C. Recognising the discrepancies with regard to cost, quality and breath of public transport systems between member states,
- D. Further noting the need for interoperability and harmonisation of national networks and transport policy,
- E. Convinced that privatisation of public transport service providers without competition leads to monopolistic situations,
- F. Fully believing that the historical lack of East-West transport routes poses a hindrance to economic cooperation,
- G. Aware of the high maintenance and improvement costs of transport networks,
- H. Observing the low opinion many EU citizens have of public transport,
- I. Noting that road traffic congestion affecting 10% of European road networks annually costs an amount equivalent to 0.9 - 1.5% of the EU GDP,
- J. Further nothing with regret the high levels of congestion in the EU's major cities,
- K. Deeply disturbed by the fact that the transport sector is 97% dependent on non-renewable energy resources and has the highest growth rate in greenhouse gas emissions,
- L. Approving of the measures taken by the EU to reach the 20/20/20 greenhouse gas emission target;



1. Recommends further expansion of Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T), in particular the 30 priority projects and those which ease congestion in East-West corridors;
2. Proposes that the European Transport Agency (ETA) harmonises quality standards for transport infrastructure to be implemented by member states of the EU and other affiliated non-member countries;
3. Suggests that member states provide their citizens with incentives to buy low emission cars such as subsidies on purchasing low emission cars and reduction of road tax inversely proportional to emissions;
4. Expresses its hope for greater understanding of new automobile technologies, in particular hybrid cars, through inclusion of a study of the latter in the theoretical part of the driving license courses;
5. Urges member states to introduce congestion charges in major urban centres as those implemented in London in February 2003;
6. Supports offering tax incentives to public transport service providers who use 10% renewable energy resources by 2015;
7. Encourages the expansion of urban rail networks for commuting purposes and to promote intermodal connectivity;
8. Recommends enhancing the attractiveness of Park and Ride (P&R) infrastructure by:
 - a) increasing comfort and safety,
 - b) lowering costs,
 - c) providing services which would not compete with those offered in city centres;
9. Endorses the implementation of an integrated ticketing system to include different national carriers on an intermodal basis;
10. Urges member states to protect their public transport system from monopolistic situations by:
 - a) buying shares in privatised transport companies,
 - b) introducing legislation which prevents the closure of unprofitable network segments without government approval,
 - c) refraining from privatising public transport segments with too few potential private carriers of licenses;
11. Emphasises the necessity of rendering rail travel more appealing than aviation over short distances by:
 - a) funding rail service providers to reduce ticket prices,
 - b) elevating airport taxes based on the final destinations of travellers.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON CULTURE AND EDUCATION

The “ignorant” digital citizen – How should Europe act to ensure that all of its citizens can realise the full potential of the internet while being aware of its possible perils?

Submitted by: Camille Dugay Comencini (IT), Uchenna Egbete (UA), Alex Frigola Bevan (ES), Vladimir Gerginic (CS), Dimitris Hapizanis (GR), Henry Kibble (UK), Kirsty Morrison (UK), Barteld Nanninga (NL), Slawomir Pelczar (PL), Helena Perekovic (HR), Achilleas Platanitis (GR), Giorgi Samkharadze (GE), Olivia Strömblad (SE), Anya Suprunenko (UA), Janne Vanhemmens (BE), Alexandra Posner (Chairperson, DE)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Alarmed by the digital divide separating citizens who have access to digital information and communication technology (ICT) from those who do not have access due to a lack of knowledge and resources,
- B. Realising the importance of having an eEducated society spanning different age groups and social classes,
- C. Having reviewed the European Union (EU) Digital Agenda which aims to provide all European citizens with faster and more secure internet access by 2013 whilst emphasising the need for research and development of ICT,
- D. Concerned about the lack of awareness amongst digital citizens regarding internet perils such as personal data theft, credit card fraud, spam and viruses,
- E. Expressing its satisfaction with the Art. 5 (1) of Directive 2002/58/EC of the EU concerning the prevention of criminal activities such as information abuse, identity theft and fraud,
- F. Alarmed that personal information on the internet is often left weakly protected causing identity theft through so-called ‘phishing’,
- G. Taking into account the Convention on Cybercrime (ETS N. 185) by the Council of Europe,
- H. Viewing with appreciation the examples of Estonia and Spain where e-Services are being implemented based on successful legal act on eGovernment,
- I. Recognising the need to promote eGovernance among EU member states with the hope of other European countries following suit,
- J. Alarmed by the gap between European governments and their citizens caused by the lack of digital information on governmental activity,
- K. Recognising that a low level of security on governmental websites may lead to a lack of confidence in eServices amongst citizens, who desire a transparent and trustworthy digital system,
- L. Keeping in mind the importance of the right of every European citizen to freely express their opinion online,
- M. Conscious that the development of e-Governance and online monitoring of personal information may lead to civilian concerns about hyper-surveillance,
- N. Bearing in mind the inconsistency regarding different legislative systems in European countries,



- O. Emphasising that not all European countries can follow the lead on research, ICT and eGovernance of economically stable countries,
- P. Having considered that laws and guidelines may become outdated due to the evolving nature of the internet;
1. Calls upon cooperation between all European countries in order to define a common policy on e-Governance;
 2. Encourages all European countries to create and enhance workshop, courses, seminars for the elderly and the youth in order to reduce digital divide;
 3. Encourages companies to provide their employees with seminars and workshops at their workplace;
 4. Supports the intensification of partnerships between European countries and companies, such as EduVision, in order to provide access to digital resources;
 5. Urges local authorities to provide internet access in public areas, eBuses as well as libraries;
 6. Endorses European countries to work alongside local governments raising interest for eGovernance through media campaigns;
 7. Underlines the necessity of viral marketing campaigns in order to warn internet users of perils;
 8. Supports the promotion and expansion of open source software to reduce illegal content on websites;
 9. Calls for the development of official websites of governments, which provide up-to-date information in all European languages in order to increase citizens participation in eDemocracy;
 10. Demands the establishment of online tools for an active interaction between government and citizens in all European countries, such as forums, portals, online polls and ePetitions;
 11. Emphasises the importance of the free flow of information between the government and its citizens while still respecting personal privacy as it is stated in the Human Right on privacy;
 12. Calls for the continuous development of security measures for eGovernance in order to inspire public confidence in the safety of personal data;
 13. Supports the promotion of web databases storing information about common spammers in order to reduce the amount of spam;
 14. Endorses ICT industries to research further into encryption technologies with the purpose of reducing the threat of identity theft;
 15. Supports the Convention Committee on Cybercrime to search intensively for websites with illegal content and shut them down;
 16. Reinforces the necessity of reporting illegal webpages by citizens.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND MONETARY AFFAIRS I

Bailouts in Greece, deficits in Portugal, crisis in Spain: In the context of the current debt crisis: how should the Stability and Growth Pact be assessed in order to ensure a fair and secure future for all?

Submitted by: Barbara Adamczak (PL), Pavel Chernenko (RU), Christine-Bianca Hanganu (RO), Edmunds Jurevics (LV), Amélie Lefort (FR), Patricia Mardale (RO), Cormac McGuinness (IE), Amantia Muhedini (AL), Niall Murphy (IE), Douglas Newlands (UK), Cansu Tanatmis (TR), Vlad Tataranu (RO), Joana Vukatana (AL), Arriana Yiallourides (CY), Irina Zyablova (RU), Philip Danielsson (Chairperson, SE), Krista Simberg (President, FI)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Recognising the importance of the Stability and Growth Pact (SGP),
- B. Recalling the criteria of the SGP to be:
 - i) An annual budget deficit no higher than 3% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP),
 - ii) A national debt lower than 60% of GDP or approaching that value,
- C. Conscious that the current debt crisis was caused by non-compliance with the SGP criteria,
- D. Noting with regret that the sanctions of the SGP have not always been fully implemented in the past,
- E. Further regretting the loss of credibility of the SGP as a consequence of this failed implementation,
- F. Noting with deep concern that only four European Union (EU) member states are currently complying with the criteria of the SGP,
- G. Affirming that it is unviable to apply economic sanctions on countries that are already struggling with large debts,
- H. Convinced that the support of EU citizens is important to the reform of the SGP,
- I. Condemning the fact that compliant EU member states were responsible for bailing out Eurozone countries,
- J. Emphasising economic growth to be a significant factor in overcoming the current debt crisis,
- K. Realising that corruption, tax evasion and the informal economy have a negative impact on national budgets and industrial development,
- L. Bearing in mind the importance of budgetary stability in the maintenance of long term social cohesion,
- M. Recognising the definition of fiscal policy to be within the competence of individual member states,
- N. Noting the importance of having a common framework to help the Eurozone countries in extreme economic difficulty,
- O. Observing that the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF), which provides a 'safety net' of up to 440 billion Euros in bonds, expires in three years time;



1. Recommends a reformed SGP to strive for:
 - a) a fair balance between rigidity and flexibility,
 - b) the clarification of rules and sanctions,
 - c) transparency regarding decision making within the EU institutions;
2. Encourages the implementation of automatically applied and graded sanctions that are adjusted according to the potential violations of Eurozone countries;
3. Calls for the member states to create national funds during times of economic prosperity that will serve as safety funds for future crises and previous non-compliance with the SGP;
4. Urges the Eurozone countries in violation of the SGP criteria to agree on debt restructuring policies with the European Commission until they meet the SGP criteria;
5. Condemns the application of economic sanctions to non-compliant Eurozone countries while still in recession;
6. Accepts only *force majeure* such as natural disasters to be a reason for non-compliance with the SGP;
7. Recommends stricter budgetary supervision through an independent body reporting to the European Commission on all aspects of the SGP;
8. Endorses the use of regular assessment budgetary objectives by Eurozone countries to be agreed upon by national governments in consultation with the European Commission so as to ensure budgetary discipline;
9. Calls upon the European Commission to manage the competitiveness of the EU through:
 - a) the use of independent and unbiased agencies to provide reports on the economic competitiveness of each member state,
 - b) publishing these reports in full;
10. Urges the European Commission to act decisively in cases of excessive national debt, by means of:
 - a) reporting to the Council of the European Union on the national debt levels of all EU member states approaching the limit of 60% of GDP,
 - b) advising the European Council on the implementation of sanctions;
11. Proposes the EFSF to be included as a permanent safety measure within the SGP framework;
12. Recommends the Eurozone convergence period to be extended in order to assure long term budgetary stability.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY II

Steps following Copenhagen: How should Europe seek to approach the UN Climate Change Conference in Cancún?

Submitted by: Georgina Ansaldo Giné (ES), Basak Arslan (TR), Wim van Doorn (NL), Charlotte Fromont (FR), Alysha Hoare (IE), Arno Janssens (BE), Anna Kampfmann (DE), Sonia Liang (SE), Alexandre Narayanin (FR), Gabriel Pavlides (CY), Teresa Stadler (AT), Dmitry Vorobyev (RU), Jari Marjelund (Chairperson, FI)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Alarmed by the 0.74 °C increase in the global average temperature in the last century,
- B. Believing that global warming is very likely caused by anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, as stated in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),
- C. Concerned by the predicted average increase of 4 °C in the global temperature if no further measures to reduce emissions are taken,
- D. Conscious of the predicted effects of a 4 °C increase, such as flooding of 2.2% of total landmass of the earth, comprising 600 million inhabitants and 10% of the agricultural potential of the planet,
- E. Further believing that immediate action to tackle climate change will require 1% of the global gross domestic product (GDP) per year, while inaction will lead to a reduction of global GDP by 20% compared to the baseline scenario, as stated in the 2006 Stern Review,
- F. Recognising the fact that a new global climate agreement needs to be reached before the expiration of the Kyoto Protocol in 2012,
- G. Noting with deep regret that a legally binding framework was not agreed upon at the United Nations (UN) Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen,
- H. Welcoming the progress made in Copenhagen in terms of:
 - i) the parties recognising climate change as a scientific fact and stating that human actions affect the climate,
 - ii) the decision made by the developed countries to fund climate action in developing countries by \$100 billion by 2020,
 - iii) the creation of the Emission Verification System,
 - iv) the adoption of measures to fight deforestation particularly in Indonesia and Brazil,
- I. Adopting the aim of keeping the increase in global average temperature below 2 °C compared to pre-industrial times,
- J. Alarmed by the fact that the European Union (EU) failed to speak with a unified voice in Copenhagen,
- K. Noting with satisfaction that the changes in foreign policy representation of the EU introduced by the Lisbon Treaty may help the EU to negotiate more efficiently in Cancún,



- L. Realising that the disparities between developed and developing countries have led to disagreements about the share of responsibility in tackling climate change,
 - M. Bearing in mind that unilateral emission regulation in Europe may lead to companies relocating their operations to areas with less regulation,
 - N. Taking note of the 2020 targets on renewable energy and emission reductions adopted by the European Commission in 2007,
 - O. Taking further note that reaching the target of 20% of energy to be produced from renewable sources by 2020 still requires extensive funding,
 - P. Keeping in mind that the carbon capture and storage (CCS) mechanism is the only existing technology able to reduce carbon dioxide in the atmosphere,
 - Q. Observing that CCS technology still requires significant development before being taken into use as a pilot project in the United Kingdom in 2012;
-
1. Urges the EU to approach the Cancún conference with the aim of reaching a legally binding agreement establishing specific emission reduction targets for all countries while taking into account their different levels of development;
 2. Calls for the EU to organise a summit before the Cancún conference in order to formulate its common stance in Cancún;
 3. Authorises the President of the European Council to act as the voice of the EU in Cancún;
 4. Recommends the EU to negotiate the same baseline year for emission targets of all states;
 5. Encourages the EU to scale its target of reducing its emissions to 30% by 2020 should the other industrialised countries join the effort;
 6. Calls upon the EU to promote the creation of a global carbon trading system including a fixed number of emission permits to be auctioned;
 7. Supports the further development and funding of the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund focusing on the development of environmentally friendly technologies and adaptation to the effects of climate change;
 8. Calls for the Green Climate Fund to establish a group of experts to facilitate environmental projects in countries particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change;
 9. Suggests that 50% of all funds collected through the carbon trade system are directed to the Green Climate Fund;
 10. Encourages industrialised countries to support sustainable economic growth in developing countries by accepting the agreed \$100 billion as the baseline for the negotiations on funding;
 11. Urges the EU to subsidise companies investing in renewable energy and to impose sanctions on those violating their emission permits;
 12. Affirms that all further measures will be regulated by the Emission Verification System set up in Copenhagen;
 13. Requests all countries with coastal areas to set up basic embankments where rising sea levels threaten the society and agriculture;
 14. Supports further investment in research to improve the safety and effectiveness of the CCS mechanism before its implementation.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY, RESEARCH AND ENERGY

World leader in scientific research and innovation: a common European goal? What should the EU framework look like to enable efficient and successful cooperation in scientific research in Europe?

Submitted by: Pinar Akkor (TR), Uģis Balmaks (LV), Raphael Bek (AT), Daria Chernomorskaya (RU), Lavrentia Christodoulou (GR), Ceren Hazar (TR), Dmytro Honcharenko (UA), Sara Juričić (HR), Luis Menéndez (ES), Erik Mürsepp (EE), Łukasz Napiórkowski (PL), George Santis (CY), Laia Silva (ES), Jonáš Jančařík (Chairperson, CZ)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Noting with satisfaction the creation of the 'Europe 2020 Strategy' aiming to develop a knowledge-based economy while promoting smart growth,
- B. Alarmed by the failure of the Lisbon Strategy which aimed at making the European Union (EU) the most competitive economy worldwide and achieving full employment by 2010,
- C. Approving the initiatives of the European Research Area (ERA) project which is designed and operated on regional, national and European levels,
- D. Recalling the aim of ERA to enable researchers, research institutions and businesses to increase their mobility and to cooperate across borders,
- E. Deeply disturbed by the fact that Europe has not achieved a leading position in research and development (R&D) as it is not reaching its full academic and economic potential,
- F. Noting with regret that there are 56% more patents per year in the USA than in the EU,
- G. Believing that researchers are discouraged from registering patents in the EU by the complex and expensive process of patenting in the EU member states,
- H. Deeply concerned by the fact that a large number of European researchers are leaving the EU in search of a better working environment,
- I. Noting with regret the lack of efficient coordination of research activities between EU member states,
- J. Approving of the funding activities within the 7th Framework Programme,
- K. Welcoming the recent establishment of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT) and the role it plays in coordinating research, innovation and education,
- L. Noting with regret that the majority of member states have failed to reach the aspiration outlined in the Lisbon Strategy of investing at least 3% of GDP in R&D,
- M. Viewing with concern the relatively low investment of the European private sector into R&D in Europe,
- N. Aware of the bureaucratic and practical barriers that hinder mobility of researchers across institutions, sectors and countries,
- O. Fully aware of the low interest in scientific careers among European youth,
- P. Emphasising the potential profits from partnership between industry and research organisations conducted through programmes such as Marie Curie Actions;



1. Recommends all EU member states invest at least 3% of the national GDP into R&D by 2020;
2. Further recommends the gradual increase in EU competency over member states in the field of R&D;
3. Affirms that implementation of EU R&D strategies should be a competency of individual member states in order to respond to their specific needs and capabilities;
4. Urges the continued development and implementation of a common, affordable and less bureaucratic European patenting system that would also be accessible for non-EU parties and countries;
5. Considers supporting EU-based companies to use innovative technologies by providing co-funding of purchases of European patent licenses;
6. Calls for improvement of the current database of open positions in R&D (Researchers' Mobility Portal) by:
 - a) demanding all public employers and encouraging private employers to list open positions,
 - b) providing easy access to the system for the applicants,
 - c) granting access to the system to non-EU applicants;
7. Further calls for a simplified procedure of acquiring work and residence permits for scientists and researchers aspiring to work within the EU;
8. Considers progressive industrial regulations (such as the usage of green technologies) aid the evolution of the market;
9. Hopes to enhance teaching skills as well as student experience through the means of knowledge sharing at conferences and exchange programmes;
10. Encourages the private sector to invest in scientific research guided by motives such as corporate social responsibility, tax incentives, access to public funds and potential profit through innovation;
11. Further encourages continued cooperation between scientists and universities by:
 - a) motivating and assisting students to publish their research in scientific journals,
 - b) raising funds for student research,
 - c) creating a network to share knowledge among students, professors and individual scientists;
12. Endorses the cooperation between EU member states, namely in providing scientists all over Europe with access to existing infrastructure such as International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) or Large Hadron Collider (LHC);
13. Supports creating new research facilities particularly in those EU member states that are lacking in new fields of research.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS II

United in diversity?: How can Europe combat social exclusion prevalent in immigrant communities and live up to its promise of equal opportunities?

Submitted by: Robin Baraud (FR), Laura Julia Blagoev (FI), Robert Caldwell (IE), Irina Gadaeva (RU), Evanthia Kasiora (GR), Vanya Kips (BE), Paulina Lushaku (AL), Maria Miguel Moreira Gomes (PT), Anja Nilsson (SE), Chloe Orphanides (CY), Julia Solervicens (ES), Jennifer Stewart (UK), Olena Vazhynska (UA), Ieva Viksne (LV), Ioanna Yiallourides (CY), Lelde Benke (Chairperson, LV)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Defines social exclusion as not feeling like a part of the society one lives in as a consequence of discrimination, cultural differences, inequality of living conditions, income discrepancy or language barriers,
 - B. Recognising the tendency for immigrants to settle in closed communities,
 - C. Noting that immigrants may not be willing to integrate into their host community,
 - D. Keeping in mind that language barriers can make education inaccessible for immigrants,
 - E. Perceiving the tendency to exclude immigrants from social and professional networks,
 - F. Emphasising the importance of an immigrant workforce to alleviate issues arising from the ageing European population,
 - G. Alarmed by the recent rise in support for nationalist parties in Europe consequently increasing hostility towards immigrants,
 - H. Convinced that the EU hosts the largest part of the world's unskilled migrants and a small part of the skilled migrants;
-
- 1. Strongly recommends all European countries to ratify the United Nations Convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and members of their families;
 - 2. Requests the further development of common European Commission (EC) guidelines on immigration;
 - 3. Hereby recommends the creation of a common European database to facilitate selective immigration by:
 - a) providing immigrants with information on job opportunities in EU member states,
 - b) ensuring the effective distribution of migrants' skills according to the needs of the labour market;



4. Proposes the guidelines to include national Ministries of Education establishing free courses for immigrants in:
 - a) language and culture for adults and children,
 - b) professional terminology and work ethics for adults;
5. Further calls for the establishment of a Europe-wide initiative encouraging entrepreneurship in ethnic minority communities by:
 - a) an annual competition in entrepreneurship for ethnic minorities in each country,
 - b) financially rewarding the winners of these competitions,
 - c) mentorship on the inception of new businesses by local NGOs and business leaders;
6. Designates the EC network of National Contact Points on integration create a computer programme simulating the integration process of an immigrant;
7. Calls upon NGOs to establish volunteer peer-to-peer mentoring programmes for migrant students in schools.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL LIBERTIES, JUSTICE AND HOME AFFAIRS

Reassessing the Schengen Area: With its extensive and permeable land borders, how to find the best balance between a sustainable migration strategy and freedom of movement in Europe?

Submitted by: Marius Aure (NO), Christina Galliou (GR), Hellen Gheorghe (SE), Harry Gray (UK), Gjergji Lushaku (AL), Luna Milatovic (RS), Maksym Nikolaichuk (UA), Luca Olumets (EE), Marina Pokrovskaya (RU), Albert Reverendo Mascort (ES), Sílvia Susach (ES), Ekaterina Sushchevskaya (RU), Sonia Trabelsi (IT), Theresa Wagner (DE), Iuliia Zemlytska (UA), Anastasiia Ianovytska (Chairperson, UA)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Emphasising that freedom of movement is the guiding principle of the Schengen Agreement,
 - B. Bearing in mind that the accession of new states into the Schengen Area may pose new challenges to the management of migration flows,
 - C. Taking into account the existence of common visa requirements to enter the Schengen Area,
 - D. Realising that the lack of consistency in the visa issuing procedures used by embassies makes visas of some member states easier to obtain than others,
 - E. Concerned by the estimated high number of illegal immigrants within the Schengen Area,
 - F. Noting with regret the existence of more vulnerable areas in certain land and water areas on external borders of the Schengen Area which eases illegal crossing,
 - G. Alarmed that open internal borders threaten security in the Schengen Area by facilitating cross-border criminal activity,
 - H. Welcoming the transition from the current Schengen Information System I + (SIS I +) to the SIS II, to be implemented in 2011,
 - I. Aware that many immigrants do not comply with the requirements to leave the Schengen Area upon the expiration of their visa, thus making their stay illegal;
-
1. Calls upon the European Commission to ensure a standardised Schengen visa application procedure by:
 - a) introducing Schengen visa application feedback forms to be returned by visa applicants on a voluntary basis,
 - b) analysing the information obtained from the feedback forms and addressing any discrepancies exposed,
 - c) publishing reports on the actions taken;



2. Supports the implementation of an online Schengen visa application system in order to facilitate legal ways of obtaining visas;
3. Requests that the embassies of the member states submit information inquiries through the SIS I + regarding the entrance and exit of the Schengen visa holders to and from the Schengen Area;
4. Further requests the embassies of the member states to report on individuals who have exceeded the allowed duration of their stay to the respective national law enforcement agencies;
5. Reaffirms that the penalties for exceeding the allowed duration of stay in the Schengen Area should be addressed on a case by case basis according to respective national legislation;
6. Calls for closer cooperation between Schengen and non-Schengen Agreement member states with regard to border management;
7. Urges the Schengen Area member states to reinforce the external border security with special attention to areas that are more vulnerable to illegal crossing by providing the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the member states of the European Union (Frontex) with more trained personnel and technical equipment;
8. Encourages the new strategies set out in SIS II to be fully implemented in order to prevent illegal immigration into the Schengen Area.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

In response to recent concerns over Russia's treatment of the Moscow Helsinki Group and Sakharov Prize Winners, how should Europe seek to build future relationships with the continent's Eastern giant?

Submitted by: Randolf Carr (DE), Dominic Degen (CH), Yann Eisert (DE), Gráinne Hawkes (IE), Noémie Henaff (FR), Amy Hendry (UK), Aleksander Małecki (PL), Juho Nikko (FI), Eoin O'Driscoll (IE), Alexander Proctor (FI), Viktoriia Pustynikova (UA), Elina Sairanen (FI), Ema Štastná (CZ), Mariam Takaishvili (GE), Alexander Ten Cate (NL), Anna O'Leary (Vice-President, IE)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Affirming Russia's right to sovereignty,
- B. Believing in the strength of European unity of purpose whilst understanding the right of individual member states to establish bilateral relationships,
- C. Recognising the need for the European Union (EU) and Russia trade relationship to diversify due to the current predominance of unsustainable fossil fuels,
- D. Noting with regret the mutual distrust between Russia and the EU,
- E. Noting with satisfaction the benefits of the existing strategic partnership between the EU and Russia,
- F. Concerned by allegations of Russian infringement of human rights such as the treatment of the Moscow Helsinki Group and Sakharov Prize Winners,
- G. Bearing in mind that non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are an essential component of a democratic state,
- H. Acknowledging Russian concerns over the treatment of Russian minorities within Europe,
- I. Strongly believing that foreign investment in Russia is currently hindered by perceptions of corruption,
- J. Concerned by the lack of small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) in Russia,
- K. Convinced that Russia's accession to the World Trade Organisation (WTO) would act as an anchor for social and economic reform within the country,
- L. Believing that an increase of cultural and educational exchange is essential for fostering mutual respect and human rights,
- M. Respecting the various differences in political systems and culture between Russia and the EU due to different political histories,
- N. Declaring full support for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, EU Fundamental Charter of Human Rights, Helsinki Final Act and the European Court of Human Rights,
- O. Fully aware that unequal social and economic conditions lead to political instability;



1. Calls for the bilateral monitoring of EU and Russian economic policies to foster trust;
2. Endorses Russia's accession to the WTO to integrate it into the global trading system;
3. Encourages the continuation of negotiations for the creation of a free trade area between the EU and Russia;
4. Approves the recognition of the Russian economy as a market economy by the EU to foster further economic ties;
5. Further calls for the establishment of a new European emissions trading scheme to include Russia;
6. Suggests the exchange of scientific and technological expertise;
7. Urges Russia's facilitation of the work of the NGOs striving to eradicate corruption, in order to attract more foreign investment;
8. Supports Technical Aid to the Commonwealth of Independent States (TACIS) programmes for democratic development of countries within this area;
9. Requests a more coordinated approach from the EU towards Russia through foreign and security policy;
10. Recommends the loosening of visa restrictions, in particular for educational purposes;
11. Resolves to establish education exchange programmes between the EU and Russia to achieve mutual cultural understanding;
12. Recommends the official incorporation of NGOs in EU-Russian discussions.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY I

From cradle to grave and 'downcycling' – How can the EU take action to ensure a truly sustainable combination of production and consumption?

Submitted by: Margarida Anselmo (PT), Anna Cremin (IE), Marie Dromey (IE), Can Fenerci (TR), Celine Göbel (DE), Kevin Hartwell (FR), Meeri Helminen (FI), Filip Jaskolski (PL), Jean Lemon Kone (FR), Edward O'Carroll (IE), Yiannos Vakis (CY), Céline Vermeire (BE), Jasmin Wachter (AT), Maria Manolescu (Chairperson, RO)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Disturbed that the current consumption of natural resources within the European Union (EU) exceeds twice its regenerative capacities,
- B. Alarmed by the lack of sustainable consumption and production policies,
- C. Convinced that current measures aimed at strengthening sustainability do not hinder economic growth,
- D. Emphasising the perceived current inefficiency of energy resources management and low usage of renewable energy resources,
- E. Deeply concerned by the perceived lack of an efficient waste management system for domestic and industrial use,
- F. Recognising both the lack and varying availability level of recycling and composting facilities across the EU,
- G. Fully aware that multiple product labelling systems regarding environmental standards create confusion among consumers,
- H. Believing that the level of EU citizens' environmental awareness could be improved,
- I. Noting with regret the lack of cooperation between environmental organisations,
- J. Condemning international dumping and illegal disposal of waste,
- K. Viewing with appreciation the existence of legislation regarding the aforementioned environmental issues such as the Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) and the 2008 package, along with other policies concerning agricultural, constructional and hazardous waste,
- L. Bearing in mind that investment in innovative sustainable projects would be beneficial for the labour markets;



1. Calls for the expansion of the EU ETS by:
 - a) including a larger number of greenhouse gases in the scheme,
 - b) integrating more industrial sectors, such as and in particular, the chemical industry,
 - c) cooperating with third-party states utilising emission trading schemes in order to establish a global trading network;
2. Demands the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to rank member states according to their sustainable consumption and production (SCP) responsibility so as to encourage improvement in SCP standards;
3. Requests stricter implementation of regulations and harsher sanctions to reduce and prevent international dumping;
4. Encourages green vouchers and new technology initiatives;
5. Urges the progressive banning of inefficient electric products rated A, B or C based on their lifelong energy consumption;
6. Further requests expert help for new companies to become more sustainable;
7. Recommends companies to use as little material for the packaging of goods as possible;
8. Encourages the creation of a network linking all EU environmental organisations and institutions in order to improve communication and encourage joint research;
9. Supports making municipal disposal more efficient and more accessible by employing measures which include, but are not limited to:
 - a) recycling bins being placed on the streets of urban areas,
 - b) distributing compost bins to domestic households,
 - c) collecting waste frequently,
 - d) implementing the 'pay by weight' scheme;
10. Draws attention to innovative ideas to raise awareness of sustainability, such as social networking, 'Green-light' music videos and festivals, carbon free days, free ecological year and think-tanks;
11. Further recommends a deposit scheme for renewable materials such as glass or plastic bottles and aluminium cans;
12. Declares the introduction of an 'eco-label' to assess the effect of a product on the environment throughout its entire lifecycle;
13. Urges the introduction of a waste trading scheme to allow companies to purchase waste which may be used in their own production;
14. Approves a limitation of the amount of waste a company can produce, whilst proportionally fining any excess ('pay by weight' system);
15. Authorises the reduction of finances generated by the 'pay by weight' scheme to subsidise sustainable projects.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS I

With over 20% of young Europeans aged 16-24 unemployed, what more can be done to ensure that this generation of potential workers does not become irreversibly excluded from the labour market?

Submitted by: Yulia Absalyamova (RU), Aleksandar Arandjelovic (RS), Cem Ergin (TR), Evgenia Faraza (GR), Gatis Gereiss (LV), Anca-Stefania Jijiie (RO), Janne Kirmet (EE), Oksana Korchak (UA), Jakub Kortus (CZ), Despina Papadopoulou (GR), Ana Maria Raducanu (RO), Anne Sartou du Jonchay (FR), Nataliia Tarasevych (UA), Karolina Uchman (PL), Przemyslaw Wilk (PL), Nassos Stylianou (Chairperson, CY)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Alarmed by the 5.3% increase in the rate of youth unemployment since 2007 due to the economic crisis,
- B. Keeping in mind that according to economic theory unemployment is a natural phenomenon that for a given market should oscillate around 4%,
- C. Taking into account the variety of interconnected factors that contribute to the increase of youth unemployment in member states,
- D. Concerned that youth unemployment does not only have economic consequences but also negative psychological effects such as higher rates of crime and suicides,
- E. Noting with regret that a significant number of young people are not provided with full-time employment contracts which guarantee higher benefits and more job security,
- F. Conscious of the lack of relationship between knowledge acquired from education and the demands of the labour market,
- G. Bearing in mind that many Europeans are employed in jobs which have no relation to their qualifications,
- H. Deeply concerned by the increasing number of young people choosing to stay reliant upon state benefit for a long period of time rather than seeking to gain employment,
- I. Taking into account that young people are facing problems fulfilling the high requirements set by employers due to a lack of experience and practical skills,
- J. Alarmed by the shortage of information and knowledge young people have regarding the difficulties and opportunities encountered by their contemporaries entering the labour market,
- K. Recognising the benefits of implementing the Europe 2020 strategy by European Union (EU) member states,
- L. Welcoming Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of 29.04.2004 on the coordination of social security systems that came into force on 01.05.2010 designed to make it easier for EU citizens to move from one country to another in search of work,
- M. Having read that 99% of start-up businesses in Europe are micro and small sized enterprises and that one third of these are launched by people who were previously employed,
- N. Emphasising the possibility of entrepreneurship provided by the European Progress Microfinance Facility (EPMF);



1. Encourages the combination of work and study during education through compulsory apprenticeships, internships and professional placements to provide the opportunity of acquiring practical job skills;
2. Recommends the transference of internships into permanent employment contracts by means of financial rewards for employers;
3. Supports companies to hire unemployed young people by providing benefits such as the exemption from paying social security charges for the person they employ for a period of two years;
4. Urges the provision of vocational training by local councils for low qualified and unemployed young people;
5. Calls upon member states not to reduce the minimum wage of people aged between 16-24 below the national level;
6. Has resolved to propose the enforcement of stricter legislation regarding unemployment benefits including:
 - a) the provision of vocational training after a period of six months of receiving state unemployment benefits,
 - b) a gradual reduction in state unemployment benefits after the six months following the end of training provided the citizen has declined job offers;
7. Suggests the establishment of regional information centres concerning employment with the cooperation of local councils where young unemployed people will be able to find information for job-seeking procedures and labour market demands;
8. Supports the organisation of week-long Employment Fairs on a regional level acting as platforms which:
 - a) introduce youth to potential future employers,
 - b) enable them to directly apply for jobs that they are interested in,
 - c) gives the opportunity for companies to offer jobs,
 - d) links young Europeans to stakeholders;
9. Further recommends the provision of scholarships sponsored by the European Social Fund in cooperation with the private sector for the study of specific subjects in order to deal with the demands of the labour market;
10. Invites further investment in national economies of member states in 'future-oriented' industries and green entrepreneurship to secure new working places for graduates;
11. Calls for the creation of additional facilities providing loans and guidance to unemployed young persons willing to start their own business such as the EPMF.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

With the world demand for food expected to double by 2050, what role should the Common Agricultural Policy play in providing Europe's population in an affordable and sustainable way after 2013?

Submitted by: Jan Bubiencyk (FI), James De Burca (IE), Pablo Gonzalez (ES), Susannah Karatzia (CY), Cem Kocabasa (TR), Dimitrios Kolovopoulos (CY), Valeriia Konstanytnova (UA), Alexandra Kotthaus (DE), Franziska Maier (DE), Lars Melakoski (FI), Timothée Pasqualini (FR), Ivan Shkundov (RU), Małgorzata Szymańska (PL), Sini Ventelä (FI), Bruce Willis (GR), Buser Say (Chairperson, TR)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Fully aware of the fact that the budget of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is unsustainable and that the reallocation of subsidies is a necessity,
- B. Noting that the World Trade Organisation (WTO) disapproves of European protectionism, excessive subsidies and protective tariffs in the agricultural sector,
- C. Noting with regret that high insulating tariffs hinder trade relations and agricultural development of third world countries,
- D. Draws attention to the importance of the second pillar of the CAP which increases agricultural standards in rural areas,
- E. Alarmed by the unequal levels of competitiveness between small and large scale farming in the agricultural market,
- F. Deeply convinced that large scale agricultural enterprises as well as small scale enterprises have the potential to compete in a free market,
- G. Keeping in mind that small scale farming is mainly focused on supplying local markets and less exposed to the world market,
- H. Expressing its satisfaction that approximately 90% of agricultural products consumed within the European Union (EU) are produced within the Union,
- I. Concerned by the artificially high prices within the agricultural market of the EU,
- J. Convinced that urban farming has potential value for the future rising food demand due to cutting transportation costs for flourishing metropolitan area,
- K. Emphasising that farming enterprises in the free market require regulation in order to meet sustainable production,
- L. Deeply alarmed that extensive use of pesticides and harmful chemicals are proven to be detrimental for human health and the environment,
- M. Acknowledging that the demand for organic food has increased in the recent decades,
- N. Realising that Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) have both positive and negative effects which require further scientific research and open discussions between the scientific community and citizens,



- O. Regretting the lack of knowledge, education and motivation within the EU, leading to unsafe and unsustainable food production;

1. Endorses the establishment of a gradually modulated system in which subsidised farms will move into a free market as follows:
 - a) farms with higher profits and greater sustainability will begin a transition from their current funding into the second pillar,
 - b) farms with uncertain competitiveness will subsequently follow this transition,
 - c) the time-lag in the abolition of subsidies for large scale and small scale farms will allow less advantaged farms to meet the higher standards in the transition period thus protecting their competitiveness in longer term;
2. Enforces sanctions on farms which have already transitioned into the free market and failed to fulfil the second pillar standards in order to ensure their level to be maintained;
3. Urges the regional and national inspection organisations to unite into one body in order to ensure more regular and thorough inspections of farms and thereby obliging farmers to uphold EU standards;
4. Further recommends gradual reduction of tariffs simultaneously with the reduction of subsidies in the second pillar in order to create a competitive market structure;
5. Supports the expansion of farmer unions in order to provide farmers with innovative and efficient methods of farming;
6. Emphasises the need for collaboration between expanded national farmer unions of member states;
7. Calls for a creation of a European long-term micro credit scheme with low or inexistent interest rates in order to encourage and facilitate the initiation of small scale agricultural enterprises for the younger generation;
8. Encourages the further extensive research of urban farming methods;
9. Further requests the intensification of scientific research on GMOs by public institutions as well as institutions for innovation and technology.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS II

Is the danger of nationalism arising in today's Europe? How should Europe react to the Hungarian initiative to make minorities in neighbouring states Hungarian citizens?

Submitted by: Anna Borrell Mauri (ES), Renaud Chardon (FR), Kistina Chelmakina (UA), Beatrice Coclite (IT), Başak Etkin (TR), Luka Filipović-Grčić (HR), Ella Kiviniemi (FI), Hans Maes (BE), Christine Maragkou (GR), Tero Pikkarainen (FI), Nemanja Predojević (RS), Petr Procházka (CZ), Aleksander Pudlowski (PL), Alexander Surkov (RU), Christiane Kraus (AT), Victoria Wilkinson (Chairperson, NO)

The European Youth Parliament,

- A. Realising that the Hungarian initiative to make minorities in neighbouring states Hungarian citizens interferes in the domestic affairs of the aforementioned states,
- B. Convinced that Hungary should have consulted its neighbouring countries before implementing the initiative,
- C. Approving the borders established by the Treaty of Trianon,
- D. Bearing in mind that territorial changes throughout history have caused the presence of Hungarian minorities in the neighbouring countries,
- E. Alarmed that the minorities are most affected in the current conflict,
- F. Taking into account the variety within citizenship models concerning rights and responsibilities of the citizen,
- G. Realising that the legal basis of the conflict between Hungary and Slovakia is the European Convention on Nationality,
- H. Noting that all sovereign states have the legal right to create their own legislation regarding who should be granted citizenship,
- I. Further noting that these laws prohibit the creation of a common policy on who should be granted citizenship,
- J. Noting with regret a state's legal right to withdraw citizenship when acquiring one of another country,
- K. Aware of the fact that offering citizenship to minorities living abroad potentially leads to non-EU citizens becoming EU citizens,
- L. Alarmed that the conflict between Hungary and Slovakia is a result of nationalism;



1. Encourages political leaders of Hungarian minorities not to advise these minorities to escalate the Hungarian-Slovakian conflict by accepting Hungarian citizenship;
2. Urges Slovakia and Hungary to rescind their recent laws concerning citizenship;
3. Calls upon the EU to initiate and participate in negotiations between Hungary and the neighbouring states and the political leaders of Hungarian minorities living abroad;
4. Calls for the alteration of the European Convention of Nationality by omitting chapter II, article 3, point 1 and article 7, point 1a;
5. Further calls for the creation of a common European policy to protect the rights of minorities in individual nations;
6. Encourages all European countries to accept dual citizenship to ensure that the minorities can be granted citizenship in both the country of residence and their country of origin;
7. Recommends the introduction of multilayered citizenship to achieve a compromise between the country of residence and the country of origin;
8. Calls upon countries with long term minority residents to grant them full citizenship;
9. Further calls upon the original country of the minorities living abroad to decide upon the layer of citizenship those minorities are offered;
10. Recommends that the EU create an agency in order to ensure that the Common European Policy is implemented;
11. Calls for the introduction of compulsory language lessons teaching the major language of the country of residence for all minority;
12. Supports the willingness of minorities to preserve their original culture.



EUROPEAN **YOUTH** PARLIAMENT
PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN DES **JEUNES**
DEUTSCHLAND GERMANY

The 64th International Session Frankfurt 2010 is supported by:



Education and Culture DG

'Youth in Action' Programme



COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE



Konrad
Adenauer
Stiftung



International Partner



Dräger-Stiftung



Mainova AG
Infraserv GmbH & Co. Höchst KG

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.