

Agenda of PPEU-Conference in Paris (8./9.2.2013)

Saturday:

First Session:

A. Greetings, Set Up and Rules of Procedure

B. Each Delegate shall introduce the position of their PP and why they want to be part of what kind of PPEU (10 minutes each)

C. Purpose of the Organisation (What do we need PPEU for (except for common programme-related stuff)?)

1. Co-ordinate the pirate movement in Europe
2. Being a platform for a Pirates European Parliamentary Group
3. Coordination of joint Electoral Campaigns
4. Coordination of Europe-wide actions, initiatives and/or protests
5. Promoting the Pirate movement at an European level
6. Collecting funds and spending them on European matters
7. Organising international conferences
8. Developing common positions by furthering dialogue between the members
9. Creation of a common opinion and voting tool
10. Providing access to Pirate Parliamentarians
11. Supporting to establish working groups on supranational and transnational topics
12. Organising support at elections
13. Facilitating the establishment of transnational dynamics, promoting our common interests beyond the sole interests of our respective countries
14. Monitoring political actions / initiatives at European level (in support of elected representatives, European initiatives relay, organized demonstrations, etc.)
15. Studying national Pirate Parties' political programs and promoting exchanges of proposals among the PP-EU members. Initiate the dynamism of sharing ideas
16. Establish and conduct reflections about international issues at European level
17. Help current and future MEPs
18. Follow European developments in Pirate topics and coordinate campaigns
19. Help coordinating cross-border election campaigns
20. Forming of a political party at EU level as defined by the criteria set by the European Commission
21. Function as a political party on EU level
22. Support country-level parties and integrate their political programme
23. Make statements to recent sudden political developments and events
24. Develop programme over time by consent or a huge majority
25. PPEU should not be able to create a basic programme and to develop it over time by consent or a huge majority, unless it is coordinated with a proper euroliquid project

D. PP-EU or PP-Europe?

Depending on the purpose of the organisation we should discuss and decide on the membership issue again.

Second Session:

E. Euroliquid

What has happened to it? Is there any progress?

F. Common Programme (What should it entail? Shall it be developed over time? And if yes, how? Shall it be binding?)

1.

a. Setting a minimal programme on topics that we could all agree to, like

- * Direct and/or liquid Democracy
- * Transparency
- * Civil/human rights (including privacy, freedom of speech and net neutrality)
- * Open Data
- * Open Government
- * Free/libre culture (including Free/libre software)
- * Open Access
- * Copyright reform
- * Patent system reform
- * What did we miss?

b. The Common Programme shall also entail all relevant topics that are usually handled on a national level to form a Common Ground from the start.

2. The Common Programme shall be developed over time

- a. by consent or a huge majority of the members
- b. by a simple majority vote
- c. not at all

3.

a. If it exists and it is functionable, the Common Programme shall be developed by using Euroliquid.

b. The Common Programme shall be developed by analyzing the national programmes and cross-inseminate the national topics into all parties.

4. The Common Programme shall be

- a. binding on the PPs.
- b. only binding, if approved by individual members by direct vote.
- b. non-binding on the PPs (just a political guideline).
- c. only binding on Ordinary Members of PPEU.

Saturday evening/Sunday:

Third Session:

G. Voting System

There are different ways to go about it and it may heavily depend on the results of the last two sessions.

But first of all starting with the voting weight:

Option 1:

Every Member allowed to vote counts the same.

Problem:

-The voting weight will neither reflect the amount of party members, the success of the party (voters, percentage at elections) or the population of the country of the member party. Therefore it will favour small and unsuccessful parties from small countries the most which cannot really be the aim.

-If we allow several member parties from one country to join, this country might get a lot more weight. And it might be an incentive to parties to spread discord.

Option 2:

Every Member allowed to vote counts the same, except those from one country which have to share their vote.

Problem:

-The voting weight will neither reflect the amount of party members, the success of the party (voters, percentage at elections) or the population of the member party

Option 3:

Every member has a voting power according to the number of their members.

Problem:

-Some parties don't have functioning membership administration, so we don't know the exact number for sure.

-As some parties don't ask for a membership fee, it will be difficult to separate erstwhile and still active members.

-As the other parties cannot make sure that the given number of a party is correct, we would have to rely on trust which might be difficult.

Option 4:

Every member has a voting power according to the percentage they got in elections.

Problem:

-Some parties haven't yet taken part in elections.

-Which elections to choose: European, national and/or regional elections?

-If there are members from a country which makes it (almost) impossible for them to take part in elections. what then?

-If we use regional elections these might not reflect on the success of the party at a whole, but only of that part of a party in the region.

-If we use national elections, there are many different systems. If the election system is first-past-the-post, the member party will probably have a worse result than in a proportionality system. There also might be some restrictions that the party can only take part in them, if they have candidates for all election areas and therefore a party might not be able to take part.

-If we use the European elections, it would mean that until after the next EP elections only the Swedish and the German PP would be able to vote, as none of the others have yet taken part in EU elections.

-It would also exclude member parties which are not from EU countries from voting.

-If there are only several regional parties in an EU member state they might not be allowed to take part in the elections.

-Behind the same percentage may be a completely different number of voters, which would again favour parties from small countries, if they are successful.

Option 5:

Every member has a voting power according to the number of votes it got in elections.

Problems:

-Some parties haven't yet taken part in elections.

-Which elections to choose: European, national and/or regional elections?

-If there are members from a country which makes it (almost) impossible for them to take part in elections. what then?

-If we use national elections, there are many different systems. If the election system is first-past-the-post, the member party will probably have a worse result than in a proportionality system. There also might be some restrictions that the party can only take part in them, if they have candidates for all election areas and therefore a party might not

be able to take part.

-If we use the European elections, it would mean that until after the next EP elections only the Swedish and the German PP would be able to vote, as none of the others have yet taken part in EU elections.

-It would also exclude member parties which are not from EU countries from voting.

-If there are only several regional parties in an EU member state they might not be allowed to take part in the elections.

-The absolute number of voters as a criterion for the voting weight of a party would favour member parties from highly populated countries who are successful.

-How to account for non-voters?

Option 6:

Every member has the voting power according to the size of the population of its territory.

Problems:

-It favours member parties from large and heavily populated countries without taking into account success or number of members.

What alternatives do we have which don't have so many drawbacks?

Suggestions:

1. We could combine some of the criterias and/or choose a double majority.

For Example: Let's say, we choose to make decisions by a 2/3-majority.

We could count this in a double way.

First there will be a head count, like on party/one confederation of parties, one vote. This will make sure that not only the big parties can decide which way to go.

At the same time each delegate also has a different kind of voting weight which will be used to calculate a second 2/3-majority.

Which criterion we will choose depends on what kind of membership we agree on and which criterion we will find best suited.

For example, if we allow only full membership with voting rights to members from EU countries, we could choose the results from the last EU elections as a criterion. This will of course only work after the next EU elections, as of now only the German and the Swedish PPs participated in EU elections before.

Then we could choose a combination of percentage and absolute number of voters which might work like this:

Party A: 2%, 500.000 votes = $2/100 \times 500.000 = 10.000$ voting weight

Party B: 10%, 40.000 votes = $10/100 \times 40.000 = 4.000$ voting weight

Party C: 5%, 150.000 votes = $5/100 \times 150.000 = 7.500$ voting weight

As the European elections use a proportionality system, there might not be too many dissimilarities to take into account than with Regional or national elections. And it would motivate PPs to be successful, but will make the differences between big parties/states and small ones smaller. But it would also take the differences in size into account. Parties in a Confederation will also be taken into account and could have their voting weight calculated each on their own.

To ensure that there are not one or two parties dominating all votes, there may be a maximum and/or minimum voting weight established (depending on the majority needed).

It will also eliminate the difficulties with assuring the number of members of a party.

And there will be only members with voting rights who are a real party that is trying to win elections. We might choose on a member-by-member base, if a party which hasn't taken part in the last EU elections nonetheless might be granted voting rights and how much weight the party should have in the second majority. This might take into account that some parties might have difficulties to participate in an election which have nothing to do with them not being able to. Or those parties just don't get a voting right towards the second majority.

This could be done with one vote by the same people, so we wouldn't need a lot of people participating in different chambers.

If we want to found PPEU before the next elections, we could choose to use the weight of the countries in European Parliament. Federations must divide those among them.

With the voting weight in the second majority, we could also divide it between yes/no/abstention to mirror the vote of the members of each PP who wants to do this.

This would mean that we would have to do some math, but I don't think this would be too difficult in a computer-oriented party.

We could also put a clause into the statutes that we will strive to set up a Chamber of Pirates in the future in exchange for the second majority or any majority at all. But it would only be necessary, if we need to vote on a common programme.

Any other suggestions for a voting system?

H. Majorities

Which majorities shall we use to agree on a topic?

- A. Consent
- B. 4/5
- C. $\frac{3}{4}$
- D. $\frac{2}{3}$
- E. 50,01%

Shall we use different majorities for different topics?

- A. Yes
- B. No

For which topics should we use which majorities?

- A. Administrative decisions
- B. Statute Amendments
- C. Common Programme
- D. Political Statements on a recent topic
- E. Dissolution of PPEU
- F. Election of a Board and other organs
- G. Admission of a new member
- H. Expulsion of a Member
- I. Rules of Procedure
- J. ???

I. How to Proceed

1. Shall we found a work group which dedicates itself to further the development of the statutes in between Conferences? If yes, how shall they work? Should there be online voting? Shall they only prepare the agenda for the next PPEU Statutes Conference?
2. When and where will be the next PPEU Statutes Conference? When and where will be other PPEU Conferences?

Fourth Session:

MAB will present recent results from his negotiations with the EUD.

Fifth Session:

Richard Stallman will make a speech and discuss politics with happy little Pirates from all over Europe! ☺