Opening Address: Roh Petas (Chair, IGLYO)

Dear friends,

It’s great to see you all here at our General Assembly in Mykolaiyv in Ukraine, a country that IGLYO has been keeping an eye on in the last year because of the worrying developments in parliament. It’s important that we’ve gathered here to show support and solidarity to LiGA and our other Ukrainian colleagues and people in other countries with similar problems.

There is great diversity amongst the IGLYO Member Organisations when it comes to size, region what kind of activities we have, and in the social and cultural contexts that we work in. We are also happy to welcome 13 new organisations into the IGLYO network here today. Unfortunately for many organisations the challenges in working for LGBTQ youth seem to be increasing rather than getting fewer. LGBTQ-phobic legislation, hate speech and violence, or the threat of such, is a part of everyday reality for many in the Pan-European region, and it’s important that we take a stand against it and fight back.

There are many ways of showing resistance and trying to make a positive change, and sharing best practices, skills and ideas on how to do this is one of the main goals for IGLYO. I hope that the people who took part in the pre-conference on Hate Speech have a lot to take back to and share within their home organisations so that we can create safer spaces for all, both online and offline.

At the GA we will try to create further tools to share. Three Position Papers will be discussed and voted upon today in the areas of Health, Education and Human Rights. These will give direction to the IGLYO Board and Secretariat in our work in these focus areas and will hopefully also be used by you, the Member Organisations, in your activities.

As a step in trying to further develop and professionalise IGLYO and its working methods, and to increase transparency, we will introduce some new elements and ideas at this GA. These are the GA Declaration, the Annual Report, which is a combination of the Strategic and Activity Reports used previously, and the idea of an annual theme in the Work Plan. This theme will give even further clarity to our work and also make it clearer for the members why we are choosing to focus on the activities that we are. The Board’s suggestion for theme for 2013 is “Anti-Bullying and LGBTQ Youth”, which crosscuts the focus areas of Health, Education and Social Inclusion.
The General Assembly is the highest decision-making body in IGLYO and it is here that the big decisions are made. We want to thank the funders for the GA for making it possible for us to be here. They are the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of the Netherlands, Planet Romeo and COC Netherlands. Big thank you to our host organisation LiGA for having us, and I’d also like to thank the Secretariat and the Executive Board of 2012.

Let’s roll! Thank you

Welcome address from Liga

Oleg Alyokhin (Chair person of LiGA): You have had a hard time getting here, but perhaps it gave you an idea of how it feels for LGBT people living here. As you know, there is a proposed law criminalizing the ‘promotion of homosexuality’. But we also have good news.

The Parliament, which was one of the hardest we have had in recent years, finished their work today, and they didn’t have time to adopt the law. But now is no time to relax. One of the laws has been adopted in its first reading, and taking into account the parties we elected, we expect these issues to be raised again. With you, we can hope to challenge such laws.

I hope that our hospitality will ease those issues you had in arriving in Ukraine. Tonight we will be able to show you videos and you’ll be able to meet our members and ask us questions. Let me also welcome you on behalf of LGBT Forum Ukraine consisting of 26 Ukrainian LGBT organisations. We hope this conference will make us an even more important organization in Europe.

Appointment of chair for GA 2012

Augustas Cicelis (Lithuania) approved.

Appointment of minute taker for GA 2012

Daniel Winstanley (United Kingdom) approved

Appointment of vote tellers for GA 2012

Euan Platt (United Kingdom) and Eirik Rise (Norway) nominated and approved

Augustas Cicelis (ACi): I was a Board member 2007-2009, and advisor thereafter. It is an honour to be here as Chair, as IGLYO always brings emotions. This is the most formal meeting of IGLYO. IGLYO is involved in non-formal education usually, so this is as formal as it gets - if this is your first event please come to some more! I will try to explain things as we go along. This event is a special event, because for the first time it is an annual GA, whereas previously it was only once every two years. There have been some changes in funding and structure of the organisation to enable this, so it’s a historical event. There will be no statutory changes, since this happens once every two years, so there’ll be more time for discussion and networking. I would like Board members present to introduce themselves.
The following Board Members introduced themselves:

- Roh Petas (Finland, - Chair) (RP)
- Despina Michaelidou (Cyprus, - WG Education lead) (DM)
- Artiom Zavadovschi (Moldova, - WG Health lead) (AZ)
- Vladimir Veljkovic (Serbia, - Secretary) (VV)
- Sarah Rowlinson (Scotland, - WG health lead, treasurer) (SR)
- Patrick Dempsey (Ireland, - communication officer) (PD)

RP introduced: Zara Shushanyan (Armenia, - WG ICIRD lead (ZS) not present
Halina Jordan (Germany, - Membership officer (HJ) not present

RP introduced IGLYO staff:
Virginija Prasmickaite, Office Manager (VP) and Jordan Long, Programmes and Policy Officer (JL).

ACi: I would like to propose the following ground rules for the GA:

- Respect the time.
- Speak slowly enough and to the point.
- When there is a panel discussion or clarification needed please raise your hand.
- If there are more people who want to speak, there will be an order of speakers made. Due to time constrains sometimes a number of speakers can be limited to some certain number.
- Say your name and organisation at the beginning of each comment or question.
- Turn your mobiles off or to a silent mode.
- If there are people who do not want their photos to appear anywhere, be sure to approach Virginija regarding that.
- Working procedures will be explained at the beginning of each session. Please feel free to ask for any clarifications regarding that.

Generally voting is as follows:

- Adoption of documents can take different forms. When it is most likely that there will be no disapproval, a consensus or general approval can be asked for. Disapproval can be voiced at any time, however. Then an open vote will take place.
- Some documents or decisions can only be adopted by a certain number of votes – absolute majority or 2/3 of the votes represented. Then there will be a call for voting for, against or abstention. The ones agreeing with a certain position raise their voting cards at the appropriate time.
- If there is a clear majority reached, the decisions can be registered without specific mentioning of the number of those who voted for, against or abstained.
- There are 2 General Assemblies going on at the same time, since two organisations exist, one registered in the Netherlands and one in Belgium. The Dutch association exists for funding purposes mainly. There would be a
‘speed GA’ of IGLYO (Netherlands) tomorrow to ensure that both organisations experience the same changes.

Adoption of agenda for GA2012

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania) pointed out that due to a typo that we have 2 Fridays. Agenda adopted.

Roll Call

ACi: Don’t be afraid if your name is not called during the first roll call because the existing members need to approve the new organisations. The purpose of the roll call is to establish quorum for the GA, also to distribute voting cards. Voting cards are irreplaceable and should be well looked after. I will ask Daniel to take a track of the number. [Proceeds to hand out voting cards]. With 36 out of 71 member organisations represented the quorum is met.

Membership ratifications – GA2012-13-1

ACi: In order for the new members to be able to participate in the GA, their membership has to be ratified (7e). Also there are some members which for one reason or another are suggested to be excluded. RP will present the suggestions and the reasons for exclusion.

RP: This is an emergency motion because some member applications were received after the GA mailing. [RP reads the list of organisations joining IGLYO].

RP: GA recognises resignation of Czech Queer Youth Organisation because they don’t exist any longer. The Board suggests terminating membership of the following organisations who have not paid their membership fees or been in contact with the organisation for at least 4 years.

ACi: There is a suggestion to vote for the whole emergency motion at once. For that the approval of a majority of 2/3 of the present votes are needed. I ask for an approval to vote for the whole emergency motion.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): I would like to hear it announced that the organisations that have been nominated are compliant with the statutes.

ACi: This is a recommendation from the Board, who are responsible to check that they meet the legal requirements and so on.

RP: I can confirm they meet the requirements.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): What if the excluded organisations wish to apply again now they have been excluded?

RP: They can apply again.

ACi: Please vote by raising your voting cards.
For: 35; Against: 0; Abstaining: 1. Motion passed.

Roll call for new members

ACi: I will ask Daniel to take a track of the number.
With 42 out of 78 member organisations represented the quorum is met.

ACi: Congratulations to new members.

Anders Hulden (SETA, Finland): Does the statutes say anything about how many member orgs must be present for the GA?

ACi: No, but there are some instances of votes where there must be a certain proportion of members, for example quorum is required for voting in new members.

Adoption of the minutes of the GA 2011 – Document # GA2012-06
Minutes approved.

Call for nominations to the Board

ACi: 2 Board members elected in 2011 resigned up until now. 2 Board members have been co-opted. There are also 2 more resignations handed in which will come in power with the next financial year. Therefore there is the need to elect 4 new Board members to fill in the vacancies.

Referring to article 17h of the statutes: “If by the published deadline the nominations received are equal or less than the number of vacancies on the Board, then further notification may be made at the GA by the delegates of Member Organisations and the Board.”, the Board wants to make a further notification.

The nomination forms can be found in one of the mailings everyone received and online. The delegates are responsible for getting the support from their respective organisations. The form can be submitted electronically to the Board at board@iglyo.com or handed to me by 10 am tomorrow.

RP: Everyone else who wishes to apply for Board must fill out and send to the Board via email.

ACi: The form can be found online or in the mailings. You do not need a physical signature, but you are taking responsibility for naming a leader from your organisation who supports your application. Your application can be eliminated if you do not have the support of your organisation.

RP: All candidates will have a chance to speak to the GA tomorrow for 2-3 minutes.

ACi: You also have a chance to write why you wish to apply on the application form, which will be distributed to delegates.

Karoline Borner (Lambda Berlin, Germany): What’s the age limit?
**RP:** You have to be a maximum of 30 years old when you are elected and minimum of 18, and a representative of a member organisation.

**Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia):** What’s the email address?

**ACi:** board@iglyo.com

**Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom):** Will board members be available to answer questions about what being a member of the board entails?

**ACi:** We have a lot of space for you to approach any board member informally, or myself.

**RP:** Everyone is elected generally to the Board and the board decides on specific positions internally at its first meeting. It may be that existing board members will continue in their current roles. The most important thing is that people can commit to the Board. One of the important things to take into consideration is diversity in terms of geography, gender, organisations and skills. Candidates may wish to mention during their application.

**ACi:** Board members must come from different member orgs and different countries, but we have a loose understanding of this, for example historically different countries within UK were considered different countries. The call for Board members has a good explanation of what being a board member entails and can be found on the website.

**Workshops**

**ACi:** There was an opportunity to sign for one of three workshops. If you have not done that yet please do it now. The workshop outline is the document # GA2012-21. There are three workshops:

- Position Paper on Health – Sarah
- Position Paper on Human Rights – Artiom
- Position Paper on Education – Despina

At the workshops you will have an opportunity to propose amendments to the proposed position papers. There are motion forms prepared for that. Please focus more on the content and not on the grammar.

Results of the workshops together with the proposed amendments will be presented at the plenary after lunch. Be sure that there is someone to present the results of the workshop, i.e. the amendments and explanations.

There have been some changes in timing

**RP:** Since we’re behind time, the workshops will be shortened to 1hr 15 and lunch will start at 1:45 and the plenary continues at 2:30 and the lunch break will therefore be 15 minutes shorter.
Karoline Borner (Lambda Berlin, Germany): Who do we approach if we don’t have a laptop?

ACi: The workshop leader.

Karoline Borner (Lambda Berlin, Germany): What if we wish to propose amendment during plenary?

ACi: Please address all questions to workshop leaders.

Presentations and adoptions of position papers

ACi: We will start with a short presentation of each of the papers. Then we will move through the amendments proposed by the group. Everyone will be able to see them on the screen. After each of the amendments the floor will be opened for comments and discussion before the vote is taken. At that time alternative amendments can be proposed in the plenary. The amendments can be submitted in the form Document # GA2012-10F and/or voiced and noted down at the plenary. They will be also screened.

If there are a few amendments regarding the same topic/part, they will be voted in turns. If all or few of them are approved the last one will prevail. There will not be an opportunity to suggest alternatives after the vote begins. Therefore please be sensible and choose one out of the few which reflects your stance in the best way.

If there are a lot of people who want to speak there will be a limit set to the number of speakers.
At the end of the discussions we will vote for the whole paper.

Health Position Paper Workshop Discussion
Presented by Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark) (CJ)

CJ: We made some technical changes throughout (e.g. including the use of trans person throughout as the most inclusive term).

Emma Bergenholtz (SFQ, Sweden): I was wondering if the use of trans person throughout because sometimes there is a relevant difference between trans, transsexual and intersex.

CJ: yes in the case where there was a reason for differentiating the specific term would be used. We also felt the wording on substance use suggested all LGBTQ youth have substance use problems and this was too negative.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): Amendment to replace ‘Poor mental health and wellbeing, and feelings of stress, depression and isolation may lead to a need to self-medicate and therefore reach for drugs, alcohol and tobacco in order to feel better or ‘escape’ daily life’. with ‘Poor mental health and wellbeing, and feelings of stress, depression and isolation can be factors that may lead to a need to self-medicate and therefore reach for drugs, alcohol and tobacco in order to feel better or ‘escape’.’ (page 5, para 2).
Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): I understand why the wording has been changed, but I think it would be helpful to connect the statement to LGBTQ youth.

ACi: As you are adding something you need to submit a separate amendment. Please do not submit amendments on grammar points as these can be resolved afterwards.

Amendment approved by clear majority.

CJ: We felt it was important to stress access to fertility treatment for lesbian and bisexual women.

Amendment to insert (after page, 6 para 6): ‘Lesbian and bisexual women experience discrimination and barriers across Europe when accessing fertility treatment, and where it is available the criteria is often heteronormative and discriminatory towards same sex couples.’

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): IGLYO is an international organization so perhaps we can remove the words ‘across Europe’.

Chaber (KPH, Poland): It would be good to add trans men to this list and they have problems accessing fertility treatment.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): Trans people.

ACi: It’s up to the group.

CJ: The group agrees with these changes.

‘Lesbian and bisexual women and trans people experience discrimination and barriers when accessing fertility treatment, and where it is available the criteria is often heteronormative and discriminatory towards same sex couples.’

ACi: It seems it may not be necessary to ask the GA who abstains and who is against.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): Maybe instead you can ask if anyone does not approve so they can make their objection heard.

ACi: Can we approve?

Amendment passed by overwhelming majority.

CJ: Amendment to remove ‘sex reassignment surgery’ from page 9, para 3.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): Why such a change?

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): Some individuals prefer not to use the term sex reassignment surgery.

SR: The group decided the terms used (vaginoplasty, phalloplasty) were enough.

Emma Bergen Holtz (SFQ, Sweden) SFQ: The opposite sex part (para 2), is it necessary?
CJ: That’s why the ‘as the practitioner only understands the binary system of gender’.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): I see lots of use of the words trans here, and I suggest the use of the word ‘trans and gender variant’.

ACi: That doesn’t concern the current amendment and is a separate amendment. Please check it makes sense for the whole document.

Amendment approved by overwhelming majority.

CJ: We want to stress the issue of trans people being denied their reproductive rights. We also wanted to point out how traumatic access to health services can be.

**Amendment to replace page 9, para 5 with** ‘In most European countries, trans individuals are required to undergo sterilization before receiving medical transition. All reproductive material is destroyed, denying trans people their reproductive rights. Such requirements are extremely dehumanizing, and create social stigma through medicalization. This can be a very traumatic experience for trans people, due to the lack of education on behalf of healthcare professionals in relation to trans issues. Furthermore, it is a very bureaucratic procedure which demands specific responses, sometimes resulting in misdiagnosis.’

Amendment approved by overwhelming majority.

CJ: We wanted to change the section of gender identity dysphoria because it is in line with the new Diagnostic Statistical Manual (DSM).

**Replace** ‘Remove the diagnosis of gender identity disorder from national medical texts’ (Page 16, para 11) with ‘Replace the diagnosis of gender identity disorder with gender identity dysphoria, in line with DSM 5 (effective from May 2013) and work towards depathologization of gender identity’.

Anders Hulden (SETA, Finland): I suggest the removal of gender identity, as gender identity is not pathologized in general, only nonconforming gender identity.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): Or inclusion of ‘non-conforming gender identity’.

Pat Kulka (ANSO, Denmark): I suggest ‘non-heteronormative gender identity’.

Adriana Kossyva (Accept, Cyprus): ‘of the trans situation’

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): Just deleting ‘gender identity’ does make sense.

Karoline Borner (Lambda Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany): What is the difference between dysphoria and disorder?

JL: these are the terms used in the medical establishment.

ACi: With this deletion, the new amendment now reads:
Replace ‘Remove the diagnosis of gender identity disorder from national medical texts’ (Page 16, para 11) with ‘Replace the diagnosis of gender identity disorder with gender identity dysphoria, in line with DSM 5 (effective from May 2013) and work towards depathologization.’

Amendment approved by overwhelming majority.

Cj: We felt highlighting same-sex activity was not good because it is certain sexual activity that is higher risk, nothing to do with same-sex.
Amendment to replace ‘of same sex sexuality activity’ with ‘of certain sexual activities’ (page 15, para 6).

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): It’s more risky to have sex between the same sex couples.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): But straight people have anal sex too.

SR: It’s the activity that defines the risk, not the relationship.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): I submit an alternative amendment.
Amendment to end the paragraph after the word ‘risks’ (deleting ‘of certain sexual practices’).

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): I suggest changing activities to practices as it includes both senses of the word.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): withdraws amendment.

ACi: Let us now vote on the amendment as it is on screen:
Amendment to replace ‘of same sex sexuality activity’ with ‘of certain sexual practices’ (page 15, para 6).
Amendment approved by overwhelming majority.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): I think it is important to contextualize this.
Amendment to insert ‘The social and environmental factors that LGBTQI youth face include…. which are….’

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): This paragraph already makes sense, and the amendment does not.

ACi: The group has explained.

Anders Hulden (SETA, Finland): There was another amendment about children.

SR: Sorry, that was not in the notes.

Anders Hulden (SETA, Finland): The text suggests that some medically unnecessary may be justified, which it is not.
Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): Was the topic about children? It one of the target groups of IGLYO children?

SR: Some of the decisions made in childhood can affect the wellbeing of intersex youth.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): Can I suggest we use a star for the first use of trans and include a definition in the footnote? (from global action for trans equality).

ACi: Definition is important because it determines the scope of the whole document.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): Is it appropriate for us to vote on the idea there will be a definition without actually writing the definition at this time?

ACi: I'm afraid that some people may not be happy with this.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): I wish to proceed with my amendment because it is a good inclusive definition.

DM: In the end of the definition there is a glossary and I think the term transgender is included.

SR: Transgender is included but trans is not, and I think there is a debate to be had about which term to use and which to define.

Emma Bergenholtz (SFQ, Sweden): I like the star (asterisk) as this is inclusive.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): There is a difference between an asterisk and a footnote.

Emma Bergenholtz (SFQ, Sweden): I was suggesting using the asterisk throughout the document.

Lena (Skeiv Ungdom, Norway): You will always have a problem as long as you use ‘trans’ as some people may not identify as such. Many people have transsexual diagnosis but some people do not identify as trans.

ACi: I suggest voting at the end of the session for the two different amendments concerning a footnote, and one regarding intersex issues. These will all be voted on at the end, after we have discussed the other papers.

Education Position Paper Workshop Discussion
Presenting: Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania) – EDS.

DM: I am going to say a few words about the actual work of the education group and the background for this paper. It builds on IGLYO’s education work since 2005. The education working group was established in 2012 with 3 members. The team worked on formulating the basic structure and aims of the position paper, which includes aims, scope, solutions and recommendations concerning the education of LGBTQ youth.
EDS: I am really excited by this working paper in particular because I am looking forward to using this in my work at Central European University.

**Amendment to change the title of the paper to ‘Position Paper on Education and Learning’**.

*Emma Bergenholtz (SFQ, Sweden):* I think the paper is about education itself not about learning.

*Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland):* I don’t think education and learning are mutually exclusive.

*RP:* Considering that the position papers are connected to our working groups so I believe that the names should correspond with the working groups.

*DM:* This paper focuses on formal education settings, as this is the work of the working group.

*Helena Kovac (EMA LGBT Network, Belgium):* It was my suggestion as we might use many types of learning outside formal education. However, if it complicates things I’m happy to withdraw it.

Amendment withdrawn by the group.

**Amendment to replace ‘sexual orientation’ with ‘sexual orientation and gender identity and expression’ throughout the document, if applicable.**

*Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia):* I suggest ‘sexual orientation and identity as well as gender identity and expression’.

*Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey):* I like the idea but ‘if applicable’ is not well defined.

EDS: I just meant to amend those places where it was unintentionally using sexual orientation

*ACI:* I think it’s a broad suggestion, rather than a specific amendment.

EDS: I’m okay to move to the next point. We didn’t have the expertise or time to find a definition of gender neutral bathroom, but we’d like to have a definition from the EU.

*Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland):* Is it just gender neutral bathrooms? You think people won’t know what that means? It seems obvious.

*Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia):* I agree with Orlaith, I don’t think it needs a definition.

*Helena Kovac (EMA LGBT Network, Belgium):* The group was discussing the issue of the hidden curriculum and identity formulation. This would include a gender neutral environment in terms of signs and symbols used and so on.
PD: We use the term gender neutral rather than unisex because it’s very gender binary.

DM: I suggest we add a recommendation to the school administrators to set up gender-neutral bathrooms.

ACi: This is getting too broad. Either we have an exact phrasing or we need to keep it as a suggestion.

EDS: We’re happy to have it as a suggestion as this a working document and will be worked on further. 
Amendment to add ‘transphobic’ after ‘homophobic’ throughout the document.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): I suggest adding gayphobic, lesbophobic, transphobic, biphobic.

EDS: The group does not agree with this amendment.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): I would suggest adding ‘homophobic, biphobic and transphobic’.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): Can we add LGBTQI-phobic?

PD: I don’t know if it’s a word but I like the idea of adding this.

ACi: There are two alternative suggestions ‘biphobic and transphobic’ or ‘LGBTQI-phobic’ (which does not work in the context of the paper). We will now vote on the first amendment:

Amendment to add ‘transphobic’ after ‘homophobic’ throughout the document. 

PD: I would support LGBTQI-phobic as it’s more inclusive.

ACi: Is that your suggestion on behalf of the board?

DM: In the context of this paper we’re talking about LGBTQ.

Amendment to replace ‘homophobic’ with ‘LGBTQ-phobic’ throughout the document.

ACi: By simple majority, LGBTQ-phobic goes through instead of the prior amendment. As I said earlier the amendments would be numbered and if the first one went through it would be amended by the second one.

EDS: We felt it important to point out that insults may be in different languages. 
Amendment to insert ‘and other insults in different languages’ in page 10, para 1.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): I know this makes things more complicated but if we have LGBTQ-phobic bullying then it should also be LGBTQ-phobic language.
Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): I see ‘poof’ and ‘queer’ as examples: I don’t think this amendment is necessary.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): I voted against LGBTQ-phobic because it isn’t the same thing to be homophobic as transphobic.

General approval for the amendment.

EDS:
Amendment to insert the word ‘harmful’ after the word ‘well-known’ in page 11, paragraph 2.

General approval for the amendment.

Amendment to replace the word ‘teachers’ throughout the document.

3 different options: a) teachers, administration and staff OR b) teachers, other school staff OR c) teachers, non-teaching staff and administrative officials

Approval of deleting a.

ACi: Who votes for option b?

28 in favour. 11 against. 3 abstentions.

ACi: Who votes for option c?

13 in favour. 20 against. 8 abstentions.

Option B prevails.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): Can I suggest amending to say ‘all school staff’?

ACi: sorry, we have to move to the next amendment.

EDS: We didn’t feel it would be possible in all contexts for students or teachers to develop their own curriculum so we proposed a revised statement.

ACi: If we vote for this amendment then the text is changed. If we vote against the original version remains.

Vote: 28 in favour. 5 against. 9 abstaining.

Motion passes.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): It should be LGBTQ-phobic.

EDS: That earlier amendment will apply to the whole paper.

General approval.
Change from 'parents' to parents and guardians.

General approval.

Never assume sexual orientation

General approval.

EDS: Suggestions for additional definitions.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): I strongly disagree with 'lesbianism'.

Amendment: replace with 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity'

Chaber (KPH, Poland): It makes no sense in this form.

Amendment: Replace with ‘non-heterosexual orientations and identities and non-conforming gender identities and expressions’.

General approval.

Vote on the whole paper.

Paper approved by general approval.

ACi: We’ll move to a break and then return to the Health and Human Rights papers.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): I’d like to make a technical comment. I suggest that we vote for the amendment in favour against and abstain. The idea of voting is for direct democracy. Too many people were changing amendments.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): Please do not whisper among yourselves.

BREAK

ACi: If you do not have urgent amendments please keep your suggestions to yourself because we are pushed for time.

Continuation of Health Position Paper Workshop Discussion

Amendment: to replace ‘this does not automatically justify medically unnecessary genital surgery, which with ‘In cases where genital surgical procedures are medically unnecessary they should not be considered, as this’ (page 14, para 6).

SR: In cases where genital surgical procedures are medically unnecessary they should not be considered, as this can be very harmful to the intersex person's psychological wellbeing.
Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): I suggest the removal of the first part of the sentence ‘although’ through to ‘ages’.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): Working group does not approve of removing this.

General approval of amendment.

SR: We support using the definition of trans from European commission’s 2012 report.

JL: For the purposes of this paper, IGLYO uses the definition of trans from the European Commission's 2012 report Trans and intersex people: Discrimination on the grounds of sex, gender identity and gender expression: "The term trans includes those people who have a gender identity and/or a gender expression that is different from the sex they were assigned at birth. Indeed the term trans is an umbrella term that includes, but is not limited to, men and women with transsexual pasts and people who identify as transsexual, transgender, transvestite/crossdressing, androgyne, polygender, genderqueer, agender, gender variant or with any other gender identity and gender expression which is not standard male or female, and who express their gender through their choice of clothes, presentation or body modifications, including the undergoing of multiple surgical procedures."

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): I chose to keep my amendment because this says ‘standard male or female’

JL: The trans movement itself does not have a definition of what trans is. We do not yet have a position paper on trans itself, but we need something useful for the purposes of this position paper on health. This is the definition from European Commission’s report which has a whole section on the gender binary. The European commission is our funder.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): I agree with what Onur says, because I don’t think all people who are trans are the same (standard male or female).

SR: I hope this paper will be snapshot of our definition of trans because a long debate about defining trans identity may not sit in this paper.

JL: We are not saying this is the definition, we are just saying for the purposes of this paper we are using this definition.

ACi: Onur, please read your definition.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey) reads this definition. From Global Action for Trans Equality: “Trans* people includes those people who have a gender identity which is different to the gender assigned at birth and/or those people who feel they have to, prefer to or choose to – whether by clothing, accessories, cosmetics or body modification – present themselves differently to the expectations of the gender role assigned to them at birth. This includes, among many others, transsexual and
transgender people, transvestites, travesti, cross dressers, no gender and gender-queer people”.

ACi: We will vote for this first. I encourage you to vote for the one that most reflects your view and vote against the one that does not. It is just a suggestion...

Amendment: to use the Global Action for Trans Equality definition for the paper.


[Szympozsion, Hungary delegate welcomed to the GA (Late arrival)].

Amendment: To use the European Commission definition of trans for the paper.


ACi: We will now vote for approval of the whole paper.

General approval of the whole paper.

Human Rights Position Paper Workshop Discussion

Presenting: Artiom Zavadovschi (IGLYO Board) - AZ, Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania) (CBV) and Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia)

AZ: The position paper itself does not intend to define or redefine human rights but rather highlight the existing instruments of human rights and how they are applied to LGBTQI individuals and LGBTQI youths. It explores how LGBTQI issues can be integrated into wider human rights issues. The paper seeks to make recommendations for international structures, states, policy and decision-makers, as well as civil rights organisations to advance equality of LGBTQ youth.

Amendment: Insert ‘equality in rights’ (page 2, para 1)
General approval.

Amendment: to add ‘intersexphobia’ throughout the document, where appropriate.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): I suggest changing to LGBTQ-phobia to remain in line with other paper.

ACi: LGBTQ does not include intersex in line with IGLYO’s name.

Nino Kharchilava (WSIG, Georgia): Our suggestion was not to just miss intersex people, if we replace it will LGBTQ-phobia we will still miss intersex people.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): I retract my suggestion.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): Because we’re focusing on an important issue I suggest to look at this as a warning sign that we need a
whole conference looking at these definitions and we make not be able to solve this today.

*Ana Rekhviashvili (Identoba, Georgia):* I’m not sure if grouping everyone together is the most inclusive way to approach these things, since what we say may not be relevant to all this groups. Before we adopt this without criticism perhaps we should think about this some more.

*Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark):* Before we add intersex we need to need to think about all times we use these terms in the organization.

**Amendment:** to add ‘intersexphobia’.

**In favour:** 20. **Against:** 6. **Abstentions:** 15. **Motion passed.**

*Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia):* We suggest replacing homophobia with gayphobia because it is used differently in some countries.

*Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary):* Homophobia is inclusive of women and men. Lesbophobia is used to describe the intersection of homophobia and misogyny. Some of these definitions are not separate oppressions they are intersections.

*Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland):* I don’t agree with the use of gayphobia; I have never heard of it.

*Andrii Zarytskii (Liga, Ukraine):* There were several different definitions suggested.

*Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania):* The purpose of leaving lesbophobia was to highlight the fact that when some people say homophobia they only mean gay males.

*Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom):* The meaning of homophobia means two people the same so I think lesbophobia is unnecessary.

*Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland):* Lesbophobia exists within LGBTQ community so it’s really important to name it.

**Amendment:** to replace ‘homophobia’ with ‘gayophobia’.

**Motion rejected.**

*Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania):* I suggest removing the paragraph because it is found elsewhere in the paper.

AZ: You also suggested putting more details about the working group itself.

ACi: This is a suggestion not an amendment, but the suggestion will be noted in the minutes.

**Amendment:** to remove page 7, paragraph 2.

**General approval for removing the paragraph.**
Amendment: replace ‘The atrocities of the Holocaust, extermination by Nazi Germany of over six million Jews, Sinti and Roma, homosexuals, and persons with disabilities horrified the world‘ with ‘The atrocities of the Holocaust, extermination of over six million Jews, Sinti and Roma, homosexuals, and persons with disabilities by the Nazis in the Second World War horrified the world.’

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): My comment is that there were Nazis in other countries too.

General approval for amendment.

Amendment: replace ‘Problems with Human Rights’ with ‘Challenges with Human Rights’ (page 10 para 2 (title)).

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): It would be better to say challenges ‘for’ human rights rather ‘with human rights’

AZ: The purpose of the paper is to highlight the difficulties in implementing human rights.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): I suggest ‘challenges within human rights’.

Amendment: replace ‘Problems with Human Rights’ with ‘Challenges within Human Rights’ (page 10 para 2 (title)).

General approval.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): The working group suggests that before the Yogyakarta Principles (page 17, para 4) add a paragraph on the Universal Periodic Review of UN Member States at the UN Human Rights Council and shadow reporting.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): This is not an instrument it is a mechanism, so UPR does not work in this section. I suggest removing this suggestion.

ACi: This is not a motion so it can be suggested and noted down.

AZ: We also suggest to add the Lydia Foy case in the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) on legal gender recognition; the case ‘Fyodorova vs. Russia on propaganda laws’ in the UN Human Rights Committee; the case of the Turkish gay inmate who was tortured and discriminated against in prison (ECtHR); and, the Swedish case on hate speech vs. freedom of expression (ECtHR) (page 23, para 1). We felt these case studies were incomplete and proposed the following case studies to highlight issues of gender recognition, inhumane and degrading treatment, and hate speech.

Amendment: replace ‘protection of rights of LGBTQ people’ with ‘fundamental rights which are not enjoyed by LGBTQ people’.
Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): I think the word ‘enjoyed’ is not appropriate.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): I also think enjoyed is not appropriate.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): We are trying to highlight the fact that they are already existing rights, not special rights.

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): The issue I see is that it is only about rights not enjoyed, because rights that are enjoyed still need to be recognized and protected.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): I suggest ‘afforded to’ rather than ‘enjoyed by’.

This was agreed by the working group.

Amendment: replace ‘protection of rights of LGBTQ people’ with ‘fundamental rights which are not afforded to LGBTQ people’.

General approval.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): I propose the following amendment.

Amendment: Replace ‘mankind’ with ‘humankind’. (page 23, para 2)

General approval.

Line Halvorsrud (Skeiv Ungdom, Norway): Our amendment is missing.

Amendment: replace ‘However, this has happened not due to the natural and voluntary evolution in the mentality of humankind and, moreover, state governments across the globe (people are still prosecuted and killed for their sexual orientation and/or gender identity and expression in many countries), but rather owing to the relentless and ongoing struggle against prejudice and discrimination of LGBTQ individuals themselves.’ with ‘The reason for this change is not the voluntary and natural struggle of governments to protect their LGBTQ citizens but rather the result of the relentless and ongoing struggle against prejudice and discrimination of LGBTQ individuals themselves. Regardless of this people are still prosecuted and killed for their sexual orientation and/or gender identity and expression in many countries.’ (page 23 para 2)

Amendment approved.

Amendment: replace ‘It had been a long way until we finally heard about and realised that LGBTQ rights are human rights and vice versa.’ with ‘It had been a long way until our governments finally heard about and realised that LGBTQ rights are human rights and vice versa.’ (page 23 para 2)

Amendment approved.

Amendment: replace ‘to successfully mainstream LGBTQ rights’ with ‘to successfully mainstream enjoyment of fundamental human rights by LGBTQ individuals’. (Page 24 para 2)
Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): I don’t agree with ‘enjoyment’.

Line Halvorsrud (Skeiv Ungdom, Norway): It still sounds like LGBTQ people have their own special human rights, so it should be phrased differently.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): If anyone can find a better formulation this is okay.

PD: I suggest ‘mainstream human rights as they should be applied to LGBTQ people’.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): I retract my issue with enjoyment.

General approval.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): I propose the amendment.

Amendment: to insert ‘ethical or philosophical’ after ‘religious’ (page 24, para 4) General approval.

Amendment: Insert ‘reproductive services’ after ‘healthcare’ (page 26, para 1).

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): Why ‘reproductive services’ and not ‘reproductive rights’?

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): When we say reproductive rights it does include some services as well, which will include psychological therapy or other sorts of services.

DM: Sexual and reproductive health services

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): Reproductive services sounds like assisted reproduction, which isn’t something necessary we should list as a fundamental human right.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): It should say rights.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): I do not agree.

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): One thing about services versus rights is that rights cover things that services don’t, for example the right NOT to do something.

ACi: First we will vote for services.


Amendment: Insert ‘and the monitoring of implementation’ after ‘implementation’ (page 27, para 2).
Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): You can’t just say that. You need to say ‘strengthen the implementation and the monitoring of that implementation’.

Amendment: insert ‘and the monitoring of that implementation’ after ‘implementation’ (page 27, para 2).
General approval.

Amendment: Insert ‘and hate speech’ after ‘legislation regarding’ (page 28, para 4).

ACi: Any questions? No? Then we move to voting.
General approval.

Amendment: Replace ‘trans people’ with ‘trans, intersex and gender-variant individuals’ (page 28, para 6).

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): I want to say no, because we have agreed on the use of the term trans people.

Line Halvorsrud (Skeiv Ungdom, Norway): All of these groups may be undergoing the same surgeries, it’s weird if you say that one group should not have to undergo these surgeries but the other groups should.


Amendment: insert new paragraph ‘Strengthen the role of the Ombudsperson institutions with regard to the protection of human rights of LGBTQ individuals’ (page 28, para 9)

Emma Bergenholtz (SFQ, Sweden): What do you mean by ombudsperson institutions? Does this word exist in the English language as well as Swedish?

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): This is available in most European countries. In some countries this is known as the people’s advocate.

General Approval.

Amendment: add ‘regional and national’ after ‘European’ (page 29, para 2).

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): Isn’t regional and national included in ‘international’?

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): Former soviet countries have commonwealth of post soviet states.

AZ: There could be mechanisms that exist within particular countries.

General approval.

ACi: We will now move to vote on the whole paper.
General approval.

ACi: I propose for the Board to work on the suggestions.

Helena Kovac (EMA LGBT Network, Belgium): Is it the working groups or Board who should work on this?

ACi: Yes, working groups with the Board, this is an important point.

Proposal approved.

Motions Proposed Document GA 2013-13

SR: First we'll discuss the motion regarding amendment to membership fees proposed by the Board and supported by FCC. The intention was to reflect the diversity of member orgs in IGLYO in terms of income and personnel. We hope that the proposed changes will reduce the number of fee waiver requests. Membership fees are important because this income is not protected or ring-fenced and can be used to cover shortfalls in funding.

Emma Bergenholtz (SFQ, Sweden): There is an error on the slide. It is 120 euros for top fee, not 100.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): What is the basis to grant fee waivers.

SR: The organization must write to the board to outline the reason they are requesting a waiver.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): what is the main reason given?

SR: Lack of income. In this case they must submit a copy of their financial statement.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): Is free membership for very small organizations possible?

SR: There is no change to the fee waiver process in this amendment, so this would still be possible.

Anastasia Danilova (Genderdoc-M, Moldova): I have a question regarding organisations with budget more than 100,000 euros per year. Our organisation is only organisation in Moldova and we must cover many services, but we don’t have a specific budget for conference participation and it is hard for us to find the 120 euros. Money is allocated for things like HIV prevention, and we cannot take money out of it. We have a big budget on one hand, but many outgoings on the other.

SR: I don’t know when membership fees were introduced, but maybe there's a question of fundraising strategy for this purpose. IGLYO has protected/ring-fenced money and it’s a question of including this in bids.
Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): It’s hard to play the budget game but if an organisation has more than 100,000 it’s only 0.1% of the budget and I wonder why the fee is not higher. I find the scale system fair but orgs with small income only have a small reduction.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): I was thinking about separating orgs based on the country on which they are located.

DW: The FCC did consider this but there are low income orgs within high-income countries e.g. it may be harder to access funding in the UK if you are trans organisation or a disability LGBT organisation.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): But in some countries 80 euros may be a whole month’s salary.

Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania): What is the basis for knowing the income of organisations?

SR: We don’t request to see financial info of orgs it’s based on trust, and we will know if organisations are being dishonest.

Arturs Saburovs (Moaika, Latvia): I fully support this statement and I do not believe high income orgs cannot find the money.

Stanislav Mishchenko (Gay-Alliance, Ukraine): We have money not for the organization, we have money for projects. We must account for each cent that we spend.

ACi: This question is discussed in every membership fee discussion. 80 euros would also be a lot for these organisations. There is not a particular way of dealing with this.

SR: Some organisations will ask for a fee waiver or lower fee and all contributions help.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): You have a whole year to fundraise 40 euros and I think if you cannot fundraise this it is a failure on the part of any activists.

Karoline Borner (Lambda · Jugendnetzwerk Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany): I would like to know how much work can be done with 40 or 80 euros so I can understand what they are working with in other eastern European countries.

ACi: This was discussed before in terms of the wages.

SR: The fee waiver system will not change.

ACi: Let us move to voting for the motion as it is written here.

ACi: The next motion concerns a ranking election system.

VV: Change of election system for choosing Board members. [reads text]

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): We have the same system in the UK but you do not have to use all of your options.

Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark): I want to ask why. If I feel there are only three eligible candidates, why to have to vote for 4?

ACi: Previously we had problems where not all board places were filled under the old system.

Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania): Under the current system if they are not filled under the first vote they are filled under the second.

Chaber (KPH, Poland): If there were only 4 candidates and 4 vacancies we wouldn’t be choosing somebody, since we had no choice. Why did you write that this was to allow delegates to express their will in a more democratic way?

RP: It enables you to give a lot more points for the one you vote the most is most likely to get in. Just as we must have a GA, we must have a Board in order to do our work. We believe an 8 person board can still do more than a 7 person board.

Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark): I see a democratic problem in this, as you could be the one with the highest number of votes but fewer delegates might have voted for you.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): This does happen in the UK.

Helena Kovac (EMA LGBT Network, Belgium): I don’t mind this approach, but I do mind that there is not a criteria for selecting people. It shouldn’t be a matter of popularity.

ACi: There is no current system. This is a proposal to develop a system.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): It seems to be that if you have a few good friends who vote for you as top choice, you can outvote someone who more people vote for.

RP: That’s every election unfortunately.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): This encourages this approach.

RP: I’m not sure how.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): Can we remove the point part?

Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark): It’s a big difference points to no points.
ACi: If you remove the point part it changes the fundamental meaning of the proposal.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): Can we change this document?

ACi: This is not a position paper which we have to adopt, it’s a motion that we may adopt. You can draft something else for tomorrow if you wish.

RP: The reason why we decided to suggest a new way of voting was because last year’s GA was a mess. The GA had decided there would be 8 people on the board and it said that you needed a minimum of 50%, and so 2 roles did not get enough support. Every organization still has the same number of votes so everyone has the same power to affect the results.

Emily Daina Sarsa (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): I want to encourage people to keep in mind there isn’t just one kind of person who does well on a Board you need all kinds of people on the board.

Line Halvorsrud (Skeiv Ungdom, Norway): I understand the problems faced last year but I don’t think this is a good system at all. The only problem is that you are using absolute majority, if you use simple majority the problem will be solved. Forcing people to vote is undemocratic. The fact that it’s about popularity is the basis of democracy. I can make a better system and propose it later. The system has many problems. The point that you made that the statutes require 8 people isn’t the case because the GA is the highest body of the organization. We can decide.

Karoline Borner (Lambda - Jugendnetzwerk Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany): This is not the more democratic way to vote because it forces me to vote. I suggest that in the next GA the election system is written into the statutes.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): What I don’t like in the new system is that in the old system a member needed at least 50% of delegates to vote, either in the first or the 2nd round. In the new system you may get elected without 50% of members voting for you.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): I don’t agree with forced voting. If I have two proxies do I have two ballot papers?

ACi: This raises many important issues. There is a definite need for standing orders and positions. This is noted every year but it needs to be put in the workplan. I sincerely thank you for all your opinions as this is very useful.

Andrius Dudavicius (Lithuanian Gay League, Lithuania): What happens if we don’t vote?

ACi: We return to the system on the statutes. And I will decide how this will proceed.


ACi: We will now close this discussion.
Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): How will the votes proceed now?

ACi: We will go by simple majority as it is in the statutes.

RP: We had workshops planned.

Emma Bergenholtz (SFQ, Sweden): Is it worth having a workshop if we can’t do anything good? The last workshop felt really stressed.

RP: These are thematic workshops there will be no amendments. I suggest we have them.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): Can we have a short break?

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): Are the workshops before or after dinner?

ACi: After dinner there will be a movie screening.

December 8th 2012, Saturday - Day Two

Workshop on GA2012 Declaration

RP: I am looking forward to hearing your presentations. Sarah is going to put up your presentations one at a time onscreen so we can read them.

Presenting on behalf of the discussion groups: Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark); Romina Tolu (We Are, Malta); Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia) and Karoline Borner (Lambda - Jugendnetzwerk Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany); Eirik Rise (Norway); Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary).

Karoline Borner (Lambda - Jugendnetzwerk Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany): We also wanted some emotional contents and it would be good to put numbers – not just 2-5% of population but also their friends and families.

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): We discussed and decided we didn’t want to highlight that other countries are also criminalizing ‘promotion of homosexuality’, because it might be seen by the Ukrainian government as a positive (they are not alone).

RP: Great work people. The Board will work on these and make a final draft which we will present later, discuss and adopt it. We are going to have a 15 minute break and later we will have a panel discussion with representatives from the Ukrainian Youth Forum, the office of the ombudsperson and a member of IGLYO.

BREAK
ACi: We have nine applications for the Board. There is one issue with one of the applications which will be discussed later.

AZ: Welcome again and thank you for your very hard work on the declaration. The Board will ensure that all your drafts will be taken into account and combined, then brought to you for the GA’s approval.

[AZ presents himself and the panellist]

AZ: I am a member of the IGLYO board and a member of the HR working group. As the Pan-European voice of LGBTQ young people, IGLYO is actively involved in the process of advocacy and lobbying to promote the interests and advance quality of human and civil rights of these particular groups. IGLYO sees the rights of LGBTQ young people within a human rights framework, emphasizing the dignity, liberty and equality of all people regardless of sexual orientation, or gender identity and expression. This is what we try to do as the Board and Secretariat of the organization.

Of course, being an 8-person Board working completely on a voluntary basis, and with a 2-staff member Secretariat, IGLYO has limited capacity in delivering swift changes or providing immediate reactions to the current Human Rights issues regarding LGBTQ youth and students in Europe and beyond. That is why it is an invaluable advantage for IGLYO to rely on you, member organisations, in the process of delivering work and achieving results you deem necessary and relevant. And this is what events like this General assembly prove – there wouldn’t be an IGLYO without its members and friends.

IGLYO builds capacity with its member organisations through activities such as conferences and study sessions with its member organisations and with European institutions. We also organise general assemblies in countries that need our presence at critical times (such as Spain prior to same sex marriage bill, or Ukraine prior to propaganda of homosexuality bill). This is why we organized the pre-GA workshop on one of the key topics in Europe – hate speech. We care about freedom of speech and combating hate speech within freedom of speech. Hate speech entails the rising spirit of homophobia and transphobia within Eastern Europe.

The draft law 8711, approved in the first reading at a parliament session on the 2nd October, proposes amendments to several existing laws, which would impose prison terms of up to five years and hefty fines for spreading the so-called ‘propaganda of homosexuality’. This bill is in breach of freedom of speech under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as well as the European Convention on Human Rights. What is even worse, this draft law has the potential to make it more difficult for LGBTQ people to access sexual health services and can further worsen the spread of HIV/AIDS in the country, which is the highest in Europe – and this is not just an LGBTQ issue. Moreover, this draft bill is in breach with the principle of non-discrimination, especially when the anti-discrimination policies are being discussed by Ukrainian policy and decision-makers.

You have the power, you have the opportunity, you have the drive and best intentions – the declaration which will be adopted later today and which will have a valuable contribution to the process of positive change in Ukraine. It shows
solidarity, unity and that we, young people of Europe, matter and should be listened to because we care.

This is not just a health issue, it is a social issue. We would like to hear from those living in Ukraine which is why we have invited our panelists, so we can hear their first-hand experiences. We have speakers who will tell us about the bill, discrimination in general, gender equality, and youth policy.

Serhiy Ponomaryov (Ombudpersons Office, Ukraine): Actually from the half an hour that I’ve been here I hear that most of your focus has been on the draft law. We can talk about that from the perspective of general human rights, or the stance the ombudsman takes on this particular issue. However, I have been asked to talk generally about the anti-discrimination law and whether it will work in Ukraine, and whether it will benefit LGBTQ youth. I will also tell you about what the secretariat are going to do.

Before 2012 there was no framework anti-discrimination law in Ukraine whatsoever. Anti-discrimination is in the constitution under Article 24, which ensures the principle of equality in the application of all of the laws. Similar provisions have been in other laws such as the Civil Code and the Administrative Code, and the law on the Rights of the Child. There have been few attempts to evoke this in the court of law, and these failed. There is an anti-discrimination provision in article 161 in the criminal code of Ukraine, but this is a bad thing because the wording of the article is very complicated. It covers three different related crimes: incitement to hatred on the basis of nationality, race or religious beliefs; hate crime on the same grounds; and the final part is a prohibition of discrimination on an open list of grounds. There have been very few cases where people have been punished under this article, and usually not under the third part of the provision, but rather the incitement to hatred and violence. You would have to prove direct intent to discriminate or cause harm to the victim. Direct intent in these cases is very hard to prove, if it exists.

In late April 2012, the ministry of justice pursuant to the requirements of the visa liberalization action plan (with the EU), drafted a law on anti-discrimination. Given the limited timescale allotted to the ministry of justice to do this, the first draft law was merely a copy of the existing law on the equality of rights of men and women. When this was passed on to the government we the secretariat intervened, and expressed our dismay that the law was so declarative and suggested some improvements to be made. Given the process of adopting the law was so swift, we managed to organize consultations only when the law was already adopted in the first reading. It turned out that, unfortunately, in late September when the committee took place, they took a stand that they would not wait for any further comments on improving the law and would pass it in the second reading. Given the position of the committee none of the proposals by the NGOs and the ombudsmen were adopted. There is now a process on amending the law. The law was highly criticized by the European Commission and the Council of Europe. Their position was there could be no visa liberalization process before the law was amended. The ministry of justice was given a direct order by the government to collaborate with the ombudsman office. Since the law in force provides definitions for different kinds of discrimination, we are trying to redefine and add to these (such as he failure to make reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities) so they meet the standards. The law basically copies the list that was already in the constitution and
included only one additional ground (nationality/citizenship). It excluded sexual orientation or gender identity. The ministry of justice takes the position that the public is not ready for such an amendment. The ombudsmen cannot dictate what the ministry of justice can or cannot do, but our position is that if the ministry of justice cannot provide a legal justification for the non-inclusion then these arguments are not valid. There is pressure from NGOs to include gender identity on the list of protected grounds. We will stand behind the addition of sexual orientation, but most discrimination cases on the grounds of gender identity seem to take place under the issue of ‘gender/sex’. In legal terms this could be baffling for the court and the authorities who are applying the law. Gender identity should be defined carefully and additionally.

Most attention of the office of the ombudsmen is defining practical mechanisms to make the law implementable. The current law does not contain any mechanisms to help the courts apply the law. We are trying to establish the principle of the shift of the burden of proof that is so important in discrimination cases. We would like to establish fines for ‘intention to discriminate’ and so on.

The new law establishes that the ombudsman of Ukraine is the primary body besides the court that will handle complaints about discrimination and ensure action will take place. To say that we don’t have any problems in this field would be a lie. The problems that we face are that the scope of authority of the ombudsmen is very limited. We are limited to cases where the primary perpetrator is the government or local authority, and this doesn’t cover discrimination that occurs on an interpersonal level, or from private employers. Partly I would say this is the right thing because the ombudsmen cannot substitute for courts. All the recommendations that the ombudsman does are not legally binding, although there is a fine for not realizing the recommendations of the ombudsman. However there is a special procedure in place to balance which recommendations can be punished in this way, and which are not so important.

We are trying to give the ombudsman the right to go to court on its own initiative in cases of discrimination where an immediate victim is absent, or cannot be identified. These cases would be in the interests of the public and not in the interests of the individual.

The ombudsman has made a statement about 8711 which, besides criticizing the law itself, says that we will try to make the president invoke his veto. The other option is to go to the constitutional court and say the law is unconstitutional. We are open about our intention to do this if the law fails at the political level.

AZ: Thank you Sergei. Delegates please hold your questions until the end. As a member of the European Youth Forum, IGLYO is very keen on inclusive youth policies that also cover the need of LGBTQ youth and students. We have here the secretary general of the youth forum of Ukraine.

Anatoli (Youth Forum of Ukraine): I want to speak about the Ukrainian Youth Forum, youth policy in Ukraine and the possibility of cooperation of the Ukrainian Youth Forum with LGBTQ organisations. We unite all legally registered youth organizations. The highest level of the administration is the congress of our organization which
takes place once a year. The next level is the board of our organisation, and then the secretariat.

In 2010 we adopted our strategy for 2011-12 and in our strategy we have four priorities. First, development of organisational skills of organisations, youth policies, human rights, and international affairs. Our national youth platform is very young, established only in 2005 (the youngest in Eastern European countries). We are involved in cooperation at a European and regional level with youth councils from six Eastern European countries and caucuses. Russian Federation is not involved in this structure which is a very difficult question for our region. We had a meeting in Stockholm about the role of the National Youth Council of Russia in our collaboration.

We are very interested to work under the youth law in Ukraine, for example we are to create a draft law for the principles of youth policies in Ukraine. We held 6 events of discussion with young people about this law. This law will be to support initiatives of young people. This law will be a paternalistic law from state to youth. The young people said we need a law to support our initiatives. In Ukraine we have a specific situation – our law defines young people from 14 to 35, a very big age range. When all European states have a big problem with demographic situation, in this case we have 33% of our population defined as young people. When this law was provided in our legislation it was a more social problem with youth housing, and that was when this age range for youth was adopted in Ukraine. From 2010 our government will have an initiative to decrease this age to 30 or 28 years. When we discussed with young people they said they want to have a norm in our law that the age range is up to 35. We want to have access to the social grants from the state.

The next point is how we work with human rights. Our strategy for 2011-13 has the priority to develop human rights and social inclusion in Ukraine. The aims are to promote human rights in Ukraine, developing new partnerships with NGOs in the human rights area. The next aim is to contribute to social cohesion, promoting cultural inclusion and equality of young people within minority groups. I think it is very positive that the GA was held in Ukraine. Our organization was the first organisation to host the GA of the EYF in Kiev in 2010.

The next question is how to cooperate with Ukrainian youth forum and LGBTQ orgs. In accordance with our statutes and legislation we have member orgs only for youth and children. General NGOs and youth and student NGOs are covered by different laws. In accordance with our statutes we can unite with other orgs as observer orgs. If LGBTQ orgs want a space to discuss human rights in Ukraine you can use our space for this. Our meetings are always open since 2010 when we changed the structure and leaders of our organisation.

We have a meeting of our board this year and I would like to invite representatives of LGBTQ orgs and include a question on LGBTQ rights on our agenda.

AZ: Thank you. I am sure the information that has been delivered is very insightful for you as representatives of LGBTQ youth and students.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): How old is the institution of ombudsperson and how is it perceived by the public?
Sergei: The institution started in 1994 so it’s fairly old considering Ukraine emerged as an independent state in 1991. The general knowledge of what the ombudsperson does is fairly low and we are investing in this with the new ombudsman. The profile is much higher with the authorities so we have some influence at that level which we are trying to capitalize on in combating 8711. We can raise a range of issues before the constitutional court.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): It’s the same situation in Armenia just now. Our government has initiated a new law regarding anti-discrimination which was very funny and they sent to us for amendments, but we realized that as an ombudsperson and as an organization we should include SOGI in the law and we made amendments to recognize it was legally incorrect and call it back from the parliament. Then we initiated a new law together by involving the European Union and we defined in the law that ombudsperson institution is the antidiscrimination body in the country, and the institution can review interpersonal cases on discrimination as well. Then we are going to represent in the parliament in January.

Serhiy Ponomaryov (Ombudpersons Office, Ukraine): That’s what we usually do and is one of our internal principles to handle petitions about interpersonal discrimination or discrimination that goes on in the civil sphere, but informally. My general comment is that it’s a politically tough situation. On one hand we support the inclusion of sexual orientation, but we are doubtful it will pass through the parliament. It is likely that the parliament will drop the sexual orientation and keep the other amendments, but it’s also possible that they will see the inclusion of sexual orientation and will refuse the law altogether. We are deciding whether to push for sexual orientation or just focus on making the necessary amendments. We could also support LGBTQ individuals to go to court or try to educate the court on these issues.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): What kind of complaint mechanism do you have for LGBTQ people?

Serhiy Ponomaryov (Ombudpersons Office, Ukraine): The same as everyone else. The law clarifies what should be written in any complaint. A citizen or non-citizen will have to state which right was violated, by which authority, and any steps they have taken to resolve it. We have mail, email, web forms or the person can petition in person by requesting an audience with the ombudsperson.

AZ: Thank you. It is really great to see how things can move forward with your contribution, especially coming to the countries where the presence of such organizations as IGLYO is critical and important. The fact is that young people across Europe matter and should be listened to. We know we young people care about everything and can make the change. I would like to thank the panelists. It is good to know that LGBTQ organisations, although not registered as youth and children organisations in the Ukraine, can participate. Our guests will be staying for lunch, so you can ask any questions informally then.

BREAK

ACi: Let us have a show of hands of voting members present, and proxies.
43 member orgs present (including proxies).

ACi: We will have another call when handing out voting cards.

ACi: There have been 9 board applications received in total. There is a slight problem with one, as it was received 4 minutes after the announced deadline. There has been a suggestion from the Board that we should accept this application because it contributes to the diversity of the candidates presented.

Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania): Similarly when there was a co-option a few months ago my application was 10 minutes late, and for this reason it was not accepted.

ACi: In that situation the Board could not accept the application because it cannot do so without permission from the general assembly. This is a different situation. Do you wish to oppose accepting this?

Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania): No I just wished to note that I did not agree with the Board’s previous decision.

General approval to accept the late application.

ACi: There will be 3 mins given per presentation and candidates will be invited to present in alphabetical order.

Annual report (activity & strategic report) 2011-2012 (Document # GA2012-14)

RP: You have all received the annual report and we’re assuming that you’ve all read through it so I will just provide a summary and you will vote on accepting it. This is the first time IGLYO has had an annual report as usually it has an activity report and a strategic report.

Some things we have done correspond to several strategic objectives but we only place them under one of them. Some sections may seem to have less content but it may not necessarily mean we have not had activity there, it may just appear under a different objective.

This report reflects everything since last GA (i.e. some things were done in 2011).

Strategic Objective 1: We have been working on: our communication tools (including new website); publications (Sports and Social Media); events including Capacity Building, Gender Equality Study Session, and Keep the Faith.

Strategic Objective 2: Lobby work (e.g. EU horizontal equality directive); statements on situations in different regions (e.g. transphobic murders in Turkey); position papers on ICIRD, education, health and human rights. List of examples of external representations can be found in the report.
Strategic Objective 3: Equally healthy working group survey; world pride workshop etc.

Strategic Objective 4: Securing funding; monitoring and evaluation (including external evaluation) and improving conference feedback; IGLYO internship; online capacity building tool for members (pilot); fundraising strategy in progress.

Strategic Objective 5: External representations on various boards and committees.

I’d like to acknowledge the support of working groups, FCC, advisors to the board and event partners.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): I wanted to say there are typos in the report, I would like to suggest that they are proofread before publication.

RP: All documents will go through language and grammar checks before being finalized and published on the website.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): Does it include only this year or last year as well?

RP: These cover activities from the last GA until the report was sent out in the first mailing. Any activities since the mailing will be in next year’s annual report.

Vote to adopt the annual report.
In favour: 43 Against: 0 Abstaining: 0. Document approved.

Financial report (accounts) 2011 (Document # GA2012-15)

SR: This is the report for 2011, not 2012. IGLYO’s financial year runs January to Dec 31. We have had almost double income of last year. The accounts were externally audited. Many of the income fees had a slight increase. The EU contributions dramatically increased with the Progress funding streams.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): Private bodies, is that anonymous contributions?

SR: This is foundations such as Open Society.

SR: There is core administrative funding for organisation- and project-based funding. Half of our funding came from European commissions. Expenditure is divided between administrative costs and project costs. We had a small loss of 310 euros but with such large figures this is quite level. The vast majority of funding was administrative costs including secretariat, office rent etc. A substantial amount was spent on statutory meetings such as Board meetings, working group and assemblies.

FCC presentation
DW: Thank you. My name is Daniel Winstanley and I have been involved with IGLYO since 2006 and I was involved in the 2009 Conference ‘This Is Who We Are’. My colleague Luisa Tolu sends her apologies, she cannot attend on this occasion.

The statutes of IGLYO say that the GA appoints the FCC and their role is to provide an independent assessment of the finances. The internal regulations say we must give a positive, negative or neutral recommendation and must visit the secretariat to review their bookkeeping. We represent the eyes of the members on the financial running of the organisation. This is quite a vague role and we are keen to hear from the member organisations if they have any additional expectations from their FCC. I would be happy to hear from you during the GA, or you can email us on the email address we established for this purpose (fcc@iglyo.com).

In October 2012 we met with the Office Manager and Treasurer who presented the accounts. We checked the book-keeping systems and carried out spot-checks. We were able to give a positive recommendation. We also contributed to the fundraising strategy and expenses policy, and discussed systems for member organisations to raise concerns about financial policy and practices.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): Can you explain the small deficit?

SR: There’s probably not one reason, but we have a small reserve. Of course we do not want deficits but this does cushion the effect.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): Is there a figure for the savings.

SR: I don’t have it today

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): Would it be possible for FCC to monitor the carbon emissions?

DW: My first reaction is I don’t know how to do that, so you would need to give me some advice on the issue. Secondly, I am not sure if is a financial matter so I would need to consider whether it was my responsibility or the Board’s.

SR: Within the expense policy we are looking at travel costs and this will include consideration of the carbon emissions.

DW: I invite you to email me so I can discuss with Luisa.

Line Halvolsrud (Skeiv Ungdom, Norway): We would like to have an idea about much the savings are so we can calculate the percentage and have a reserve for rent and redundancy for staff.

SR: We need to address this within the fundraising strategy as many of our funding is ring-fenced.

Karoline Borner (Lambda - Jugendnetzwerk Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany): Why has the statutory meeting costs increased so much?
VP: We have two staff members who attend meetings. We have more Board members. We started staying in slightly better accommodation and prolonged the meetings from two to four days.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): Were there more meetings?

VP: There was the same amount of meetings just longer.

ACi: There was a general assembly in 2011 but not in 2010 so this added to the costs.

JL: Our funding package from the commission was earmarked for admin.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): I am wondering how much you reach out to individuals who have benefited from IGLYO activities for small donations?

SR: This would absolutely be possible and can be included in the fundraising strategy. This could also be part of the work plan if we were doing outreach to alumni.

Vote to adopt the Financial Report.
41 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions. Document adopted.

Workplan 2013 (Document # GA2012-16)

RP: This is an overview of what we plan to do for 2013 and all of this relates to the strategic objectives that are still in effect. We hope you will like the element of introducing a theme for the year to cross cut our areas of education, social inclusion and health.

Strategic objective 1: Events: Stop H8 conference; equality in action (funding not yet confirmed) conference; GA2013 (venue to be decided today).

Strategic objective 2: Research; position papers; policy and advocacy strategy leading to the creation of strategic objectives 2014-16. Human Rights factsheet.

Strategic objective 3: Communications strategy; pride events (if invited and depending on resources); ICIRD video contest.

Strategic objective 4: Organizational development with IGLYO (physical and virtual consultations) to contribute to strategic plan; online capacity building tool; code of conduct and representation guide; passing of skills and knowledge from board to board; continue with internship.

Strategic objective 5: New website; external representations; institutional partnerships; develop and expand membership.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): I have one question and two suggestions. We already have a video on ICIRD so what’s the point in having a
competition? I suggest we have a video competition on anti-bullying. Also can the youth resource focus on the website?

RP: The ICIRD video was successful so we were hoping to build on that. Other working groups have more activities planned so we wished to use ICIRD as the focus.

PD: Within the survey it talks about information-sharing between member organisations and IGLYO so please respond in the survey.

Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark): I ask that whenever you use an abbreviation please can you explain it, rather than assuming we will understand. With the strategic plan we need to talk about whether we are a pan-European organization or whether we are an international organization.

RP: Membership is a discussion we have every year for good reasons. We would like to be international, but our funding is European and we would not be able to offer the same service.

ACi: There is a huge discussion every year when the statutes change, and it would be good to look at the minutes when you are preparing motions to change statutes. It is important to notice it goes on every year. It’s not only about the funding it’s a lot of different aspects.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): It is interesting that Russian organisations are not involved in IGLYO.

ACi: This could be covered in the outreach programme (expanding membership) in the activity plan.

Vote to adopt the work plan.
In favour: 43. Against: 0. Abstaining: 0. Document adopted.

Provisional budget 2013 (Document # GA2012-17)

SR: You can see the provisional budget in the mailing. This is for financial period 1st January 2013 to 31 December 2013. These are provisional costs and refer to administrative costs only. We hope to achieve the same level of funding as last year. Membership fee is based on the motion that was passed yesterday. The expenditure is largely staff costs. This includes not just salary costs but also other employee costs.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): The working groups cost is the same as the GA, why?

SR: It is four meetings. The budget for the GA is not the total cost as we will raise funds for this activity in project funding.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): The budget is much smaller than last year.
SR: This is organizational budget only, project-based funds are not included.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): Is the cost of the video included in the budget?

SR: I believe the ICIRD group will raise funds.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): Our job will be to facilitate the competition. The labour and costs will be from the contributors.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): This is high risk because member organisations will not have allocated budget to produce a video.

SR: I think he hate speech workshop demonstrated that great videos can be produced with little time or money. It is entirely voluntary if member organisations wish to participate.

Motion to adopt the Provisional Budget.
For: 41 Abstaining: 2 Against: 0. Document adopted.

BREAK

ACi: I'd like to begin with a reminder of who is on the remaining Board, who they are and where they are coming from so you can be mindful of diversity element.

RP: We would like to present ourselves more thoroughly because diversity is very important in terms of gender, region, organisation, experience, age etc. It is important that you are prepared and capable to do the job expected of you. It is very fulfilling but it is a lot of work.

I am Roh, I was nominated by ANSO. I am the Chair. I identify as queer and sexual. I am 25.

AZ: I was nominated by Genderdoc-M. I am 25 years old. I identify as cis-gender gay male. I am human rights working group lead.

VV: I am Vladimir from Belgrade, Serbia, I was nominated by Safe Pulse of Youth. I am 30. I am secretary. I am a not sure if it is necessary to state which gender I am.

DM: I am Alex from Cyprus, nominated by ACCEPT LGBT Cyprus. I am 31 years old now. I coordinate the education working group. I identify as genderqueer and bisexual.

ACi: Are there any questions that would help you know about these people?

Anders Hulden (SETA, Finland): You will continue with your working areas in the next board?

RP: That does not have to be that way. All four of us feel we would like to continue in the positions we have. It depends on the skills and capacities of those elected to the board but there may be some changes necessary.
**Anders Hulden (SETA, Finland):** How many positions are there in the board?

**ACi:** There are only 3 fixed positions in the board, vice chair/secretary, treasurer and chair. Decisions will need to be made about the redistribution of roles based on the new competencies.

**RP:** Other positions include Sadja (membership officer) Patrick (communications officer) Zara (ICIRD lead) and Sarah (treasurer and health working group lead).

**ACi:** Sarah and Patrick were co-opted and so there mandate ends at this GA and they are both running for re-election. I will strictly ask you to stop speaking at 3 minutes. I will take up to 3 questions after each speaker. Please be concrete and specific in your questions.

**Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia):** What about election process?

**ACi:** I will explain afterwards. Before the election we also have the presentations of GA host organisations.

**Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia):** My name is Arturs I represent Mosaika. I am 25 years old. I have about 7 years of international experience in many fields, including LGBT and environmental. I bring experience from private industry and governmental institutions in the United States. I have also worked for international NGOs, for example the UN in Kenya. I graduated with extremely high honours in the US. Since March 2011 I moved to my home country Latvia. I have spent every day working to improve the situation for LGBTQ youth. In ‘closet’ I work to improve the journalistic skills of youth across a diversity of individuals. I was on the team organizing Baltic Pride which was the first safe pride. I am part of IGLYO ICIRD and as a board member I plan to focus on the membership.

**Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia):** Would you care to describe your personal qualities?

**Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia):** I am pretty strong with my communication and lobbying skills and I have strong opinions and am usually able to push them through. I do not avoid controversy and conflict. I am able to go to parliament and communicate on tough issues. I am very outspoken on behalf of LGBT orgs and individuals.

**Emma Bergenholtz (SFQ, Sweden):** Would those strong opinions be a problem for your ability to do teamwork?

**Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia):** Usually I work with teams and I am often selected as a leader because I’m able to bring the team together and focus their efforts.

**PD:** How do you identify yourself?

**Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia):** I identify as a gay man.
Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): I am from Armenia, 20 years young. We For Civil Equality were the first LGBTQ organisation in the south caucuses. My position is human rights expert. I am a law student and work for the ombudsman on SOGI and minority issues. I am a consultant for the regional project. I did my internship in UNAIDS for 6 months and did an internship in the US on HIV/AIDS. I have done a lot of work on advocacy and lobby issues. I want to bring to IGLYO my skills of networking, fundraising and lobbying and advocacy skills.

Ana Rekhviashvili (Identoba, Georgia): When I was reading your application I saw you identify as queer, I was just assuming that maybe I could connect it with the way you see activism. Do you integrate your identity into your work?

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): As you may know it is hard to be openly gay in my country. I usually identify as queer because in my country to avoid homophobic issues so I can reach LBT as well.

Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania): My name is Comsin I am 22 years old I am from Romania. I am gay, if need be I am male. I was born in Iran from Romanian parents. In high school I was student body president and lobbyed on behalf of students. From there I got involved in the ministry of education on behalf of Accept. Recently I have advocated to the Romanian parliament and EU institutions. I organised student exchanges with international participants and also organized conferences with hundreds of participants. I took part in capacity building and another conference, as well as the last IGLYO GA. I am a volunteer for the largest and oldest LGBT organisation in Romania, Accept, and am on their FCC. I am also involved with a programme for youth as agents for behaviour change. My dissertation was on gender-neutral environments. I would like to work with each of you and lobby on your behalf.

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): It’s with great honour and enthusiasm I stand before you today. I am afflicted with a fever for activism. I have been honing my skills as an activist, with extensive skills as a leader. I am president of the student union. I work with HERSHI on rights, gender and sexuality etc. In Romania I designed and directed a 12 month advocacy project. I am a person who works throughout the duration of a project and see it through. I can continue throughout my mandate. I believe my particular skill set is needed at this time. Looking towards IGLYO’s future I believe it is not necessary to think about radical change but rather a constant and diligent effort. The issues that I have heard include gender and trans equality, action on neo-nazism, and developing an understanding of inclusion both in policy and practice.

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): How old are you?

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): I am Em, 24, queer but confused, from Tolerant Youth Association.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): What was your best practice in LGBT activism?
Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): I am best at networking at different levels, with everyone from governments to pre-schoolers. That’s my biggest strength as an activist.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): A lot of people are studying. Do you think you are contributing enough to your activism?

Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): I have had the most intense semester with my masters, but I am very committed to my activism and dedicate a lot of time. I can do it I assure you.

Helena Kovac (EMA LGBT Network, Belgium): My name is Helana, I am a national of Serbia and Hungary and have lived in many countries. I am studying policy and management, and have a BA diploma in youth work. I have considered whether I can really contribute to the work and I believe that a board needs strong grassroots activists. It also needs people who know how to manage things, understand how teams work, have a list of good practice, and have self-management skills. I have a strong international experience and work with an international team. I am not as strong at grassroots LGBT work at a national level I have worked a lot in an international sphere. The places where I see I can contribute are in these topics, where I have experience beyond the LGBT sector. I can contribute to understanding good practices and would provide responsible good practices and practical solutions. I love to organise chaotic things.

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): Age and identity?

Helena Kovac (EMA LGBT Network, Belgium): I am 29 but feel 27. I am a lesbian woman.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): Hello everyone, I am also quite nervous. I was very difficult for me to decide whether I wanted to run for the board, and I had to think for a long time because I think it is quite an important responsibility. I am from Turkey and am 21 and identify as queer. I haven’t done a lot of queer activism. I have been working for international LGBT human rights commission. I have mainly worked on Iran and Syria, mostly undercover. I have been working with the green movement and Greenpeace. I have mostly done volunteer work and I was campaigns unit head assistant and worked in Israel and Palestine but always worked with volunteers as well as professional staff members. I believe in a holistic approach to activism. At the moment I am still working with Greenpeace Mediterranean, mostly dealing with Turkey and Israel. I think we should focus on communication with member organisations and involvement of member organisations. I would also say I have a lot of skills in lobbying and project management.

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): How will you use your experience in environmental activism as a board member?

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): I am a member of the green party and Federation of Young European Greens (FYEG) and also the gender working group and LGBT subgroup for FYEG. I think there is a lot we can do to bring activists together.
**Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland):** My name is Orlaith, I’m 28 and female, lesbian and feminist. I hope you know a bit about my background. I want to join the board for a number of reasons, because I’ve been an LGBTQ and feminist activist for a number of years. I am a fair and equal thinker, my mantra when growing up was ‘it’s not fair’, which my family will put on my gravestone! On the notion of fairness, I have done a lot of work in school - starting petitions to allow us not to wear skirts and allow us to play football. I am not afraid to challenge the status quo, or disagree with my peers when I think something is wrong. I would invite you to stay in touch with me and share your progress and your worries. I also have a personal agenda in my application – I am keen to develop myself personally. I ask you to vote for me because you think I would be good on the board.

**Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary):** As a feminist what changes would you like in IGLYO?

**Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland):** I’d like IGLYO to focus more on women’s issues as these are often overlooked in LGBTQ issues.

**Patrick Dempsey (Belongto, Ireland):** It’s my pleasure to be here and get to know you. I’ve learned a lot from you already. I have given my time to Belong To for 5 years: delivering training, speaking at conferences, and being a spokesperson in the media. I was a youth advisor to the minister for youth. I suffered because of my identity and was bullied by teachers and staff and experienced physical violence and I had to leave school. I don’t tell you this because it’s a sad story, but because it explains my motivation. I was co-opted in September and was involved in the communications strategy. Working for IGLYO has made me feel like a European. I have delivered LGBTQ rights training. I got a senator to talk to the Ukrainian minister on the situation for LGBTQ people in the Ukraine.

**Karoline Borner (Lambda - Jugendnetzwerk Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany):** Identity and country?

**PD:** Ireland. I identify as gay male but it’s uncertain as identity is fluid.

**Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary):** How old are you?

**PD:** 20

**Sarah Rowlinson (LGBT Youth Scotland, Scotland):** I am Sarah, age 25, I identify as gay female, and I’m from Scotland. I was grateful to be co-opted by the board in April and was very pleased to have contributed to the life of the organisation. I have been involved in activism, including disabilities and mental health issues, and the last 2 years have worked for LGBT Youth Scotland. I have a varied role as a team leader, supporting young people, and securing funding and project management. My job is to support and empower individuals to have their voices heard. It’s as much about listening as it is about talking. I hope I am approachable and my facilitation skills allow me to work with a range of people in different settings. I hope, over the last couple of days, I’ve been able to give you an idea of what my role has involved: fundraising strategy and strategic partnerships in health. Summing up I have had an incredible 8 months and feel I have made a contribution to IGLYO, and would like the opportunity to continue what I have started.
Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): Do you identify as an LGBTQ person?

SR: I identify as gay female.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): Do you think your previous experience working with disability and mental health has helped your work on the health board in IGLYO?

SR: Yes, but also thinking about multiple discrimination.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): are you part of the health working group?

SR: I have taken a lead on the health working group.

ACi: I feel sad that there are only 4 places, as the quality of candidates is very strong.

Presentation of the host organisation for GA 2013 applications

RP: Hosting the GA is a great honour and a big responsibility for host organisations. There is a good description of what this means in the pack. You have to commit to search for funding, venue and lodging, food etc. You must also be part of organizing the programme such as programmes and seminars if we choose to do so. The host organisation will need to work throughout the entire year of 2013. However the IGLYO board will help every step of the way – you are not alone. The host organisation needs good communication skills and it is important the contact person is accessible and had the mandate to make quick decisions if necessary.

ACi: We will have 5 minutes per presentation and up to 5 questions.

LGBT Ungdom and SABAAH

Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark): I am Christopher, member of the board of LGBT Ungdom, and am the international lead. Sabaah has entrusted me to say a few words on their behalf. I will give you a short view of the organisations and about Denmark.

Sabaah means ‘new day’ or ‘new beginning’ in Arabic. They represent ethnic minority LGBTQ in Denmark. Denmark has been a frontrunner in the fight for equal rights for sexual minorities but this has now stagnated and we see some problems. Denmark is a very homogenous country where the majority population are white Danes and there is some conflict between white Danes and ethnic minority Danes. We still see racism within LGBTQ community and the Danish Defence League reaching out to the LGBTQ community. We suggest some reasons why we are trying to co-fund this: we have good ties with municipality of Copenhagen and they are already keen on the idea, as are the Danish youth council. We would like to use Copenhagen City Hall. We are socially and culturally ‘hip’ and arrange different events, and have a good variety of networking. We hope to welcome you all to Copenhagen next year.
Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): What are your expectations from your organisation?

Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark): We hope this can be a starting point for some very good working together, and getting minority groups working together in more projects.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): How many people would be involved in the organization approximately.

Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark): We hope to have a working group and have a broad base of activists that we can contact and use for the GA and planning process.

Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania): Has any GA been organized jointly by two or more organisations?

ACi: Yes in Malaga (Spain) in 2007.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): I have just shown you a short video of Riga. On behalf of Mozaika, I would like to invite you next year to Riga. We hosted Pride in 2006 and we hosted this year’s Pride in 2012 and politically it was the most successful pride in terms of safety. We are good destination for transportation. We hosted Eurovision and the ice hockey championships. We will be hosting Europride and the ILGA Europe conference. We have an amazing city and lots of fun activities. We are funding a large grant for next 3 years so we can guarantee funding. We are prepared and ready to host and would be happy to have you.

Matea Popov (Zagreb Pride, Croatia): Since you’re already hosting Worldpride and ILGA Europe why do you think it is important, and do you think you have capacity?

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): Next year we’ll be working on hate crime and bullying issues and we are hoping to bring our own experience to IGLYO’s theme. We’re hoping to carry bullying issues all the way to the GA. It would be good to provide our local experience.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): Was the funding that they planned to apply for able to contribute to the GA and might that free up some of IGLYO’s money for other programmes?

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): We are planning to apply for grant money. We hope it will be successful?

Andrii Marchenko (Gay Forum, Ukraine): What is the attitude of Latvians towards LGBT?

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): Homophobic in the past. Organised homophobia and active and aggressive homophobia has disappeared. One Member of Parliament tried to start an anti-LGBT activism but he is a lone voice. People in general are quite tolerant. You can be safe on the streets.
SPOD, Turkey

Onur Fidangul (SPOD, Turkey): We have elaborated why we want to host the GA in our application. I’m not very worried about the logistics, I know it’s a huge amount of work and takes a lot of energy time and commitment. As international coordinator, I organize a lot of international meetings and trainings in Istanbul. The LGBT movement and organisations are in a strategically important position. A lot of organisations lost interest in IGLYO after the proposed GA in Tel Aviv. It was battle for me to convince members of my organisation to host the GA. The work in Turkey has a very important role as we are a role model for MENA countries and important for the Baltic region and caucuses. We have a lot of youth activism, but they are not interested in IGLYO, so I think it will encourage people to be more active in IGLYO. It will be important to activists in MENA too. There will be a group of volunteers who have already committed their time. The civil society movement is quite small so I don’t think it will be a problem to get people involved. Although SPOD is a one year old organisation, the people involved have a lot of experience in activism. I believe we can do fundraising and get money from the Dutch or Swedish ministry. We haven’t had any kind of international meeting like this before. I will try to get all these university organisations involved if we go ahead.

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): Can you list any specific strategies that you’d use in the logistics to reduce the environmental impact of the GA?

Onur Fidangul (SPOD, Turkey): I don’t know if I can make a decision on flights and transportation. I would ensure that every material will be as sustainable as possible. We could have a cooking team. My flatmate is studying gastronomy and is vegan. I have to think about it.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): It could be a political question, but what about the Israeli members in terms of security?

Onur Fidangul (SPOD, Turkey): I don’t think we’d have a security issue with members from Israel. I know this because I’m in Greenpeace Mediterranean and we work a lot with Israel, Lebanon etc.

ACi: I will now do a roll call. We will give you two voting ballots: one for board members, and one of GA 2013 host organisations. You will cast your votes at the same time.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): Do candidates to the board also get a vote?

ACi: Yes, because you are representing a member organisation. Anyone on the Board or Secretariat cannot vote, because we are not representing organisations directly. Proxies have been noted earlier. You must stay in the room until we cast all the votes. There are spelling mistakes in the paper which have been noted. Technically we have to ask for approval that we can elect 4 members.

Chaber (KPH, Poland): In the statutes it says that the General Assembly has the power to elect 6-8 members.
ACi: The whole board must be 6-8 members.

Chaber (KPH, Poland): Is there a possibility to vote for the number of Board members depending on how many reach a certain threshold of votes?

ACi: There is not specific vote threshold. Since there is not a specific procedure it is up to me to decide.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): I have a question about how many people can be elected on a ballot.

ACi: Either 1, 2, 3, or 4.

Pat Kulka (ANSO, Denmark): So the people with the most votes will get in even if they do not get at least 50%?

ACi: Yes, it is a simple majority.

General approval that we will be electing 4 members.

ACi: If two people get the same number of votes then it may be necessary to have a second election to decide between the two.

Pat Kulka (ANSO, Denmark): When do we come back to the plenary room?

ACi: We will have 15 minutes break after the first person leaves the room.

Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania): Will the votes be counted publically?

ACi: No, but you may complain if you don’t agree with the number of votes.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): Do we just tick, not a number?

ACi: Just tick a box on the bulletin corresponding to candidate you would like to vote for.

During the break films from the conference were screened.

ACi: The vote tellers are in the room. Is the declaration text ready?

First we will have a discussion of the declaration. I’ll read out the proposed text and we have an alternative text too.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): There are quite a few grammatical issues.

ACi: Grammatical mistakes will be corrected.
Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania): There’s a phrase which appears to be incomplete.

ACi: It will be proofread.

Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey): In the paragraph where it says internationally binding principles, it mentions Yogyakarta, which is not internationally binding.

Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia): It does not just restrict the rights of LGBTQ people, but all citizens.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): It does reflect this in another paragraph.

Andrii Zarytskii (Liga, Ukraine): The reading is no longer in parliament (10290) because the member who proposed it is no longer in parliament.

Melinda Szell (Szimpozion Association, Hungary): Where it says ‘we believe that LGBTQ young people shall be accepted’, please change shall to should.

Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia): It should not be called a law because the bill has not yet been completely passed.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): I love this. I think it should include what I wrote about being LGBTQ isn’t a choice and you can’t stop people being LGBTQ by passing a law.

Eirik Rise (Skeiv Ungdom, Norway): could be good to mention the visa liberalization issue.

Chaber (KPH, Poland): ICCPR is mentioned twice. It’s a bit inconsistent regarding LGBTQ. It would be good to change the structure so it starts with the situation and then moves to the solution.

PD: We will have LGBTQ uniformly throughout the text.

Karoline Borner (Lambda - Jugendnetzwerk Berlin-Brandenburg, Germany): At the beginning of the paragraph there is an issue.

Melinda Szell (Szimposion Association, Hungary): I think it should be pointed out that it does not protect children because it does not address the cause of sexual violence.

ACi: This will be included in the minutes and acted upon. Well done for all of your work. Can we approve this draft on the basis that the comments are included?

General approval.

ACi: I will now announce the results from most votes to least votes. 44 ballots were cast for new board members.

1. 38 votes Sarah Rowlinson. Elected
2. 29 votes Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland) Hendron. Elected
3. 23 votes Patrick Dempsey. Elected
4. 22 votes Helena Kovac (EMA LGBT Network, Belgium). Elected
5. = 17 Cosmin Bebu Vijian (Accept, Romania)
6. = 17 Onur Fidangul (SPoD, Turkey)
7. = 7 Arturs Saburovs (Mozaika, Latvia)
8. =7 Ashot Gevorgyan (We For Civil Equality, Armenia)
9. =6 Emily Daina Saras (Tolerant Youth Association, Lithuania)

ACi: Please don't be discouraged, because it is a tough competition and I thought all candidates were great. I hope some of the candidates will be running again next year. It was very encouraging to see so many good candidates apply. The new mandate of the Board will only start in January.

Results of voting for host organisation for GA 2013

ACi: 44 ballots were casted.

1. 30 votes to LGBT Ungdom and Saabah, Denmark
2. 10 votes to Spod, Turkey
3. 4 votes to Mozaika, Turkey

ACi: I would like to really thank all organisations for applying. It is encouraging to see so many organisations interested in hosting. I will now officially close the GA.

Opening of IGLYO GA (NL).

Approval of the transfer of all relevant decisions from IGLYO Belgium to IGLYO Netherlands.

ACi: I officially declare the GA of IGLYO NL closed.

RP: It is with great pleasure we come to the end of the GA. We are the first board to organize two GAs and it is encouraging to see that we can do this, and the next GA will be even better. It is great that we now have 4 position papers on the focus groups that IGLYO works with, and I hope that you will use these in your own work. I also think the declaration is a great document. I also want to say that I agree fully with Augustas about the board elections. We had nine really competent applications and it’s a shame some can’t join us. There may be co-options next year. There are also prep teams and working groups for you to be involved in, so please continue your involvement. My energy levels have been raised thanks to being here with you. I want to thank the board of 2012 and it’s a shame that Zara and Sadja could not be here.

I wish to thank our friends from Liga, Andrii and Julia and Oleg. It is really wonderful and the organisation has been fantastic. Thanks to our wonderful chair of the GA Augustas and our minute-taker Daniel. I’ll see you all in Copenhagen next year.

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): Can the other board members make themselves available for a picture?
AZ: congratulations on so many achievements. I must deliver some sad news from Kiev. Last week they were preparing to participate in a march dedicated to human rights day. While the application was contested by the city administration, they submitted another application Friday evening without waiting for permission and changing location. They were obstructed by police and right wing activists and were detained by police. They have been freed by the police. This is a really alarming moment. We can see that in the new parliament things are still at a very bad level. The declaration is very urgent and needed, and we will make sure it reaches all the stakeholders. We suggest you take part in the activity which we prepared. We would like to take pictures of all of you in front of the sign.

Orlaith Hendron (Here NI, Northern Ireland): Can I also suggest that once organisations return home they submit a letter to the MEPs?

Sian Mary Hughes (LGBT Youth Scotland, United Kingdom): May we send the declaration?

RP: The declaration will be distributed and is free to share and use as inspiration.

ACi: It just goes to show that the work is very important.

JL: The Board asked me to run an evaluation for the GA, similar to the evaluation for the workshop.

Christopher Jakshoj (LGBT Ungdom, Denmark): I would like to draw attention to Uganda where as we speak they might pass the Kill the Gays bill. The situation is extremely vulnerable at the moment. All the activists fighting this could face death immediately if the bill is passed.

ACi: It was an honour for me to be involved in this GA. Thank you.