

# III INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY MEETING MINUTES

PRAGUE, CZECH REPUBLIC  
1<sup>ST</sup> - 5<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2023



#### Human Rights Partner of ELSA



#### Technical Supporters



#### General Partners of ELSA



#### General Legal Partners of ELSA



#### General Education Partners of ELSA



The European Law Students' Association

## FOREWORD

Dear Network,

We are excited to present to you the Minutes of the III International Strategy Meeting held in Prague between the 1st and the 5th of February 2023.

It was an eventful meeting filled with passionate discussions surrounding the future of our Association and wonderful socialising amongst fellow Officers of the Network.

We would like to once more show our gratitude to all the Secretaries that contributed to the minutes and to the Organising Committee who did an amazing job in organising the meeting and making sure all of us would always remember our visit to Prague.

We decided to create these minutes partially as a full, sentence-by-sentence account of the meeting and partially as a more general recap of the discussion. For the workshop concerning the statutes, we thought the conventional minute format would be most fruitful. For the other workshops, having more free-flowing discussions without the constraint of having everything minuted word by word would be more beneficial.

ELSAfully yours,

    Inês Gonçalves

   

**Yuri, Basil, Mikko, Inês, Jean, Linnéa, Leia and Dora**  
International Board 2022/2023

---

## ISM WORKSHOP MINUTES

### Table of Contents

---

<b>FOREWORD</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ISM WORKSHOP MINUTES</b>	<b>2</b>
WEDNESDAY, 1st FEBRUARY 2023	3
Opening Workshop	3
THURSDAY, 2nd FEBRUARY 2023	4
An Advocating Association: Through the Lens of Law Students and Young Lawyers - Group 2	4
An Advocating Association: Through the Lens of Law Students and Young Lawyers - Group 1	5
A Non-Political Association - Group 1	7
A Non-Political Association - Group 2	10
Statutory Proposal - Group 1	14
FRIDAY, 3rd FEBRUARY 2023	24
Strategic Plan - Group 1	24
Strategic Plan - Group 1	25
Strategic Plan - Group 1	27
Strategic Plan - Group 2	28
Strategic Plan - Group 2	29
Strategic Plan - Group 2	30
Strategic Plan - Group 3	31
SATURDAY, 3rd FEBRUARY 2023	42
Strategic Plan - Group 1	42
Strategic Plan - Group 2	43
Strategic Plan - Group 3	43
SUNDAY, 5th FEBRUARY 2023	45
Closing Workshop	45

---

**WEDNESDAY, 1<sup>st</sup> FEBRUARY 2023**

---

17:00 – 19:00

**Opening Workshop**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Yuri van Steenwijk (YvS)	International Board
Basil Schaller (BS)	International Board
Mikko Laitinen (ML)	International Board
Dora Štambuk (DS)	International Board

*YvS opens the workshop at 17:00*

Yuri van Steenwijk, the President of the International Board of ELSA, warmly welcomed all the participants of the III International Strategy Meeting in Prague and thanked the Organising Committee for hosting this important meeting where we will, with the joint effort, shape the future of our Association. There was also a partner presentation from the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights(FRA). The International Board presented the agenda and passed the floor to the Organising Committee to explain some organisational matters.

*YvS closes the Workshop at 18:00.*

---

**THURSDAY, 2<sup>nd</sup> FEBRUARY 2023**

---

14:00 – 16:30

**An Advocating Association: Through the Lens of Law Students and Young Lawyers - Group 2**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Mikko Laitinen (ML)

International Board

Jean Mattijssen (JM)

International Board

*JM opens the workshop at 14:00.*

*JM introduces the discussion about ELSA as an Advocating Association with discussing different definitions of what social responsibility and advocacy are.*

**Discussion point:**

- What do social responsibility and advocacy mean to you as a National and Local Officer?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Besides activities we usually do, we have a duty to be socially responsible and act for the good of society.
- Being socially responsible for an association or a company can ease strengthening the brand, promotion of activities and marketing in general.

**Discussion points:**

- Is advocating political?
- Should ELSA advocate?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Advocacy on its own is not always political, but the topics that are advocated for might be.
- ELSA can still advocate on topics such as human rights.

*To ensure common ground, JM introduced a definition of advocacy as pleading in favour of something to recommend and encourage support for something.*

*JM introduces the group task of defining ELSA's approach to advocacy, human rights and social responsibility. More specifically, how they are represented and interrelated and how they are regulated within ELSA.*

- **Group 1** - All 3 concepts are interconnected, and you really cannot speak of one without the others. Pillars of ELSA should be accounted for in all of ELSA instead of just ELSA

projects. Spreading the knowledge and creating joint ownership of the concepts among the whole board.

- **Group 2** - Impartiality, could it be changed into apoliticality? Avoid packing the DB with too much substance, but instead, create a framework and guidelines. Many possibilities in ELSA, which means people might get lost in the different projects. Implementing the 3 words all the way to LGs
- **Group 3** - We believe that advocacy, social responsibility and human rights are essential for ELSA, but at the same time, it can be difficult to approach this as countries differ. Advocating through established documents and standards and raising awareness of them, such as IHL or ECHR.
- **Group 4** - DB article 1 is a good way to define. We can use our legal knowledge to educate people. Being the voice of law students on advocacy topics. More regulation is hard because of differences in the network.

*JM explained the regulations and showed what is already regulated in the International Council Meeting Decision Book regarding Advocacy, Human Rights, and Social Responsibility.*

*JM presents two ideas of how to become a more advocating association and explains execution. The first idea is to take one or two topics, such as human rights and the rule of law and to advocate through the lens of these topics. The second idea builds on the first idea. The second idea is a team or committee that continuously works on reports that outline ELSA's stance through the main topics on a more specific topic, such as climate justice. This team would consist of National and Local Officers and would be supervised by the International Board. The International Council would vote on the adoption of the team's reports in the ICM Decision Book to provide National and Local Groups with a foundation of ELSA's stance towards a certain topic, as well as to bind ELSA to positively contribute to this topic.*

*JM closes the Workshop at 16:30.*

17:00 – 19:00

## **An Advocating Association: Through the Lens of Law Students and Young Lawyers - Group 1**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Jean Mattijsen (JM)  
Dora Štambuk (DS)

International Board  
International Board

*JM opens the workshop at 17:00.*

*JM introduces the discussion about ELSA as an Advocating Association with discussing different definitions of what social responsibility and advocacy are.*

**Discussion point:**

- What do social responsibility and advocacy mean to you as a National and Local Officer?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Besides activities we usually do, we have a duty to be socially responsible and act for the good of society.
- Being socially responsible for an association or a company can ease strengthening the brand, promotion of activities and marketing in general.

**Discussion points:**

- Is advocating political?
- Should ELSA advocate?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Advocacy on its own is not always political, but the topics that are advocated for might be.
- ELSA can still advocate on topics such as human rights.

**Discussion point:**

- Is advocating political?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Depends on how we use it and for what we advocate.
- Advocating is sharing or speaking out in public related to certain issues, and it should not be considered political if we share our values and philosophy.
- It is up to us. We can make advocacy non-political, depends how we approach the topic.
- Advocating should not be political. In some countries where democracy is not developed enough, unfortunately, that is not the case.

**Discussion point:**

- Should ELSA advocate?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Depends on the topic we advocate for and how.
- ELSA should advocate and follow its philosophy and values.
- ELSA should advocate. We should not hide behind non-political.
- We had a problem with Advocacy regarding a specific project and decided not to proceed. However, in every country, advocacy should be different concerning issues related to the respective country.
- ELSA should advocate, and if we decide to advocate on a specific topic, we should evaluate if any topic will cause difficulties in some countries.
- We should not hide behind the non-political status of ELSA, and we agree that we should advocate as an Association.

*To ensure common ground, JM introduced a definition of advocacy as pleading in favour of something to recommend and encourage support for something.*

*JM introduces the group task of defining ELSA's approach to advocacy, human rights and social responsibility. More specifically, how they are represented and interrelated and how they are regulated within ELSA.*

- **Group 1** - We tried to evaluate how we implemented this into our work as National Board Members. Social Responsibility is an umbrella that covers a lot of activities we already do. We try to keep the balance between the Career orientated events and Human Rights aspects in all events if possible. We don't advocate HR in general but focus on specific topics, and we believe it is regulated however, it is still very vague. It would make sense to have concrete values we stand for and to include them in our DB. We can have examples, suggestions and ideas on how we can bring those ideas to specific projects.
- **Group 2** - We tried to define ELSAs' approaches to those topics and tried to step back from the National Groups perspective only. We should expand on with whom we share our values and topics we want to advocate for, and regarding Social Responsibility, we need to work more on how to connect those topics in the network to improve as a whole. One of the main pillars is Human Rights and being socially responsible. We depend on each other, and we are socially responsible if we advocate for Human Rights. We believe one depends on the other. The definition in the DB is short and broad.
- **Group 3** - We concluded that every National Board has its own approach, so we believe it would be difficult to define the general approach. One of the topics that could be common is legal education; ICC reports that showed ELSAs' impact were very impressive. When it comes to Human Rights, we, as a network, already do a lot. Regarding Social Responsibility, we need to see how we can, as members of society, contribute more. Some groups, such as ELSA The Netherlands, are trying strongly implement Social Responsibility as much as possible. Regulations-wise, we need a more comprehensive approach and a better or more detailed definition. People should understand what the purpose is.
- **Group 4** - We evaluated how Advocacy and Social Responsibility are implemented in the network. There needs to be more specific information about Advocacy in the DB, and regarding Social Responsibility, we believe that it's implemented clearly only through ROLE. We should clarify it more. It would make sense to have concrete values we stand for and to include them in our DB. We can have examples, suggestions and ideas on how we can bring those ideas to specific projects.

*JM explained the regulations and showed what is already regulated in the International Council Meeting Decision Book regarding Advocacy, Human Rights, and Social Responsibility.*

*JM presents two ideas of how to become a more advocating association and explains execution. The first idea is to take one or two topics, such as human rights and the rule of law and to advocate through the lens of these topics. The second idea builds on the first idea. The second idea is a team or committee that continuously works on reports that outline ELSA's stance through the main topics on a more specific topic, such as climate justice. This team would consist of National and Local Officers and would be supervised by the International Board. The*



*International Council would vote on the adoption of the team's reports in the ICM Decision Book to provide National and Local Groups with a foundation of ELSA's stance towards a certain topic, as well as to bind ELSA to positively contribute to this topic.*

*JM closes the Workshop at 19:00.*

14:00 – 16:30

## **A Non-Political Association - Group 1**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Yuri van Steenwijk (YvS)

International Board

*Due to the fact that we wanted to facilitate free-flowing discussion and that there is no proposal to be voted on, we decided to forgo 1 to 1 minutes in favour of keeping track of the general point discussed.*

*YvS opens the workshop at 14:09*

*YvS presents the discussion about the non-political status of ELSA, including discussions held on this topic in the past since the founding of ELSA:*

### **Discussion point:**

- What does non-political mean to you?

### **Answers brought forward:**

- Being completely isolated from politics - non-appearance to a specific party;
- Remaining as neutral as possible on global issues;
- Not letting politics into our decision-making;
- Going with an objective view to not get into conflicts, however, we also stand for human rights, so we advocate human rights at the moment they are breached;
- It means that we avoid discussing some issues, but we are trying to tackle the important ones to our association (legal especially);
- We can still engage in political issues but without taking actual stands or any sides, being very objective;
- It means that we are open to everyone;
- When you are tackling a political issue, you are checking both sides, when we have famous politicians in workshops, discussions - it is important to bring people from both sides to discuss;
- The focus of our activities must be on the legal aspects of the topic;

- During our events, different views of the situation should be presented, taking into consideration international perspectives, in such a way that it does not seem that ELSA identifies with one opinion or the other.

**Discussion point:**

How do you benefit from the term non-political?

**Answers brought forward:**

- when we are non-political, we are more open, and we attract more people, as we are not only affiliated with one side of the political spectrum or one specific party,
- you can be more focused on students and law (keeps a scope of the Association),
- it can help with partnerships,
- in some countries, being apolitical is necessary to exist due to the political situation.

**Discussion point:**

When is the term non-political a disadvantage?

**Answers brought forward:**

- It's a limitation, we need to be careful what the content of our events is and who we invite when organising something or making a statement,
- There are internal disagreements - what is non-political, what is political etc.,
- Human rights and politics go hand in hand, sometimes it's very political, but we still want to speak out on the topic,
- This term might have a different meaning in different countries,
- When we are not political also regarding university politics - we cannot have representatives at university as it is political,
- It's really impossible to be apolitical,
- We can not be as supportive on certain matters as we wish to be (the war in Ukraine, for example) due to the non-political status of ELSA.

**Discussion point:**

Where do we go from here?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Strict guidelines, the more general you go, it will be difficult, but every project has it. There have been a lot of patterns: writing guidelines per project, specifically what the long-occurring situation had been political;
- Guidelines are not binding, but they would help;

- We need clarification - as we are discussing it a lot;
- Humanitarian action is not political action, in our opinion, and guidelines need to be clarified;
- It shouldn't be clarified as much, and we are afraid that in places where ELSA is not that strong when we put another bureaucratic level, it will not be good;
- Clarification in DB, in ELSA content, is that we are silent;
- We could make a handbook or guideline for every project, but it will take a lot of time. You can't count on one country cause in another year, it can be different again; we can do clarification in the DB and then maybe do it within projects;
- When we go political, where we have to be for one party, there will be kind of a fight. The clarification might be good, but it shouldn't be too detailed;
- Clarify a little bit. That would already do a lot for us;
- We have to leave some room for discretion;
- New officers will think about that, workshop about it at the beginning of the term, how we can actually serve our goals without avoiding a problem;
- Do we want a working group - NO! (all delegates said that they don't want that),
- That doesn't mean that we should take a step back. We can bring up conversations about human rights;
- ICM Palermo - there was an input paper from ELSA Norway, Austria etc., about changing from non-political to non-partisan (not affiliated to a political party), but with this definition, you will also run into uncertainty.

**Discussion point:**

Can ELSA Officers/Members be politically active?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Depending on how strictly we interpret non-political if you are an ELSA officer or even member, you cannot have political terms - this sometimes might be a problem;
- ELSA International is stopping political life for a year as otherwise they could be using the platform that is given to them to make a political statement, it's working (whole workshop group agreed on that);
- We need to divide those conversations: private and ELSA life are different;
- ELSA Officers and ELSA members - should be divided. Officers - it's not a good idea, in general, to be active in politics, but they could be passive in politics to keep ELSA separate for the term. Members can be active as we cannot check all of them;
- One member brings up an example of her joining a Local Board. "I had to quit my political party. I am a silent member. I couldn't post something about a politically neutral association and then a post with a politician. Where you take such a position, we need to take into account to not make it a part of the work."

**The conclusion from this point:**

- International Board- shouldn't be involved in politics

- National or Local officer - a more nuanced approach is required, a different story from the International Board
- Individual members - we don't need to and cannot control it

**Discussion point:**

Should we change non-political to another word?

**Answers brought forward:**

- We bring up some terms and their differing dictionary definitions  
Apolitical - not interested in politics;  
political - connected with the state, government or public affairs  
non-partisan - not supporting the ideas of one particular political party;
- What about the term politically independent;
- We need to start to clarify what these terms vaguely mean to us- changing the term doesn't do the trick;
- non-political - you don't say that it's this, as it is not defined. it's not important to change this term but standardise or unify operations;
- A common sense approach seems a lot more realistic than finding a perfect definition;
- ELSA has existed for 41 years, and it's still here. There are improvements. The international perspective seems very clear. There will not be a one-stop solution to writing a document;
- We need to do something. We came up with points, not being affiliated with a party but evaluating a situation for ourselves. Going forward, we can flesh out the term non-political. It makes it easier to further clarify and act upon this and leaving it unclear is not a good option.

**Discussion point:**

What are the limits of ELSA's support?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Are fundraisers for weapons/drones ok?
- I don't associate fundraisers with politics at all. If we didn't get the finances for drones, I believe that this country wouldn't exist;
- You need to distinguish those two. Military support is political. Humanitarian support is not, as it is human rights that are violated. Military - drones are killing people, and even though it is a humanitarian help, we cannot be associated with it;
- Military support goes against what I believe ELSA stands for;
- It's important to be consistent. The Ukraine situation has shown us that if we are not consistent in all conflicts, then we are all political;
- We need to be aware that any precedent we set here would also be applied if two ELSA Groups get into an armed conflict;
- trying to create a guideline of consistency is unachievable.

*YvS closes the Workshop at 16:30.*

17:00 – 19:00

## **A Non-Political Association - Group 2**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Yuri van Steenwijk (YvS)

International Board

Mikko Laitinen (ML)

International Board

*YvS opens the workshop at 17:00.*

*YvS presents the discussion about the non-political status of ELSA, including discussions held on this topic in the past since the founding of ELSA:*

### **Discussion point:**

What does non-political mean to you?

### **Answers brought forward:**

- Non-partisan and not being influenced by political parties;
- Basing projects on facts and law, not politic;
- Freedom from political agendas.

### **Discussion point:**

How does being non-political impact you as ELSA officers?

### **Answers brought forward:**

- Complicates activities in supporting the country;
- Point of nervousness, what can I actually do;
- Limits partnerships or finding speakers as they have political affiliations.

### **Discussion point:**

How do you benefit from the term non-political?

### **Answers brought forward:**

- Credibility;
- Safety from the backlash of a political scandal;
- Funding is easier for non-politicals;
- Learning impartiality as future legal professionals;

- Giving a platform for students to engage in a non-political organisation.

**Discussion point:**

When is the term non-political a disadvantage?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Organising events (can I do it or is it political);
- Finding speakers.

**Discussion point:**

Where do we go from here?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Becoming political has way too many downsides compared to staying non-political, so we should not do it.

**Discussion point:**

Should non-political be clarified in a document? Should it be clarified in the standing orders?

**Answers brought forward:**

- One document is way too exact and specific;
- Spreading the message of people who have started their political opinions;
- We shouldn't just concentrate on the wording and specifications but actually concentrate on making a difference in our countries.

**Discussion point:**

Can ELSA Officers/Members be politically active?

**Answers brought forward:**

- We should put an emphasis on being aware of what is going on around us. Being politically active is, in a way, a personal matter;
- It should not be a barrier to joining ELSA that you are a member of a party, but if you are an officer, that should be taken into account;
- If you voice your opinions on social media while being actively involved in ELSA might leave others with wrong assumptions about ELSA;
- If a person is a member of a party, but does not show that in their ELSA activities should that be an issue;
- When you are a member of a board, your actions reflect the entire board.

**Discussion point:**

Can a Board Member show their political opinion without being a member of a party? What about just being active in general?

**Answers brought forward:**

- It would harm the Association;
- We all have political opinions, but the way we present changes;
- The more “power”, the more responsibility. Things are different for local members or for National Board Members, for example;
- You can also take a stance on an issue without showing a political opinion.

**Discussion point:**

How strongly should this be enforced?

**Answers brought forward:**

- Depends highly on the country and the situation in the academia of that country;
- Using the platform given by the Association should not be done for political purposes. And this depends on the level you are being active.

**Discussion point:**

Can ELSA as an Association take a stance

**Answers brought forward:**

- Voting in general assemblies about a specific stance in conflicts would fracture ELSA;
- Are we losing the respect of some of our members because we are not taking a stance?;
- Why is it our responsibility to take a stance on this right here, right now;
- Could we rely on the stances taken by other, more powerful organisations such as CoE or the UN?;
- ELSA has been built to create bridges between nations, not burn them down;
- We should have some objective way of determining severity, including inputs from other metrics such as international organisation statements. In non-black and white cases, we would need to be nonpartisan and neutral;
- There are other ways of helping. Humanitarian aid, accepting and assisting refugees, sharing knowledge.

**Discussion point:**

What are the limits of ELSA's support?

**Answers brought forward:**

- What about getting requests to provide actual combat supplies?;
- Does an extreme situation requires extreme means? What's the definition of an extreme situation?;
- Are we talking about politicalness or human rights and their defence of them;
- ELSA needs to take the time to consider situations and take them as they come. Each conflict is different with complex backgrounds;
- We, as ELSA, cannot finance arms, we are students, so the way we can help is different;

- We need to have solidarity towards our brothers and sisters in the world. We need to try to support where we can and find ways to help without losing ourselves.

### Discussion point:

How should we proceed with the matter in the future? Is it up to the IB, the Nationals, the ICM etc?

### Answers brought forward:

- The outright ban on speaking out would not work. Neither does a set-in-stone guideline on how and when to speak out. Situations differ, so we need to have the flexibility to react accordingly and trust the officers in position when the situation happens. Council decisions work when one is coming up, but not in all situations;
- The IB is voted into office to handle all the daily business of the Association and thus needs to be trusted to make the correct decision when the time comes. On the other hand, having a responsibility like that is beyond what can be expected from the members of the International Board;
- Regulations for emergency situations or statements could be added to the regulations;
- Does this not actually already exist (extraordinary ICM)?

*YveS closes the workshop at 18.55*

14:00 – 16:30

## Statutory Proposal - Group 1

Participants' list:

Basil Schaller (BS)	International Board
Dora Stambuk (DS)	International Board
Rugilė Hokušaitė	ELSA Lithuania
Nea Nurmela	ELSA Finland
Yordan Kyurkchiyski	EIT
Susanne Kratzer	ELSA Austria
Thibault Aktay	ELSA Belgium
Vojtěch Niederle	ELSA Czech Republic
Julie Vestergaard	ELSA Denmark
Freia Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Vasilis Kaitsas	ELSA Greece
Roman Szuter	ELSA Sweden
Nives Edler	ELSA Switzerland
Jeroen Schildering	ELSA the Netherlands
Raphaëla Pavlidou	ELSA France



Elena Ruth	ELSA Germany
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Filip Zawada	ELSA Poland
Jurijs Georgs Rusakovs	ELSA Latvia

*BS opens the workshop at 14:10*

*BS does the revision of the List of votes.*

Revision of the list of votes:

ELSA Lithuania	present and voting
ELSA Finland	present and voting
ELSA Austria	present and voting
ELSA Belgium	present and voting
ELSA Czech Republic	present and voting
ELSA Greece	present and voting
ELSA Sweden	present and voting
ELSA Switzerland	present and voting
ELSA the Netherlands	present and voting
ELSA France	present and voting
ELSA Germany	present and voting
ELSA Poland	present and voting
ELSA Latvia	present and voting

*Total amount of votes: 13*

*DS will chair Statutory Workshop.*

*BS presents Proposal No. 1.*

**DS:** Any arguments in favour or against the proposal?

**ELSA Germany:** If it is not in the Dutch version of the Statues, can we not just cross it out?

**BS:** I do not want to send the Statues, even just as translation, with changes without members knowing why they are made, again, as we saw that this led to a lot of confusion in autumn.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal?

**ELSA Czech Republic:** I propose adding a period at the end of the sentence.

**BS:** The period is still there. It's not crossed out.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal? I see none. We will proceed with voting on the recommendation of Proposal No 1.

*Vote on the recommendation of Proposal No 1:*

*In favour: 13*

*Against: 0*

*Abstentions: 0*

*The Proposal is unanimously recommended by the Workshop.*

*BS presents Proposal No. 2.*

**DS:** Is there a need for clarification? I see none.

**DS:** Any arguments in favour or against the proposal? I see none.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal?

**ELSA Czech Republic:** “Observer” should not be capitalised in the middle of the sentence.

**BS:** All the grammatical issues are within the translation, but since it is only a translation, there is no issue. When we publish the official materials, we will ensure no errors.

**DS:** We will proceed with voting on the recommendation of Proposal No 2.

*Vote on the recommendation of Proposal No 2:*

*In favour: 13*

*Against: 0*

*Abstentions: 0*

*The Proposal is unanimously recommended by the Workshop.*

*BS presents Proposal No. 3.*

**DS:** Is there a need for clarification?

**EIT:** Is this the submitted version, or is it the one made during the 79th International Council Meeting?

**BS:** This is the compiled version.

**ELSA Germany:** Could you clarify more and check if the last part is legal?

**BS:** Yes, we will check.

**EIT:** When this was drafted, the idea was that it should go together with another proposal about terminating the membership. If the member loses its legal personality, they can't get demoted because they will already be terminated.

**BS:** Yes, you are right. That proposal was legally passed, so we have to notarise it and not re-vote it. As you can see in the Minutes, there were four proposals made in the 79th International Council Meeting. We only have to notarise this one (*Proposal no. 3*), as the others were not changed.

**ELSA Sweden:** So it was voted upon, and then it was changed? Why do we have to revote?

**BS:** Based on Dutch law, amendments to the proposals have to be known beforehand. If it is amended during the International Council Meeting, you can't vote on it at that time.

**DS:** Any arguments in favour or against the proposal?

**ELSA Belgium:** If we're not sure about the legality, should we propose to postpone it?

**BS:** If it is impossible, we will strike it out, and at the ICM Malta, we will have a workshop to discuss it. But for now, it would be helpful to me if we form an opinion.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal? I see none. We will proceed with voting on the recommendation of Proposal No 3.

*Vote on the recommendation of Proposal No. 3:*

*In favour: 13*

*Against: 0*

*Abstentions: 0*

*The Proposal is unanimously recommended by the Workshop.*

*BS presents Proposal No. 4.*

**DS:** Any arguments in favour or against the proposal?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** This is the legal fusion of two associations, and the new association would automatically get a membership.

**EIT:** Technically, if you notarise the later proposal, would the final text be the "e"?

**BS:** The point "e" still exists in the current version. The current point "f" will become "e", and that's why we have it here.

**ELSA Germany:** When we decided, what about 5 and 4? Did we change the numbers of the following paragraphs? You have to change it with amendments.

**BS:** It is supposed to be like that.

**EIT:** The proposals here were made at the same time. Is that what you asked?

**ELSA Germany:** No, it is not what I asked.

**BS:** The numbering of the following articles will change.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Can we make an article that says all the articles will be re-numbered after this?

**BS:** I see the issue. I rather do it properly, and the problem is that this was an original proposal.

**ELSA Germany:** We should do it now. It would have been incorrect if it had been notarised, and we would have had to change it. So it is better to do it now.

**BS:** This is not an amendment. We need a new proposal for changes like that. We will look into this and make a proposal on changing the numbers.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal? I see none. We will proceed with voting on the recommendation of Proposal No 4.

*Vote on the recommendation of Proposal No. 4:*

*In favour: 13*

*Against: 0*

*Abstentions: 0*

*The Proposal is unanimously recommended by the Workshop.*

*BS presents Proposal No. 5.*

**DS:** Any arguments in favour or against the proposal?

**ELSA Czech Republic:** First sentence - if the proposal can be submitted by an observer, shouldn't the "observer" be included in the article as well?

**BS:** It's not possible for observers to submit proposals.

**ELSA Germany:** I am confused about how you will ensure that only the Council is responsible by changing the order of words.

**BS:** We added “the only”.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** What about point “c”? It's more about the demotion of a member and not expulsion.

**EIT:** I can give a practical example of “c”. A couple of years back, during Covid, there was a situation where one National Group organised a study visit invited, and in the end, it didn't happen, and the money was not returned. It will be up to us to decide if we want to have this member expelled.

**BS:** If we should include point “c” in this list? Point “e” is meant to establish that the National Groups are responsible for the actions of their members, so the locals.

**EIT:** That's what I meant. In the mentioned situation, it was a local group, and the national group was not doing anything.

**ELSA Belgium:** Does “e” mean that the National Groups are responsible for the Local Groups and can be expelled because of their actions?

**BS:** *\*cites point “e”\**. The primary responsibility of the National Group is its members, which are the Local Groups.

**ELSA Belgium:** Is “c” included?

**BS:** Yes.

**ELSA Belgium:** It's a good point to keep. It allows us to treat situations we can't foresee. Depending on the issue, it might require expulsion. It might be risky to put “e”.

**EIT:** I agree. I'm not sure to what extent the National Group has the power to do something about the Local Group. They might not have any power over that, so maybe we should not include it on the “e”.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** It's not on “c”, but I have a problem with “a”. There are provisions in this section group. Maybe we could consider using “a more severe violation” [inaudible].

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** I would like to keep the point “a” only if it includes “a severe violation”.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** I would put “severely violated” in point “a”.

**ELSA Germany:** In the end, the Council decides. If they don't think it's severe enough, it's still our decision, and we are responsible enough.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** I hope that a situation like this will not happen, but it might. It might be an argument to expel somebody, which I don't think is good to have this possibility.

**ELSA Finland:** Maybe it's good that it says that we take appropriate measures. How do we see them? Is it still a reason to expel people?

**BS:** I don't have a perfect solution. It doesn't matter how it will change, and it will become a discussion during the ICM. I'm happy to add something, but it will probably not change the actual outcome if something like that happens.

**EIT:** We have three checks, so it can be done under “dumb” reasons. I'm not sure if it would have any impact if we keep it as it is.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** If the council has this proposal, who will see that the criteria needed for the proposal to be discussed are met?

**BS:** It's hard to say. Generally, the International Board must inform the council about every proposal submitted. I presume that National Board would check if it's possible even if the IB thinks that it doesn't fulfil the criteria. It would be the council deciding if the proposal will be discussed.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** Then it doesn't matter, and we do not have to change anything.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** We would like to withdraw our amendment and need time to discuss it within the National Board.

**DS:** We will proceed with voting on the recommendation of Proposal No 5.

*Vote on the recommendation of Proposal No. 5:*

*In favour: 11*

*Against: 0*

*Abstentions: 2*

*The Proposal is positively recommended by the Workshop.*

*BS presents Proposal No. 6.*

**DS:** Any need for clarification? I see none.

**DS:** Any arguments in favour or against the proposal?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** “Article 6.3 of the Standing Orders” could be “as set out in the Standing Orders”. If you change the Standing Orders, this article would need to be changed as well.

**BS:** We will change that so it doesn't mention any specific articles.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal?

**BS:** I will amend what ELSA The Netherlands just suggested. I will delete “ according to art. 6.3” and add “as set out in”.

**DS:** We will proceed with voting on the recommendation of Proposal No. 6 as amended.

*Vote on the recommendation of Proposal No. 6:*

*In favour: 13*

*Against: 0*

*Abstentions: 0*

*The Proposal is unanimously recommended by the Workshop.*

*BS presents Proposal No. 7.*

**DS:** Any need for clarification? I see none.

**DS:** Any arguments in favour or against the proposal?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** I just want to note that in Malta this will not be changed.

**BS:** We are aware.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal?

**BS:** The same as before, I will delete “according to art. 6.3” and add “as set out in”.

**DS:** We will proceed with voting on the recommendation of Proposal No 6 as amended.

*Vote on the recommendation of Proposal No. 7:*

*In favour: 13*

*Against: 0*

*Abstentions: 0*

*The Proposal is unanimously recommended by the Workshop.*

*BS presents Proposal No. 8.*

**DS:** Any arguments in favour or against the proposal?

**EIT:** If I understand correctly, “e” says [*cites the point*], you can appoint. I understand that after the autumn International Council Meeting if the deputy is not elected, you appoint a new one.

**BS:** Yes, it is already regulated. It doesn't matter if it's an autumn or spring International Council Meeting.

**EIT:** If you appoint the deputy between autumn and spring, and then he is not elected, when does his or her term end?

**BS:** After the spring International Council Meeting, the new deputy would be appointed for the term left after.

**ELSA Germany:** What happens to their decisions if he's not elected?

**BS:** The decisions would stand, as they were a member of the IB.

**ELSA Germany:** What happens to deputy regulations? Because now we would have both.

**BS:** Standing Orders will be changed accordingly.

**ELSA Germany:** All the numbers should be changed.

**BS:** It will be changed without reference to specific articles.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** International Board can only elect not more than half of the Board.

**BS:** I intentionally did not add this to the Statutes. It is already regulated by law.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** Do we need “after the International Council Meeting” in point “e”

**BS:** Yes, you are right.

**ELSA Finland:** Point “c” only mentions Local Groups, but does that cover groups without Local Groups?

**BS:** That's a good point. No, we would have to rephrase that.

**ELSA Switzerland:** What about people from EIT? They are not necessarily in National or Local groups.



**BS:** Yes, it's possible that you're in EIT without being in a National or Local group. But being on an International Board, it's accustomed to being part of some National Group.

**DS:** I would keep it, but there are a lot of EIT positions not involving National or Local members. But if you are running for the International Board, it is useful to have some experience. In some areas, it would be very challenging to have non-experienced Officers.

**EIT:** I know that some groups have direct membership, where people can buy the membership on the internet.

**ELSA Germany:** Not happy with this solution because I still think if you don't have legitimacy, you should not be allowed to do everything that "legitimate" members of the International Boards can do. I would propose splitting this proposal because we can either vote upon the whole thing - as we would vote in favour of one part of it and then against the other one.

**BS:** The only part we can split is "e", as it's unrelated to deputies. How we are now proceeding with deputies, we can't continue. If we want them to be doing their work, they would have to work with Power of Attorney from the International Board. And this way, the deputy is not liable for their own actions, and they would still have total power to act as other members of the International Board. It doesn't change what the deputy can do. That is the question of preference.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Board is liable for what the deputy does. We are trying to change that, and this is the best solution. They are full members of the International Board, but we still hold the position that the council still has to vote on their status to make them "legitimate".

**ELSA Belgium:** This is basically the best thing we could do in this situation. We had to balance our interests, and it was the best outcome.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** It makes the deputies liable for what they do, and there is nothing more we can do. I support it.

**BS:** I'm okay with separating article "d" into a different proposal, and in the end - it's the best solution we could find in a working group.

**DS:** I see the point of ELSA Germany, but I don't see why we should split. It makes sense how it is now. Any other arguments? I see none.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal?

**BS:** The same thing as before: changing "according to art. 6.3" to "as set out in" in points "e", "d," and "e". Remove "art. 11" and add "for nomination and election of IB members" in point "f".

**ELSA Belgium:** Didn't you want to strike the "after the ICM" in point "e"?

**BS:** Yes, we will strike it out.

**DS:** We will proceed with voting on the recommendation of Proposal No 8 as amended.

*Vote on the recommendation of Proposal No. 8:*

*In favour: 12*

*Against: 1*

*Abstentions: 0*

*The Proposal is positively recommended by the Workshop.*

*BS presents Proposal No. 9.*

**DS:** Any need for clarification?

**ELSA Czech Republic:** Would the fee of observers will be added to the Statue?

**BS:** I don't think it is needed.

**DS:** Any arguments in favour or against the proposal?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** I'm in favour of this proposal. It's not necessary to have it in the statutes.

**DS:** Any amendments to the proposal?

**EIT:** "member" in article 9.3 should be capitalised.

**BS:** Yes, thank you.

**DS:** Any further amendments? We will proceed with voting on the recommendation of Proposal No 9 as amended.

*Vote on the recommendation of Proposal No. 9:*

*In favour: 12*

*Against: 0*

*Abstentions: 1*

*The Proposal is positively recommended by the Workshop.*

**DS:** Any further comments or need for clarifications?

**ELSA Belgium:** Will there be a second part of this workshop?

**BS:** No, with this, we finished.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Thank you, you made everything amazing!

*DS closes the workshop at 15:45.*

---

**FRIDAY, 3<sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2023**

---

10:00 – 12:30

**Strategic Plan - Group 1**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Jean Mattijsen (JM)

*JM opens the workshop at 10:16.*

*JM presents Strategic Goal No. 1.*

*JM opens the floor for discussion.*

**1.1 Financial Inclusivity**

- ELSA Germany, ELSA Italy and ELSA Czech Republic discuss making International Internal Meetings less expensive. National Groups discuss the review of the standards and ways of organising International Internal Meetings to lower costs. ELSA Germany adds the point of reviewing internal meetings in general, considering the difficulty of finding hosts. ELSA Belgium suggests: reducing the number of Internal Meetings and reevaluating the pricing of Member Groups in the favoured and non-favoured classification.
- The remuneration of the International Board should increase and be annexed to match inflation rates.
  - ELSA Germany points out that in the reform of remuneration, Belgian labour law should be taken into account better;
  - Groups are divided on whether this should be included in the Strategic Plan.

**1.2 Diverse and welcoming Association**

- The wording did not serve concrete goals for the Association to strive towards. Therefore it was moved upward to take the place of the first sub-article, article 1.1. Part (a.) of art. 1.2 was merged with the preamble sentence to make the diversifying characteristics serve as a goal instead of means.

**1.3 [New] Wellbeing of its members, Code of Conduct**

- General agreement. Discussion on whether this should be a preamble or a sub-article of Article 1.

*JM closes the workshop at 12:33.*

14:00 – 16:30

## **Strategic Plan - Group 1**

International Board members of ELSA present:

Mikko Laitinen (ML)

Jean Mattijsen (JM)

*JM opens the workshop at 14:00.*

### **1.4 [Previous 1.3] Knowledge management**

- Necessary is differently interpreted, depending on if it is National or Local Officers.

### **2.1 Embrace technological innovations**

- Updating technical infrastructure should be done regularly. Therefore, add the word regular.;
- Add (b.) on the renewal of the website and forms and on making IT solutions available to National and Local Groups;
- Add (d.) on the embracement of emerging technologies and their regulation, along with understanding how these technologies consider human rights. This should anticipate any rising technologies that the Strategic Plan might touch over the course of its five years.

### **2.2 [New] GDPR and Archives**

- Sub article addressing the need to improve the data protection of ELSA and its National and Local Groups during all events worldwide.

### **2.3 [Previous 2.2] Coherence with regulations**

- Change (a.) to a softer wording such as “Doing regular reviews of its regulations to be in accordance with all applicable laws.”
- Streamlining o the Statutes should only take place when deemed purposeful;
- Adding (e.) to evaluate its compliance with GDPR and its handling of personal data.

### **2.4 [Previous 2.3] Continuity of knowledge**

- Remove the part ensuring the EIT transition as it fits better under another article;
- Focus more on a revision of the structure and use of the Advisory Body and on how to facilitate its use.

### **2.5 [Previous 2.4] Quality of International Internal Meetings**

- Add a point on the implementation of a strategy that encourages National and Local Groups to organise environmentally sustainable Meetings;
- Add a point on the implementation of a strategy focusing on host attraction and evaluation of the hosting application process.

### 3.1 Advocacy

- Defining Advocacy and how it relates to Social Responsibility and Human Rights within ELSA. Emphasising that it should take an educational approach to ensure the use of fact-based knowledge;
- Setting a wider target audience in society;
- Adding a point on the development of guiding principles for advocacy within ELSA and its National and Local Groups. These guidelines should focus on which actions need to be taken and the advocating possibilities.

#### Committee and externals

- Adding a point on creating a committee that focuses on addressing campaign issues related to advocacy;
- Adding a point that focuses on how to establish partnerships that can help with advocacy and give training on it.

### 3.2 Human Rights

- Add a point on evaluating the current Annual Human Rights Campaign and ELSA Day in order to improve its purpose and effectiveness;
- Add a point on the creation and promotion of guidelines on human rights and apply them to all key areas;
- Add a point on platform, communication and promotion. Provide a platform that gives room for discussion and training and that includes experts. Have an improved human rights dedication for Synergy. Create a PR instruction on how to implement a campaign.

### 1.3. Social Responsibility

- Define Social Responsibility.

*JM closes the Workshop at 16:20.*

17:30 – 19:00

### Strategic Plan - Group 1

International Board members of ELSA present:

Mikko Laitinen (ML)

Jean Mattijsen (JM)

*JM opens the workshop at 17:32.*

*JM opens the floor to discuss adding new goals to the Strategic Plan draft.*

### Public Relations

- The workshop discussed whether ELSA should expand on its public relations strategy. One worry that arose was that such a possible expansion would push towards the non-political status of ELSA. Therefore it would be cardinal to investigate the activities and status of the potential partner. Furthermore, establishing a common strategy could prove to be difficult as the needs of National Groups differ. Therefore the workshop generally disagreed with including public relations in the Strategic Plan.

### Legal Education

- The point was raised that advocacy was mostly discussed during this, while legal education also should be mentioned. Points such as the promotion of legal education projects to local groups, accessibility of more complex projects, and the inclusion of necessary non-legal skills like coding or using artificial intelligence, lowering the threshold of attendance of such tasks.

*JM closes the Workshop at 19:00.*

10:00 – 12:30

### Strategic Plan - Group 2

International Board member of ELSA present:

Basil Schaller (BS)

International Board

Dora Štambuk (DS)

International Board

*BS opens the workshop at 10:00.*

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.1.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**ELSA Germany:** We have a question regarding the allowance. Would it be an issue due to Dutch law?

**BS:** We have checked, and to our knowledge, everything is in accordance with Dutch law.

**ELSA Germany:** You should elaborate more on how to increase the allowance and specify.

**EIT:** I believe the last sub goal should be explained.

**ELSA Italy:** If the idea is to reimburse IB, we should think of rephrasing subgoal d.

**ELSA UK:** Regarding the first point, what about the tendency to increase fees because of inflation?

**ELSA Germany:** Are the EIT reimbursements for specific EIT members? Will it happen that some positions are more attractive and, therefore, will use that and be more popular?

**BS:** It is true that some positions in the EIT are more active when it comes to travelling, but they are different and often more demanding. With this, our EIT members would be more present, and it would financially ease their work for ELSA International.

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.2.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**ELSA UK:** This should be done year by year, not as a strategic goal. If said that something is an SG, then we need to achieve it by a certain year.

**ELSA Finland:** As a part of the Strategy Goal, measuring needs to be included, especially with point b. How to measure it? Is it even possible?

**EIT:** We should specify a bit more for it to be clear.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Maybe we should consider adding sex orientation.

**ELSA UK:** Adding this to the preamble instead would maybe work better.

**ELSA Germany:** Was it on purpose that all the discriminatory points are mentioned?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** We agree that we should, therefore, keep the list as proposed.

**ELSA France:** We can maybe add disabilities.

**EIT:** I have a suggestion, maybe to phrase, being more accessible instead of the term inclusiveness.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** If we are more explanatory, there should not be an issue.

**ELSA Germany:** Is it adequate to put birth on the list? And can we talk more about the preamble and how to frame it?

*The opinion of the WS on including point c is to keep it.*

**ELSA Finland:** Should we clarify the mechanism in points c and d?

**EIT:** Regarding the point d., I believe we have something similar in the current SG. What we had in the previous one is more specific, so we can use that.



**ELSA the Netherlands:** We are concerned about how we would measure point d.

**ELSA Italy:** The Goal should be measured, otherwise is senseless to have it.

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.3.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Does it include transition - knowledge management point?

**ELSA Italy:** How to measure this goal? Point b can be an indicator if we achieved the goal or not, not standing as a goal itself.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Maybe we should put this indeed as an indicator and rephrase the goal.

**EIT:** 2.4 and 1.3 could be merged, because it's regarding the same issue.

**ELSA UK:** We have an Officers portal which is easily accessible. What other improvements can we implement to achieve the goal?

**ELSA Germany:** How do you, as EI do archiving?

*Workshop agreed that 1.3 requires further developments.*

**ELSA UK:** Members portal? We discussed that last year. Would it help and serve as a knowledge management tool?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** I would appreciate it if we develop this further and not strike out.

**ELSA France:** I see the problem with again similarities with 2.4.

*BS closes the Workshop at 12:35.*

14:00 – 16:30

## **Strategic Plan - Group 2**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Basil Schaller (BS)  
Dora Štambuk (DS)

International Board  
International Board

*BS opens the workshop at 14:03.*

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.1.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**ELSA Germany:** Regarding the Financial plan, did we discuss it, and can you elaborate a bit more generally on the goal, especially the b point, so that we understand the purpose better? And do you/we want to focus only on the Website or generally?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Educating the network on how to use tools we have.

**ELSA Germany:** We should balance digital and non-digital tools.

**ELSA Finland:** Exploring might not be sufficient.

**ELSA Germany:** What about “having more unified websites and becoming more presentable”.

**EIT:** It would be difficult to unify it among the network, and, therefore, I don’t know if it is appropriate to put it as SG. Secondly, Is there an idea of having the Membership platform still ongoing? If not, should we consider that? And lastly, should we expand on the HR in the EIT IT Team?

**ELSA Germany:** HR issue point and research ways on how to outsource work in that regard. We need to explore how to delegate some IT work.

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.2.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Is it intentionally left out the “Dutch” law from the point a.

**ELSA Belgium:** Does it look like we are not in compliance with the law? I am concerned about having it written like that.

**ELSA France:** Would it be better if we merge a and b points?

**EIT:** I propose adding “maintain” in point a.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Regarding point b, can we elaborate it a bit more?

**ELSA Finland:** What does regular means in this context, yearly? 5 years? Is it specified enough?

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.3.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**EIT:** Point a needs to be rephrased because it is related to different things.

**ELSA Germany:** Requires more explanation.

**EIT:** We can add maintaining and improving HR strategy and expanding training.

**ELSA Germany:** I believe that this sub goal can be divided. Secondly, the value of the EIT members should be changed to ELSA Officers in general.

**EIT:** I believe we need to mention EIT as well.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Recognising the work is very broad, could we specify that? We can have recognition of the ELSA Officers, and EIT merged.

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.4.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Is there already an Advisory Body existing?

**ELSA Germany:** Can we delete part with the outside experts?

**ELSA Belgium:** What do you mean by reform?

**ELSA Germany:** There is a need to specify that it is meant for ELSA International at the moment if it is the case.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Should we mention or include a separate point on utilisation of the Advisory Body.?

**ELSA Belgium:** I have an issue with the word consulting.

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.5.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**ELSA Italy:** We should start our advocacy campaigns.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** We should not hide behind non-political status when it comes to raising awareness on crucial issues.

**ELSA Spain:** I would like to propose defining advocacy focus points and changing for into of in the point a.

**EIT:** We should work on the expansion of projects such as ROLE and ELSA4Schools.

*BS closes the Workshop at 12:30.*

17:30 – 19:00

## **Strategic Plan - Group 2**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Basil Schaller (BS)  
Dora Štambuk (DS)

International Board  
International Board

*BS opens the workshop at 17:00.*

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 3.1.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**ELSA Italy:** We should start our advocacy campaigns.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** We should not hide behind non-political status when it comes to raising awareness on crucial issues.

**ELSA Spain:** I would like to propose defining advocacy focus points and changing for into of in the point a.

**EIT:** We should work on the expansion of projects such as ROLE and ELSA4Schools.

*BS presents Strategic Goal No. 3.2.*

*BS opens the floor for discussion.*

*The following questions, concerns and additional ideas were brought up:*

**ELSA France:** We should focus more on how to raise HR issues in projects that are more accessible for the network and externals.

*BS asking for new proposals for the Strategic Plan.*

**ELSA Germany:** Legal Education, Public Relations.

*BS closes the workshop at 18.36.*

10.00 - 12.30

### Strategic Plan - Group 3

International Board member of ELSA present:

Yuri van Steenwijk (YvS)

International Board

*YvS opens the workshop at 10:00.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.1. a.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA the Netherlands:** I support the goal of keeping it as low as possible. However, countries like the Netherlands and other eastern countries want to organise an ICM but aren't able to since the costs need to be kept low.

**YvS:** Do you want to change the strategic goal or scrap it entirely then?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** We shouldn't scrap the idea, but maybe adapt it to allow for

**ELSA Denmark:** I think it is that way already because it says to keep the costs "as low as possible".

**YvS:** In the working groups, it was discussed if there should even be such concrete goals, including measurable numbers, as was done in the past. The consensus was that this isn't flexible enough since it, for example, doesn't incorporate inflation or other problems, but we can consider this if you want.

*General Agreement not to include specific numbers.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.1. b.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA Germany:** This wording only includes the current International Board. Why do you want to do this only for the international board?

**YvS:** Only very few National Groups get an allowance at all, so it wouldn't be "increasing". Many can't afford or don't want to do this.

**ELSA Germany:** However, you already don't pay for attending an ICM.

**YvS:** That is correct, but there are other costs, like food. So, we discussed an increase from 350€ to 450€.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** What amount would be sufficient for the IB to not make losses?

**YvS:** That depends on the person, but including flying home, visiting uncovered ELSA groups, etc., we would need around 500-550€. Keep in mind we don't pay rent.

**ELSA France:** We could try and predict the inflation and raise it based on that or include the inflation by percentage in the regulation. That way, we wouldn't have to discuss this every year.

**YvS:** The allowance hasn't been raised in 5 years. If there is no money, then the IB doesn't get paid, but in the last years, the allowances were only moved around to other months due to liquidity issues. What do you think about matching it to inflation, though? It should be possible.

**ELSA Germany:** We had a discussion about if it's legal to increase the allowance.

**YvS:** At the moment, as far as we are aware, we don't count as employees and therefore don't fall under minimum wage. We will have a more clear overview of this before ICM Malta for sure but as far as we understand it should be legal to increase the allowance.

**ELSA Germany:** Wouldn't it fall under Dutch law?

**YvS:** No, this area falls under Belgian law because we work in Belgium.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** The allowance falls under Dutch association law as well as Belgian tax law.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** So would we access the inflation at the moment, or would this be a long-term goal?

**YvS:** We already use this concept of matching costs with inflation for some projects already and so far have based it on the data of the European Central Bank.

**ELSA Germany:** We would like to change it to: "Evaluate if increasing the allowance is legally possible and then increase the allowance of members of the International Board of ELSA."

**ELSA France:** I don't think that's necessary since it's only a goal. A step towards achieving that goal is seeing if and how it's possible.

**ELSA Germany:** But it doesn't hurt anybody to write it down.

**YvS:** By common sense you are right ELSA France, but in the past legality has been disregarded, so it doesn't hurt to add it, since it might take a few years until this is implemented by a different IB.

**ELSA France:** You said that you would tie the inflation to the data of the European Central Bank, but the allowance is tied only to Belgium, not that of the entire European Union, unlike for projects.

**YvS:** Fair point, but we are getting into too much detail since we don't currently want to write the regulation.

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.1. c.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA France:** Do we want to keep it that way or specify it in this workshop? Like what events and what officers should be supported? For example, should simply the best be selected, or should we ensure that every country can attend?

**YvS:** I think we should keep it general because this is very case specific. If ELSA pays for this, then it would have to be heavily regulated, but if partners want to provide scholarships, I don't want to limit my successors in enabling that.

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.1. d.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA Netherlands:** I like the idea, but I would maybe include discounts, especially for ICMs. I don't think reimbursement is possible soon, so maybe we could settle on discounts for now.

**ELSA Switzerland:** Not all directors are from Europe, so the discounts might not apply to them.

**YvS:** I don't think reimbursement has to mean total reimbursement of all costs incurred. As mentioned before, we won't give out money we don't have. Changing it to "partial reimbursement" makes the goal unnecessarily weaker.

**ELSA France:** For what would we reimburse the EIT, where they couldn't also profit from a discount?

**ELSA Switzerland:** I just think that wouldn't provide the same advantages to the entire team.

**ELSA Germany:** I think that unequal reimbursement is always the case due to there being set amounts that can be paid, even though there might be different amounts of travel costs depending on where you live.

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.2. a.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA Lithuania:** I think we should add sexual orientation.

**YvS:** That's a fair point since we did the same by expanding with gender.

**ELSA Belgium:** What would you do to implement that goal? How is that included?

**YvS:** I tried to think of more concrete things to add by looking at corporate regulations, which usually implement hiring quotas. That doesn't seem like a good idea for ELSA though, so I'm not sure what to add. We can consider cutting it out and focusing on the concrete parts of the goal.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** In my opinion it is already pretty concrete since it's only meant to be a goal.

**YvS:** So, do we keep it or not?

*General agreement is shown.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.2. b.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Maybe I'm biased as an assistant for welfare, but it might be good to make it an obligation for the national groups, too, since it's really important. So maybe add "to support the national groups in creating code of conducts" in point c.

**ELSA Belgium:** Supporting might be the wrong word since it implies that the groups are already trying to implement this.

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.3. A.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA Germany:** Data Privacy compliance should be especially highlighted here.

**ELSA France:** ELSA France specifically would like to add that we want knowledge management through not only documents but also personal knowledge management. Since we didn't have a proper transition and had no access to help, they don't have to be available, but it would be nice to have a way to find out the names of the last three treasurers of the IB.

**YvS:** An archiving system already shows that, but I don't know how we would change the regulation to help with the knowledge about this.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Privacy laws consider the interest, so the names can be processed. It's a fair point that you don't know about the archiving system, but the IB should be able to help with that.

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 1.3. b.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

*No comments.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.1. a.*

**ELSA Germany:** We should add "especially the websites" after "technical infrastructure".

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

*No comments.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.1. b.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

*No comments.*

**YvS:** Should there be a No. 2.1. c.?

**ELSA France:** It could be helpful to do online events in order to be financially more inclusive. Obviously we know that online ICMs and alike are worse, but it could be nice to offer an online option that isn't forced.



**ELSA Czech Republic:** I disagree because even though it's easier to attend online, there are no real discussions. The workshops are far shorter. During covid, we were obligated but for the online ITM, many people applied, but in the end, barely any people came. So, it's not beneficial towards the goals of ELSA.

**YvS:** The concept of inclusiveness, unfortunately, doesn't apply. We don't get flooded by officers that would like to attend but can't. Instead, the same officers are active. Furthermore, hybrid events are very expensive. We already have a hosting problem, and increasing the expenses won't help.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** We looked at that option for our NCM, and the idea was that the hosting group would carry the costs, and that simply wasn't feasible since the fee for this was far higher than the standard fee would be.

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.2. a.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA Belgium:** The punctuation isn't consistent.

**YvS:** We will make sure that that will be unified before we present the real proposal.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** If I want to apply to be in the EIT, you will send me a contract, but according to our laws, if I send it digitally, it doesn't hold any legal value.

**ELSA Germany:** We would like to add that it would need to be achieved by the end of 2024.

**ELSA Belgium:** Is all of this public? Because if it is, and I'm a law enforcer and read that we aren't complying with the law, all my alarm bells would go off.

**ELSA France:** I wouldn't write that we want to comply by the end of 2024, but rather "as soon as possible" because the goal isn't concrete enough to know what should be achieved by 2024.

**ELSA Germany:** We know that it hasn't worked in the past though, so "as soon as possible" isn't good enough anymore.

**YvS:** The next ICM will take big steps towards becoming legally compliant, but it could obviously change in the future. Also, this goal isn't a goal that only needs to be achieved once since the statutes or Dutch law could change.

**ELSA Denmark:** The word "ensuring" is very constant, and we need to make sure that we're always complying. Making it too specific could be harmful.

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.2. b.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

*No comments.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.2. c.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA the Netherlands:** The Dutch law intentionally hinders the changing of the statutes. Therefore, it is a good idea.

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.2. d.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

*No comments.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.3. a.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

*No comments.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.4. a.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA France:** Does ELSA include only the IB or also the EIT or also the national groups, or simply all of ELSA? Can we, as national boards, also get the advice of this advisory board?

**YvS:** In this concrete example, the advisory board is only used for ELSA International. This might inspire other national groups to implement this, too, though.

**ELSA France:** Why can the national groups not use this advisory board as well, at least until we implement our own advisory board? And couldn't national board members also join the advisory board to facilitate this?

**YvS:** The bigger the advisory board gets, the less likely you are to use it because you don't have a connection to these people and, therefore, won't utilise them. If a national board wants advice, they can always come to the International Board of ELSA, which will likely be able to help better anyway.

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.5. a.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

*No comments.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 2.5. b.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

*No comments.*

*YvS closes the workshop at 12:00.*

*YvS reopens the workshop at 14:08.*

*YvS presents Strategic Goal No. 3.1. and 3.2.*

*YvS opens the floor for discussion.*

**ELSA Poland:** We were focused on incorporating international corporations, for example, by helping in the decision-making by voicing our concerns. Also, we looked at cooperating with other NGOs.

**ELSA Austria:** The European Youth Forum is demanding that for any European decision-making, the effect on young people needs to be evaluated, so we can help out with projects like those to be heard.

**ELSA France:** We need to establish if we want to focus on our own interests or on social responsibility. Also, it isn't clear if we want to focus on human rights only in the EU or elsewhere either.

**YvS:** Whether we advocate on behalf of ELSA members or use ELSA members to advocate on whatever topics.

**ELSA Greece:** We could have an advocacy week where we clarify what advocacy is and what can be advocated for. This can include smaller activities that better society in some way. These would be at the discretion of the national groups. These could maybe be once per year for two years as a trial and then more often. There should be open calls where we can bring our ideas upon the ELSA Delegations. Also, it could be an idea to bring in advocacy partners like the red cross versus only human rights partners.

**ELSA Austria:** There is an organisation called Climates, and we have projects with them and a law firm which sponsors the events. The purpose is to teach members about the climate crisis.

**ELSA France:** These law firms still want to make money though, so we need to be careful that they can't implement their own interests. This comes back to what interests we are following. However, this might be different with advocacy partners.

**ELSA Greece:** We could have an advocacy campaign, which includes events like the one of ELSA Austria.

**YvS:** We are already discussing a project like the advocacy campaign, so we can certainly implement it.

**ELSA Belgium:** There should be a regulatory framework for advocacy. There should also be an incentive for local groups to advocate more since they are closest to the students. Clarify long-term that human rights and advocacy should be implemented in every area rather than just being represented by specific projects. They should also be incentivised to use

**YvS:** How should we use advocacy in every area?

**ELSA France:** It is easy for each of the key areas to implement human rights by taking the projects they already have and giving them a human rights focus. Even something like switching to a CO2-neutral bank fulfils this purpose.

**ELSA Belgium:** All existing projects and maybe even regulations can be presented with a human rights twist right from the start.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** However, we, for example, have an essay competition with a set partner that chooses the topic themselves.

**ELSA Belgium:** You should only do it when it's possible.

**YvS:** There has been a trend to establish an area for human rights since nobody has felt responsible so far. So decentralising it doesn't really solve this problem.

**ELSA France:** I used to think that, but really the human rights focus is just presented in another way. It should be because, so far, you can see many projects like the ELSA delegations as career opportunities when instead, the focus could and should be voicing our concerns. So, if I knew that this is the organisation's work, it wouldn't be about feeling responsible but simply fulfilling the work.

**YvS:** So you want to rewrite the statutes to state that our main goal is advocating?

**ELSA France:** We want a strategic goal that states that we strive to become an association that primarily aims to advocate.

**YvS:** What does ELSA look like if that goal is achieved? What is left of ELSA as we know it now? Most of our projects, like the traineeships and especially our economically driven and, therefore, all partners, would be gone.

**ELSA France:** That's not what I mean. I want us to stay as we are. Most of our projects can already be about advocacy. We should do the same things but with a different motive. The locals aren't really aware of the fact that we are a human rights organisation. This could be used to introduce ourselves in the future.

**ELSA Greece:** I agree with France. This doesn't need to be a problem. We can take the projects we have and simply use different topics. We should simply highlight to the necessity to add an advocacy aspect to the projects.

**ELSA Austria:** I think we already do it, and we simply need to advocate that we are.

**YvS:** We need to be realistic about our goals and/or realise the effect of these goals.

**ELSA Germany:** This would seriously impact our funding. Partners won't want to support these projects. Even if we say that it is important to us regardless, members also aren't as interested. So we would slowly diminish. Therefore, we need our standard projects to be able to advocate effectively in turn.

**ELSA Germany:** We suggest adding this:

“3.1. ELSA shall strive towards ensuring the awareness of human rights by:

- a. Establishing a separate structural department for human rights within the regulations and within this:
  - i. Defining the terms advocacy, human rights and social responsibility,
  - ii. Naming projects that would be a regarded part of these,
  - iii. Elaborating how these can be executed in a non-political manner,

- b. Acquiring more human rights and advocacy partners,
- c. Facilitating more efficient use of and access to human rights partners.”

**ELSA Sweden:** We also want more regulation. It needs to be clarified how we can talk about human rights without being non-political.

**YvS:** Keep in mind that defining how to be non-political was already discussed. While we are on the point of Human rights partnerships, I would like to take the time to discuss this further. In my experience, sometimes these partnerships get made without any purpose and can be pointless if they aren't attached to a project/any concrete goals. Do you have HR partnerships, and what do they look like?

**ELSA Greece:** We have a human rights partner who gets invited to human rights events, and they promote our events, and we promote theirs. So, it can be specific. Even co-promotion is important for voicing ourselves, so general partners might even make sense.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** We should implement a way for the national groups to access the human rights partners or support them in finding their own.

**YvS:** What is the International Board of ELSA supposed to do to help the groups find a human rights partner?

**ELSA the Netherlands:** They should primarily remind them of the importance of a human rights partner.

**ELSA Greece:** There needs to be better preparation, but I'm not sure what kind of preparation there is so far and how it can be improved. Depending on the organisation we visit, it might be good to improve it, as they'll be delivering an important message.

**YvS:** Dora and Jean want delegates to take a more active part in the decision-making by making statements, which rarely happens so far and even if it was, then it didn't fulfil the advocacy goal. The biggest problem we face is that even if the delegates are well prepared, how do we ensure they want to speak, especially in the name of ELSA? We don't have a solution, but we can agree to work on it within the strategic plan.

**ELSA France:** Dora and I talked about the selection process. We need to be able to evaluate if they want to speak or further their career.

**ELSA Germany:** But how do you want to determine that?

**ELSA France:** We don't know either.

**YvS:** Either way, that leaves the problem of what we advocate. Plus, ELSA Delegations aren't as popular yet as they could and should be, in my opinion

**ELSA Germany:** Suggesting to implement:

“3.2. ELSA shall strive towards improving the reach of the ELSA Delegations by:

- a. Having the International Board choose one topic from the respective agenda, for which the delegation will prepare a statement,
- b. Having the International Board consequently decide whether the statement is in accordance with art. 3 of the statutes of ELSA and in agreement with the preamble of the Statutes and Standing Orders of ELSA.”

**ELSA France:** We had a similar thought, where the delegations write the statements, and the international board only reviews them to make it less work. It's also easier to make adjustments rather than writing new ones. We trust you to make the final decision about how we should be represented. Another idea is that the delegates get to choose the topics they want to make a statement on and write it individually.

**ELSA Austria:** It's also possible for the delegates to have to draft a statement for the application process.

**ELSA Denmark:** I'd rather change the purpose of the delegations, where we, instead of making statements, make reports after, to inform the network of what we learned. The international board could then promote these reports.

**YvS:** It's already required to submit a report after. So far, it is more to ensure that the delegates pay attention, but they aren't used, except sometimes through the Council of Europe.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** If we can say something, why shouldn't we? It's not the point of the ELSA Delegations.

**ELSA France:** We should use the platforms we already have to advocate more instead of becoming more passive.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Having international calls to collect the values of the national groups was our idea. The national groups would select a few topics each, and then the International Board of ELSA would vote upon which ones should be represented.

**ELSA Denmark:** I think both approaches can exist at the same time.

**YvS:** It could be very pretentious for ELSA to just make statements. I would also like to talk about the annual human rights campaign. Do you think having a specific mention in the strategic plan could help?

**ELSA Germany:** The regulations for the annual human rights campaign is alright, but we could work on the marketing aspect. Many local officers don't even know the marketing materials exist and make their own.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** I think we need to better clarify the difference between the International Human Rights Campaign, the International Focus Program and the ELSA Day.

**YvS:** Yes, these projects were linked for a while and then separated, so we should clarify the differences better.

**ELSA France:** I would reevaluate these campaigns completely to think about their utility very thoroughly. ELSA would be fine without any of those campaigns. I'm not saying we should remove one of them, but rather we need to develop their personalities.

**YvS:** I don't think we should be scared to implement aspects that will present themselves as larger projects for the coming International Boards of ELSA.

*YvS closes the workshop at 16:28.*

*YvS reopens the workshop at 17:13.*

**YvS:** I'm very sceptical about adding a clause about the legal framework for human rights, advocacy, and social responsibility, especially the non-political part. Do you think there is enough motivation for this to be properly implemented?

**ELSA Finland:** We could also create a handbook instead of regulations.

**ELSA Furkan:** I think the heated debate about the politicalness of ELSA doesn't allow for regulations. However, local officers still need to know what to do, so we should make a handbook.

**ELSA Germany:** I think it should be a general elaboration, which mentions projects as examples since there was unclarity on this.

**ELSA France:** It's best to explain what we do through examples rather than abstract definitions.

**ELSA Denmark:** I suggest implementing something along the lines of: ELSA should strive to help the network understand the meaning by implementing a handbook.

**ELSA Finland:** We should also add the rule of law project to ensure the entire network implements this.

**ELSA Lithuania:** We already have an advocacy manual, so maybe this should simply be shared more.

**YvS:** Are there any other aspects that you want to open article three for?

**ELSA France:** I noticed during this ISM that there are many problems, like how the working groups don't include enough local boards. It could therefore be a fruitful goal to strive for a better line of communication between the IB and the local groups.

**YvS:** It's a problem, but we don't want to go past the national groups, and they certainly wouldn't be happy either, so nobody will vote to implement this, but we can look at how to improve the engagement.

**ELSA Germany:** It could also be very stressful for the IB to have to stay in direct contact with the local officers. So far, it is up to the officers, as they can use WhatsApp groups, Facebook groups, etc.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** I completely agree with ELSA Germany. The communication should continue to pass through the national boards. I think the engagement of the local boards also depends on the national boards. They need to be informed properly.

**ELSA France:** Maybe communication is the wrong word for that because I didn't mean that there needs to be direct contact about problems and alike. Instead, you could communicate with the individual local board (not the people) to spread information and increase engagement, like through a mailing list.

**ELSA Czech Republic:** I don't think it's the fault of ELSA International because, at the beginning of one's term, you get access to communication tools like Facebook groups.

**ELSA Austria:** We have no marketing-related strategic plans. Maybe we also need something that goes into PR.

**ELSA Denmark:** I think it was mentioned in the working group to set a focus on branding.

**YvS:** You're right that it's an area that doesn't really get mentioned much, so this could be a valuable addition. Do you think this should be a new goal entirely or added somewhere?

**ELSA Germany:** I think you can put it under a point called "human resources" since it plays a huge factor there. Especially since we have an HR problem.

**ELSA Austria:** I think there are two sides on the spectrum: Either it's professional and posted less or posted more regularly but in a less professional manner, which so far means many people don't know what's going on. Another point that isn't mentioned are the alumni. They should be implemented more, since they have money and experience.

**YvS:** The engagement of the alumni is touched on slightly with the alumni board, but there are certainly more possibilities. We have a good relationship with the association ELSA Alumni, but it wasn't always that way. To avoid situations where the future IBs feel pressured to cooperate with the alumni.

**ELSA Germany:** We also haven't discussed the financial aspect of how we want to implement and achieve all these goals.

**YvS:** We have a financial strategy, which was decided upon last year, so it doesn't make much sense to add different points to this strategy.

**ELSA the Netherlands:** Maybe something should be added about the development of the areas, like how AA and S&C currently include a lot of activities.



**YvS:** I'm afraid we'll come back to the board reform circle again. You are right, though, that AA is currently heavily stressed, but there is an exit strategy still implemented, so if it becomes a problem, we can undo it.

*YvS closes the workshop at 17:45.*

---

**SATURDAY, 3<sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2023**

---

14:00 – 16:30

**Strategic Plan - Group 1**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Mikko Laitinen (ML)

International Board

Jean Mattijsen (JM)

International Board

*JM opens the workshop at 14:00.*

*JM shares the summary of the discussion during the Strategic Plan Workshop of Groups 1, 2, and 3 to give an overview of the opinion of all participants of the ISM. After the suggestions were presented, the Workshop discussed them further.*

*Roundtable discussion.*

*JM closes the Workshop at 16:35.*

14:00 – 16:30

**Strategic Plan - Group 2**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Basil Schaller (BS)

International Board

Dora Štambuk (DS)

International Board

*BS opens the workshop at 14:02.*

*BS shares the summary of the discussion during the Strategic Plan Workshop of Groups 1, 2, and 3 to give an overview of the opinion of all participants of the ISM. After the suggestions were presented, the Workshop discussed them further.*

*Roundtable discussion.*

*BS closes the Workshop at 16:00.*

14:00 – 16:30

**Strategic Plan - Group 3**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Yuri van Steenwijk (YvS)

International Board

*YvS opens the workshop at 14:00.*

*YvS shares the summary of the discussion during the Strategic Plan Workshop of Groups 1, 2, and 3 to give an overview of the opinion of all participants of the ISM. After the suggestions were presented, the Workshop discussed them further.*

*Roundtable discussion.*

*YvS closes the Workshop at 16:32.*

---

**SUNDAY, 5<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2023**

---

11:00 – 12:30

### **Closing Workshop**

International Board member of ELSA present:

Yuri van Steenwijk (YvS)	International Board
Basil Schaller (BS)	International Board
Mikko Laitinen (ML)	International Board
Jean Mattijsen (JM)	International Board
Dora Štambuk (DS)	International Board

*YvS opens the workshop at 11:00*

Yuri van Steenwijk, the President of the International Board of ELSA, warmly welcomed all the participants of the III International Strategy Meeting in Prague and thank the Organising Committee for hosting this important meeting where we will with the joint effort shape the future of our Association. The International Board of ELSA passed the floor to ELSA Ukraine to talk about the UTrainee project.

*YvS closes the Workshop at 12:00.*