

Venue

Arena and Convention Centre (ACC), Kings Dock
Liverpool L3 4FP, United Kingdom
30 March – 2 April 2017

Thursday, 30 March 2017

Congress Opening

Welcome & Keynotes

14:00 – 16:00

Alice Hooker-Stroud and **Amelia Womack** open the Congress. They introduce Margaret Blakers, Monica Frassoni, Caroline Lucas.

Margaret Blakers welcomes participants to the Congress from the Global Greens.

She gives a history of the Global Green and Global Green Congresses. She explains the challenges that the world faces and the importance of Greens in this process. She commemorates the late Louise Crossley and Steve Emmott with whom the Congress couldn't have been possible. She encourages all participants to get to know each other and take advantage of their time at Congress.

Monica Frassoni greets everyone from the European Green Party.

She explains the difficulty of facing Brexit, indifference to the migration crisis, rise of borders, and erosion of rights and freedoms. The situation today is difficult for our values, environment and the world. She states that Greens are needed more than ever and how important it is to remain united in these difficult times.

Caroline Lucas welcomes everyone to England from the GPEW.

She reminds Greens that they are not alone, the Green movement is global. This is what unites the Greens from Britain to Burkina Faso, to Peru to Pakistan. It's not Europe that we should turn our backs on but those stocking the flames of fear and xenophobia. She says that in times like this, cooperation and politics of hope are more important than ever.

Amelia Womack introduces key note speakers, Christine Milne.

Christine Milne begins the keynote speeches.

She explains that Greens use power to push for the changes we need to see in the world to combat climate change and rising populations. She says that it's not just enough for Greens to be strong on local, regional or national levels, but global as well. She urges all how to think about how to strengthen the Global Greens. She asks everyone to think both locally and globally. She explains that the Paris Agreement was a sign of hope that Greens had worked on. We cannot win on climate or social issues under neoliberalism. There is necessity to have

proportional representation. Being apolitical is actually partisan. The future is Green or not at all.

Isabella Lövin commemorates the death of Zaida Catalan, former spokesperson of the Swedish Young Greens.

She begins by saying that it's never been more important to Green than now. We as Greens are the complete opposite to the populist movement; we do not see simplistic answers to complicated questions. She explains the Arctic Death Spiral and other extreme weather events. The Green movement was created to stop this abuse of the planet. She says that we are in the beginning of the Global Green revolution, transformation of our transport system, economy, half of the new power in the world last year came from renewables and prices are plummeting. Swedish government has six Green Ministers and the first ever feminist government. Sweden has made a lot of progress on climate policies, which is proof that Greens should be in government. She urges that we need to get people engaged, without participation of people, democracy cannot survive. She says that Greens must not just talk about a better world but really make change happen.

Sylvio Michel thanks the Greens for the invitation to speak. He explains that Mauritius is a very small country, which is the descendent of slaves. He explains the history of the Mauritius Greens and the struggles that he had experienced. He thanks the Global Greens and African Greens who supported the Mauritius Greens for their support. He says that the struggle is for more democracy.

Alice Hooker-Stroud thanks all participants and asks them to enjoy the Congress.

Technical announcements are made by Louise Greenbaum.

Congress Opening

Welcome Ceremony

17:00-19:00

Meyrem Almaci and **Teo Comet** introduce the Party Welcome Ceremony.

They present the representatives from each Federation.

They present videos from each Federation.

They introduce the Hope Street Choir.

Friday, 31 March 2017

Plenary Session

Fighting for Hope: From Paris to 1.5 Degrees

9.00-10.30

Chair:

- **Simone Peter**, Co-Chair of the German Greens (Bündnis 90/Die Grünen)

Speakers:

- **Carole Dieschbourg**, Luxembourg Minister for the Environment
- **Papa Meissa Dieng**, Senegal, Professor of International Environmental Law
- **Yeb Saño**, Philippines, Executive Director of Greenpeace Southeast Asia

Simone Peter opens the session by welcoming all participants. She outlines the current threats for the fight against climate change, especially the policies of U.S. President Donald Trump. Against this background, in her view it is even more important for others to lead, for example the European Union, but also China or certain U.S. states like California. Brexit is yet another threat to climate justice, as the EU and UK now go different ways in fighting climate change. Without this partnership, it will be even harder to move forward.

But there are signs for optimism, like the fact that in 2015, more capital than ever before has been invested in renewable energies, surpassing the investment in fossil fuels. In her eyes, the renewables are unstoppable. For example, in Germany one third of the electricity is already produced by renewables. 350.000 jobs have been created in Germany, more than 200 billion euro have been invested and in 5 years, the last nuclear power plants will shut down.

Yet, there are still big fossil fuel companies putting brakes to the energy transition, so we have to continue fighting, inside and outside parliaments and governments. This year, there will be many decisive steps: For example, the G20 meeting in Hamburg, COP23 in Bonn and several important elections in Europe. In 2018, COP24 will need to define further steps to reduce global warming to a maximum of 1.5 degrees. And in 2019, there are new elections to the European Parliament. We advocate for discussing the hopes, not the risks.

Carole Dieschbourg opens her statement by making clear that we now have to fight for making the 1.5 degree goal an actual reality. For this, we have to raise the ambition towards the 2018 COP. She speaks in favour of a platform for indigenous people inside the COP negotiations, similar to the ones for women or civil society. This is because politicians need to feel the urgency for action, which they sometimes do not.

Local authorities are important – many Greens are already included in local governments, fighting for the climate. And the question is: Why are we waiting? As Nicholas Stern has pointed out, we already know that it's much more expensive to wait than to act now. Now, that climate change is questioned again, she advocates for building new coalitions, finding new partners. And we have to put people in the centre of our politics, not big industries.

For Europe, the question now is: Will we be ready to fight climate change together or be stuck in internal discussions? To scale up the European ambition we need more Greens in government. For example, in Luxemburg you can see important steps forward, such as the fossil fuel divestment plan for the national pension fund, or a clear roadmap for de-carbonising until 2050. But as this will not be enough, the government includes local

authorities, of which 104 out of 105 take part. And Luxemburg has seen a decoupling of growth and emissions in the last years, plus provides the highest per capita climate financing. These are examples of what Greens can reach in government. If we as Greens don't fight for it, we don't fight for human rights, freedom and peace. In Dieschbourg's words, we must encourage people and politicians to be pioneers, to turn off the autopilot and to make change possible.

Yeb Saño highlights that one of the first important steps would be to call the climate change challenge a "crisis". It is the most serious challenge that our generation faces and that we have to tackle with urgency and boldness, but foremost with hope. It is an issue of justice – it is one of the worst examples of injustices in history: because those that did not cause it suffer most from it. He calls to stand up against this injustice and to rally the whole world to end the fossil fuel era. Those who have profited most from this era have to be targeted. World leaders have to stand at the side of those who are facing the consequences of climate change. The recent developments have shown how important it is to stay and fight together. If world leaders fail to save the climate, people will do. Domestic grassroots actions are the solution for fighting climate change.

He also points out the importance of accountability and transparency – one ton of carbon has to be one ton of carbon, without cheating. Furthermore, only 20 billion dollars are today foreseen for climate adaptation which is way too little. Three years in a row have each been the hottest ones in history. This is why we have to take action. In Saño's eyes, we cannot tackle climate change without tackling the root causes, we have to confront us with inequality, we need a system change. We have to empower women and break free from fossil fuels. This is a battle we cannot afford to lose; this is why we have to move on.

Papa Meissa Dieng believes that we need a system change in order to achieve a democracy that is climate-compatible. He points out that we are inside the Anthropocene, an era in which the people dominate the earth's face. So, facing this, we have to realize the principle of shared responsibility. He questions whether the participative representative democracy can actually cope with the climate change justice. For example, national representation is an example for the problems we face with the international phenomenon of climate change. The European Union could be a first answer, but is today stuck in bureaucracy.

There are two paths we can take, either carry on with the representation we have today or we can take the path of ecological democracy. It introduces representation in which we choose to represent ourselves, with proximity and closeness instead of institutions. It is on us to invent a new mode of democracy, including the individuals in the decision-making process. With this, of course there will raise new challenges, for example regarding future generations. How will they be represented? These are questions that need to be solved. But participatory democracy can have many faces, depending on level and contexts. Unlike today's representational democracy, we need a new model that we now have to introduce on several levels.

In the **discussion**, Carole Dieschbourg pointed out that the EU not only has to be a good example, but also be a leader in climate financing. The need for adaptation money is very high in order to build up resilience against climate change. And she again highlighted the importance of the local level, as 75% of people now live in cities. Jeb Saño commented that

COP23 will be a very important meeting for this, because it marks the start of the negotiations about the rules of the Paris Agreement. In Papa Meissa Dieng's opinion, however, climate financing will not solve the problem of climate change. Instead, a system change is needed. In his view, even the term adaptation only suggests to change slightly, but not tackle the root causes. Dieschbourg replied to this that in her opinion, it is indeed true that climate financing is only a drop in the ocean, but in the Paris Climate Agreement, there are also many other elements, like capacity building or working as partners.

Plenary Session

Agricultural Transformation

14:30 - 16:00

Chair:

- **Hélène Ryckmans**, Member of Parliament for ECOLO, Belgium

Speakers:

- **Stina Bergström**, Miljöpartiet de gröna, Sweden
- **Benedikt Haerlin**, Foundation for Future Farming, Germany
- **Tim Lang**, Centre for Food Policy (University of London), UK
- **Sanya Smith**, Third World Network, Switzerland

Hélène Ryckmans starts with an introduction of the current situation of the EU agricultural system. She considers the situation to be not very good, and reckons that international trade agreements like TTIP and CETA are going to worsen it. In the short term, food policies have an impact on our alimentation, on our health and on the revenues of farmers. In the long run, they have an impact on the planet.

She continues by saying that the agribusiness is the main responsible of the current decline of our food system. By lobbying States and European Institutions, they prevent the policies to protect consumers, producers and environment. International Trade Agreements put us in an even deeper crisis by abolishing regulations and standards that are there to defend our health, our soils, our livestock our commons.

She says that we need a food system which is resilient from fossil fuels, coherent with the need to access to water, we need to improve the access to arable land, protect biodiversity, we need to implement a transition towards agroecology. We need to rebuild a direct link between producers and consumers, to promote a decrease in the consumption of animal products. The growing demand of organic food is a sign of this need, she says. The European citizens are already showing their willing to transform the food system, while governments are still hesitating. We need to reform the CAP and to promote local exchanges, within the EU, instead of promoting Free trade agreements with third countries, and lengthen the food chain.

Tim Lang: Starts saying that Britain imports 1/3 of its food. He wonders: if we leave the EU where do we get that food? It is a very risky situation for the UK. In the Brexit

negotiations a serious discussion about food has to be taken. He underlines that the discussion must be about food and not about agriculture. Our current production model of agriculture is not working, it was set for the crisis of the 30s and 40s, to deal with them, and it is still relying on that obsolete paradigm. Today we are over producing, over consuming, consuming bad food, while in other part of the globe people are under nourished or starve to death.

The current model promotes the economic idea that if we produce more food, the price will fall down, and food will be more affordable. But today we know the risks of this idea, which failed to feed the world, and destroyed our ecosystem.

Yet, he thinks, some good things have happened throughout the EU. For 20 years we have been working to increase food safety for consumers, and to make the CAP greener.

Stina Bergström says that the aim of CAP is to make agriculture more efficient, secure food supply guarantee farmers revenues, and insure reasonable prices for consumers. Talking about her country (Sweden), she explains that since the country joined the CAP, there has been more and cheaper food, less farmers and a food supply increasingly dependent from import. CAP is 40% of the whole EU budget.

In 2020 a new cap should be put in place. She says she wants the direct payments to be scrapped and substituted with a support for rural development, to promote local and national production and to put producers and consumers closer to each other. She says that the fact that Sweden is importing much of its food, means that the ecological footprint of food consumed in the country is being paid in other countries. Nevertheless she says that Sweden had historically had high level of self-sufficiency with very high standards. But Swedish farmers have difficult times to compete with the EU (low prices) and to make profit, she says.

Organic consumption is very high in Sweden, and the total organic area is 17%. The Swedish government is pushing to go up to 30% of the total area by 2030. It is also set as a target that 60% of the food consumed in the country should be organic, by 2030. Today the figure is 30%. She considers that one reason for organic consumption being so high in Sweden is labeling, which has tough requirements and a high level of confidence from Swedish consumers. The interest on national self-sufficiency is on the agenda in Sweden. She says that the goal is to go towards a world where all food is organically produced, with a decrease of meat consumption, a limited use of antibiotics and where seeds and biodiversity are protected.

Benedikt Haerlin starts by saying that business as usual is not an option. He mentions a report issued in 2008 featuring an international assessment of agriculture knowledge (signed by 500 independent scientists, after 5 years of work, and approved by several heads of States). This report stated that we cannot feed in 2050 10 billion of people with the current methods. 40% of total GHG emissions come from agriculture; this report states that this is not sustainable, and that we must reduce them by 80% within the course of one generation. These experts said that only small farmers (especially women) of the world could ensure this. This is why large-scale agriculture is not an option.

He says that recently the FAO published a report on food where it uses 20% of the

recommendation of this report. The FAO, after years, was not talking about an increasing on food production of 70%, but only by 50%. FAO is using the word agroecology more frequently, is considering small farmers and women as a key of food security. All this, he considers, is a sign of change. Nevertheless the FAO, he says, still considers the increase in meet consumption as something unavoidable, if we want to guarantee food security. FAO still considers biofuels as an alternative to fossil fuels.

He continues by saying that these days we have probably the less inspiring agriculture commissioners in 50 years. He doubts that he (*Phil Hogan n.e.*), wants to reform agriculture in the EU at all. He refers to a report of the Commission saying that the greening of the CAP is not working, and therefore there is no willingness to expand the areas of ecological priority from 5 to 6%.

He mentions the fusion of Bayern and Monsanto, building monopolies of seeds and fertilizers. Bayern is earning much of its money on pharmaceutical products to cure hearth diseases and diabetes. It's clear that they are not going to fight against fatty and sugary food. Consumers and producers have to unite to prevent them to take over all our food system.

He says that we have to think in terms of land we are consuming. In average the feature is 2000 square meters per consumer. We have to wonder how we are using our 2000 square meters of arable land/per year. In the moment we are asking this question to ourselves, we are becoming co-producers. And he concludes, when the Greens are helping you to become this, that shows we are going in the right direction.

Sanya Smith focuses on trade agreements and how they affect agriculture. She refers in particular to: WTO, partnership and corporation agreements. She refers in particular to agreements between north and south countries. WTO, she says, has stopped the export subsidies, but EU and US are both using them

In general the standards are lowered according to the current law of the country stipulating the trade agreement (the one of the developed country, she means). What is the way forward? One of the options is not to have free trade agreements. Another is to avoid the problematic provisions, like the ones discussed before. Or to agree on good provisions in these treaties, for example: rules on public stock holdings in developing countries, allow developing countries to raise tariffs when there is a special need etc.

Plenary Session

Green Trade Policy in a Globalised World

16.30-18.15

Chair:

- **Dave Keating**, Deutsche Welle, Germany

Speakers:

- **Reinhard Bütikofer**, European Green Party, Germany
- **Richard Di Natale**, Australian Greens, Australia
- **Tanoh Gyekye**, Third World Network, Ghana
- **Uiko Hasegawa**, Green Party of Japan, Japan
- **Elisabeth May**, Green Party of Canada, Canada
- **Caroline Lucas**, Green Party of England & Wales, United Kingdom

Dave Keating begins by saying Greens have been making our arguments on trade for some time. There are rising threats to THE green view of trade; TTIP, Trump, Brexit.

Reinhard Bütikofer continues by saying if UKIP agree with us that the sun shines, it doesn't put us in the same camp. The same can be said for agreeing with the same policy conclusions. We didn't think it could get worse after TTIP, but Trump's ideas are so much worse, there is no multilateralism. There are three camps, not two: protectionism, free trade and our stance. Free trade is favoured by corporations. Trade has become a public concern, previously was trusted to others that deal with the complex issue. Intrusive trade regulations changed the trajectory of public trade discussion.

Richard Di Natale echoes Reinhard's stances. Australian free trade supports large corporations. It is lowering environmental, labour, animal, human rights protections. We must increase the wage gap.

Tanoh Gyekye says Trump perpetuates neoliberalism and has aligned himself with corporations. The establishment centre ground is causing great damage, but the Trump-style response is not a solution, a new alternative needs to emerge. Rejects polarised views of protectionism vs neoliberalism. Trump supports naked imperialism, some people appreciate its honesty. The real face of neoliberalism is this nationalism.

Uiko Hasegawa starts by saying these are changing times. There is the changing value of yen compared to dollar. We support fair trade, its as important as economic trade. In favour of an exchange of manpower.

Elisabeth May states that Canada signed up to NAFTA quickly, they were the first to have an agreement. Many didn't realise what the implications would be. If an investor, a foreign corporation looking to make money in Canada, has its profits threatened it is at risk. Current trade agreements are not about trade, but are about taking powers from domestic governments. Why would anyone want new trade agreements? What's the motivation? TTIP, CETA, NAFTA reflect corporate rule. Pre-existing trade agreements more than cover free trade as a basic concept.

Caroline Lucas says that we need better campaign lines, evidence isn't effective enough. We must be taking back control in multiple areas of people's lives; many areas where people want to take back control do not affect the EU. The successive governments pushing neoliberalism are really responsible. Governments are in secret talks with various countries. The prospects of trade agreements with US are worrying, environmental and social

standards won't be considered. Old fights will have to be fought again; precautionary principle, environmental protections. Great repeal bill, on pressing, will stop elements of EU law, especially things like environmental rights. UK has a lack of negotiation capacity as has previously all been done from Brussels, limited expertise. Blocking bad trade agreements could be difficult on a parliamentary level but aiming to mobilise public, GMO products/worker's rights/etc threats will make people realise the thread.

Reinhard Bütikofer says that we must be coordinating European and UK battles. Have to work against TiSA, the liberalisation of trade-based services. There is a need for combining efforts.

Tanoh Gyekye replies that the UK might fail to get agreements but individual corporations could seek deals that could lead to further systemic liberalisation.

Richard Di Natale says trade has to be transparent. There is no point talking to democratic legislators if it's done in secret. Trade purveys almost all areas of other policy, in a similar way to technology.

There is discussion whether protectionism as a concept can theoretically align with localism and subsidiarity or if it inherently clashes with green values of openness and pan-nationalism.

There is discussion about the WTO and to what degree it is purely neoliberal as well as the merits and disadvantages of local protectionism.

Saturday 1 April 2017

Plenary session

Green political democracy: from grassroots to government

9:00-10.30

Chair:

- Natalie Bennett, Green Party of England and Wales, United Kingdom

Speakers:

- **Anne-Marie Bhirabake**, Burundi Green Movement, Burundi
- **Tom Crone**, Green Party of England and Wales, United Kingdom
- **Metiria Turei**, Green Party of Aotearoa, New Zealand
- **Alejandro San Martín**, Chile

Natalie Bennett welcomes conference and introduces speakers. We're here to talk about democracy from grassroots to government. She begins by asking what's the state of democracy in their countries.

Metiria Turei outlines the system in New Zealand which has proportional representation and a high level of accountability, although there are some areas which could be reformed e.g greater parliamentary scrutiny over issues which sometimes only sit with the executive.

Tom Crone says that the fundamentals of democracy are in place, though this is being eroded over time. Liverpool Council undemocratically opted for a mayoral system, concentrating power in the hands of one person.

Anne-Marie Bhirabake speaks about a cycle of violence in Burundi where the president has used violence to stay in power despite his term having ended. Many of the most powerful political actors are from the same political family. International support has been withdrawn from Burundi since 2005 and there is now a famine. Before then the situation was better in terms of democracy. Women were working for female empowerment and raising awareness about how women can participate in politics.

Alejandro San Martín expresses the support of the Green family for the people of Venezuela. Chile does fulfill general requirements of democracy, but there are low levels of participation by the general public. There is a lot of corruption especially from financial interests in recent years, which has never recovered from Pinochet. Chile is about to adopt proportional representation.

Metiria Turei says the core needs of the 'missing million': people at the sharp end of multiple deprivation who lack trust in politics as they've been let down so badly, they should be addressed before we can expect them to participate. We also need to look at mechanisms to bring more people into the political process. The Greens are campaigning for transparent, open and more trusting in the public – which will allow us to live our values as Greens. We have a memorandum of understanding with the Labour Party and have been working hard to improve access for the least powerful groups: women and Māori and Pacific people.

TC: Introducing PR would be a massive change. We need the citizens' forums as in NZ here too.

Anne-Marie Bhirabake says that honestly, there's no political activity possible. Opponents are all in exile. Since May 1015 400,000 people have left the country and there are refugees elsewhere. The Greens have tried to initiate dialogue, but the government refuses to respond. So we're focusing on raising awareness. Only very gradual, softly-softly approaches will work with people on the ground because they are scared and hungry. The movement is scattered. What we need is energy and strength, but we don't have it. The powers that hold all the power are happy to use violence. There are some who want to use violence against them, but the greens are firmly opposed to that.

Discussion over types of proportional representation possibilities and how do you insure that people are well informed when they are voting. They also discuss about the West's attempt to spread democracy and the costs of participating in democracy. Finally they discuss how Green Parties can support grassroots minority groups.

In Defence of Freedom: Against Illiberal Democracies

14:00-15.30

Chair:

- **Reinhard Bütikofer**, Co-chair of the European Greens Party

Speakers:

- **Liz Kennedy**, Director of the Democracy Program at the Center for American Progress, United States
- **Jens Siegert**, Journalist and former director of Heinrich-Böll Foundation in Russia
- **Adam Ostolski**, Academic and former leader of Zieloni, Poland
- **Susanne Kröger**, Dutch Green Member of Parliament, Netherlands

Reinhard Bütikofer starts by presenting the speakers and by outlining some of the main questions around the topic of the panel, in particular: what are the common features of the “authoritarian” developments we see in different parts of the world? Do they have similar or different root causes? How can liberal democracies be defended? How can Greens make a difference and play a role in defending these values?

Liz Kennedy says that in the US the election of Trump was a shock and that increasing inequality and economic anxiety are certainly one of the factors. Since 2008 all the wealth that is created in the country goes to the 1% and therefore people feel their voices are not taken in to account. But cultural anxiety is also there and is largely due to the diversification of the US and Trump also won by being outspokenly racist. According to her, he was mainly elected because he presented himself as “anti-system” candidate to a population which is actually leaning towards more progressive agenda (*better paid federal jobs, more healthcare etc.*) which has not been implemented by previous governments. However, he is not going to do any of this. On the contrary, he is the symbol of the winning plutocracy, which has been trying to delegitimize and reduce the role of the government to its minimum in the last 40 years. So in that sense he cannot be defined as a populist. In order to fight him we will need all the grassroots energy that has started exploding in the last months and we will need to make an effort to explain what the value of liberal democracies really is.

Jens Siegert traces the lines of the different *epoques* of Putin’s regime. He says that Putin first tried to integrate into the West at his own terms. Not becoming a democracy. This didn’t work. In a second moment he started tightening the screws, muting opposition more and more but without installing a tough dictatorship. Is more a “smart authoritarianism” where political freedoms are very tightly controlled. A main characteristic of his narrative is anger towards the West, its elites and its “political correctness”. His grip on the public opinion and the strengthening of this narrative were due partly to the Ukraine crisis and partly to the internal crisis of the western liberal democracies.

Adam Ostolski explains that the political dictionary terms we used till now is not valid anymore, in particular for concepts like freedom and democracy. Lech Kaczyński and his acolytes don’t see themselves as anti-democratic. On the contrary in their narrative they fight against “impossibilism” (*the impossibility for citizens to change the status quo*), oligarchy and for the “redistribution of respect”. He wants to shape the opposition in a way for him to stay in power forever. He wants them to be united and 100% against his government. And he is quite successful in that because the opposition is then obliged to also oppose “social” measures like lowering of pension age, which are quite popular among the electorate.

Susanne Kröger says she decided to go into politics because of the changes she has seen in the Netherlands in the last years with the affirmation of Wilders and his narrative. The easiest way to fight this kind of populism could seem to become “anti-populist” and to polarize this debate, to run an anti-campaign. But Greens rather decided to run a campaign on inspiration, vision, hope of what a Green and left society could look like. They have decided to be respectful and open to the voters of Wilders and their fears. By talking to PVV voters they learnt that they needed to address mostly socio-economic issues as well as empowerment because people feel decisions are taken without them.

Susanne Kröger claims that respect for your opponents and what is underneath is crucial. Criticism to neo-liberalism is shareable by the Greens, but we come to a solution while populists don’t.

Liz Kennedy is convinced that liberal democracies must indeed find ways to address people concerns respectfully and making them agents of change, empowering them. Mobilize those who have given up on the political system. Change also the system in a way to make politics much less dependent on corporative interests and redefine the concept of conflict of interest. Work also on the understanding of the institutions by the citizens.

Jens Siegert says that in Russia the feeling that what happened in the ’90 and afterwards is due to external forces and that Russia is a kind of a sieged country surrounded by enemies. In Russia majority of people are afraid of “freedom” in the sense that they see it as the total absence of rules they had in the ’90s. This explains in part success of Putin who paints himself as the *rule of law*.

Adam Ostolski explains that there are three ways to confront right-wing extremist populism: confronting it head-on by scolding people who support it and disrespecting them; trying to emulate

populists in the issues where they are wrong (*like migration*). This is the easiest way to face them, but it also gives them the possibility to set completely the agenda; while the right way for him is to argue for people's empowerment and to stand up against the establishment to defend the needs of people who are not represented using the same emotions and feelings populists use, but for the right causes, i.e. pro-immigration and fundamental freedoms.

Fighting Global Tax Injustice

16:00-17:30

Chair:

- **Molly Scott Cato**, Green Party of England and Wales, United Kingdom

Speakers:

- **Kennedy Graham**, Green Party of Aotearoa, New Zealand
- **Flor de Maria Hurtado**, Partido Ecologista Alternativa Verde del Peru, Peru
- **Philippe Lamberts**, Ecolo, Belgium
- **Adama Sere**, Rassemblement des Ecologistes du Burkina Faso, Burkina Faso

Molly Scott Cato introduces the topic of global tax justice by highlighting that people in the global south are most negatively affected by tax evasion. A report of Oxfam shows that approx. 26% of the profits of the 20 biggest banks are recorded in tax havens although the money was not made in those places. Often the profit of companies in tax havens is bigger than their turnover. She mentions the first anniversary of the Panama Papers revelations these days.

Kennedy Graham, points out the importance of fighting inequality through tax justice. Greens want to be part of the government after the September election to strengthen the national law to reverse trend of losing democratic power to global corporations. Stopping tax evasion is a key priority. Economy is seen as a subset of society and the ecology, therefore tax justice goes along with ecological and social justice. This is included in the Green proposal for new budget responsibility rules.

Flor De Maria Hurtado, explains how taxes are evaded in Peru. This is mainly to tax incentives to large corporations, allowing them to transfer profits to tax havens. It also allows for money laundering by business people by using tax loopholes and bribery. The key problem is the enormous power of corporations as well as corrupt local politicians and judges. Internet is an important tool for cooperation and to name and shame global companies that are engaging in these practices.

Philippe Lamberts, points out that the world has never been richer, but inequality has reached a peak. But it is possible to change this and also counteract global corporate power. Europe's problem is tax competition between EU member states. Creating tax transparency is a way to put pressure on companies and countries alike. It is then possible to introduce measures that make it difficult to shift money between places and to converge European tax codes. Taxes are not a burden but a contribution.

Adama Sere, explains that global taxation has an effect on social and climate deregulation, particularly in the global south. People that produce commodities are unaware of mechanisms of the global markets and price fluctuations. Also corruption and opacity on money from trade makes tax collection to fund public goods subordinate. Global corporations are benefitting from excessive tax incentives. Greens need to work together globally to fight this injustice.

North-south-dimension not enough taken into account by international organisations like the OECD remarks **Philippe Lamberts**. However, having global taxes would be not feasible without a global democracy. Tax authorities needs democratic accountability. Moreover, it should be made illegal to be 'too-big-to-fail' as a company, giving them the opportunity to exploit society.

Adama Sere remarks that those people who draft a law need also to be subject to the law, also on a global level. The countries of the global south need to be at the negotiation table. For corporate law it is necessary to find the right balance as to make the society benefit from corporate activities.

Corporation are able to avoid payment of taxes due to a weak legislation explains **Flor De Maria Hurtado**. Fines are not high enough to decrease the incentive for corporations to engage in illegal activities.

Kennedy Graham talks about the successful establishment of international bodies to deal with global issues. This can also be done for global taxation, but it needs a step-by-step approach to make decisions increasingly binding. Molly Scott Cato calls attention to a global campaign for a binding UN Charta on Human Rights so that cases can be taken against global corporations.

The panel agrees that political parties need to be independent also financially from corporations. Experience shows that restricting the funding of parties by corporations is a good way. Yet there are differences between countries on limits for party donations and ceilings on campaign spending.

Green values should guide the EU economic transformation strategy

18.30-20:00

Chair:

- **Oras Tynkkynen**, European Green Party, Finland

Speakers:

- **Per Bolund**, Miljöpartiet de gröna, Sweden
- **Matthias Buck**, Agora Energiewende, Germany
- **Sandrine Rousseau**, Europe Écologie/ Les Verts, France
- **Ward Mosmuller**, DSM: Brighter Science. Brighter Living, Netherlands

Oras Tynkkynen says that transforming our economies towards circular, inclusive economies which keep everyone on board is essential. But the macro level isn't always so

inspiring: today we'll provide concrete examples of green economic transformation happening right now across Europe.

Per Bolund is convinced that the energy transition is also the way to build our economy. Big projects create jobs at all levels. The green transition can be the inspiration for Europe away from the far right. Sweden's emissions have decreased by 25% since the 90s while the economy has grown. Since the greens came into government, Sweden's budget for the environment has increased by 70% and is set to double again in the next 4 years. Sweden has invested 7BN annually in reducing carbon e.g. biogas from forests not food; 50% match government funding for local authorities and companies moving to 100% renewables and fossil free travel projects; a carbon tax, a reduction obligation for suppliers of petrol and diesel fuels. The argument that climate action is against development is falling apart. This can be scaled up to the EU level as well and the EU should pave the way for all countries to introduce carbon pricing.

Sweden has to employ a lot of lawyers to fight with the EU! We've been forced to increase tax on biofuels and solar against our will because of EU legislation. We need focus on the EU level on how it can be supportive, not increase the barriers to positive climate action.

Sandrine Rousseau describes the region of the Pas de Calais: a large, postindustrial region with relatively high unemployment, where the Front National get a lot of votes and the Greens the lowest. In 2013 the idea of the Third Industrial Revolution was introduced and was very impactful, creating some momentum towards e.g. renewable energy, circular economy and electric mobility. 4 years later we can see a major impact with 300 projects along these lines and 140 million Euros invested. Local people have a new sense of pride in their achievements. Two companies have upskilled workers to work with windpower. In Pas de Calais an oil refinery transitioned to biofuels and workers were supported to deal with this. People are reticent about the energy transition because they don't know where their place in the new economy will be. It's essential to make our transition equal: never give up on anyone and build a participatory democracy. The EU must help us move forward fairly towards a low carbon future.

Unfortunately agricultural project haven't worked so well as the National Front won locally and stopped all agricultural initiatives. EU regulations can also make it hard to move forwards as quickly as we'd like.

Ward Mosmuller DSM was once a state owned mining company but now produces sustainable products. We switched to green values: corporate responsibility, sustainability and social engagement. We are part of the Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition because a higher CO2 price would drive sustainability. We are part of the C8 coalition of businesses who are looking at value chains and advocating and pushing for policies to support the circular economy. We have internal sustainability targets looking into e.g. value chains – where do we get our raw materials and where do they go once our products are finished? In this way we have produced 100% recoverable carpets. We need science to make sure our methods are proven, we need people and politicians to challenge us. When we start to buy only sustainable goods, we have the future in our hands. We need EU support to put a fair price on carbon and give support for a wider range of companies to follow the front runners in producing sustainable goods.

Matthias Buck looks at why the energy transition in Europe seems to be slowing after a time of great progress. Renewables are cheaper than any other energy generation but investment has slowed in many EU countries over the past 5 years, when it's going up everywhere else. This is because as the proportion of renewables we use gets larger we're running into systemic issues and need deeper systemic change. There's an epic fight in Brussels: if we move over 50% renewable energy, traditional business models will not work any more. We have a huge amount of stranded assets in the energy mix. To get to systemic change we need green values, vision and strong green politicians to guide the transition to over 50%.

As well as phasing in renewables, Germany is also phasing out nuclear, so this means that the other parts of the mix have had less focus than they could have done with – e.g. there are currently no targets on coal, but action on this will follow soon. I believe in a managed exit from coal, not waiting for EU targets, but charting a path so that for instance, we know if we're going to train new miners.

Employment is critical for the Greens, in the energy transition, there are clearly some that will lose and they're fighting hard, so you need a positive narrative for those who'll lose their jobs. New energy world players will win, but they're not as well organised, they don't have a clear energy policy agenda and this is a huge gap that needs to be filled. Germany has seen the benefits of insisting that there is only one energy future.

Sunday, 2 April 2017

Plenary session

Voting session

09:30 – 12:30

Chair

- **Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield**, EGP committee member
- **Mar Garcia**, EGP Secretary General

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that there has been a request to add to the agenda of the Congress the point on the nomination of Claude Weinber as a co-convenor of the Global Greens (GG). Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield provides more information regarding the nomination process.

She outlines that the EGP Committee has been in this process for 3 months, because the GG operates in a very fluid way and includes many people. On Friday 31 March 2017, a lot of information on the GG convenor was provided, although perhaps not precise enough. The process that GG defined for the new convenor is a nomination by the federations, not an election by the Council, hence, normally, the Council should not vote on it.

The committee suggested to the Global Greens coordination (GGC) to send a call for nominations and to have a vote on the nominations within each federation. However, this process hasn't been accepted by the GGC due to organisational burden for other federations, which have less capacities to handle such a process.

The plan was to present all the nominated candidatures at the closing session of the GG Congress. In contrast, the selection process for choosing co-conveners out of the nominated candidatures is not defined yet. It will be decided on Monday, following the Congress. Margaret Blakers, the long-standing convener of the Global Greens, will finish her mandate in May 2017, so the new convener has to be appointed by then.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that there will be a discussion on the issue after voting on the resolutions.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites Olga, Tsepilova, chair of Green Russia, to speak in memory of Alexey Yablokov, former chair of the party, who passed away on 10 January 2017.

Olga Tsepilova: "Alexey Yablokov, talented and well-known scientist, biologist, civil activist, charismatic personality, leader. He united all environmental non-governmental organisations in Russia in the end the 80s. In 2006 he became a leader of the Green Russia faction within the party Yabloko. He will stay our leader forever." Olga Tsepilova thanked the congress for the memory and support to all Russian greens. Olga Tsepilova finishes her memory words by the words of Alexey: "Let's go on, friends".

Mar Garcia invites the congress to have a minutes of silence for Alexey Yablokov.

Gwendoline Delbos Corfield informs that the Congress that there were 452 votes initially allocated.

The voting rights have been withdrawn from 4 member parties, 3 for financial reasons, and one special case as explained during the Council session on Friday (20 votes). Hence, the total amount of allocated votes this morning is 432.

The electronic voting system is introduced to the delegates. In a trial vote, the total number of 432 out of 432 allocated votes is cast, thus the 50%+1 quorum being achieved.

Resolution "On the situation in Syria"

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites Oras Tynkkynen, EGP Committee member, to present the resolution. Oras Tynkkynen reminds the Congress that this resolution was originally tabled by Slovenian Greens for Glasgow Council 2016, where we decided to work in depth on the subject within the framework of the Foreign Affairs working group. The working group has prepared the draft text, that is presented to the Congress. Oras Tynkkynen thanks everybody who participated in the Compromise Amendments Session for their commitment and willingness to compromise.

Igor Jurisic, President, SMS Zeleni, Slovenia, explains the reasons for tabling the resolution on this issue.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that most of the tabled amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote "en block" for them.

All compromise amendments are accepted "en block" with 4 abstentions.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites to vote on the amendments left to be voted individually:

AM 8 (ICV) is adopted with 298 votes in favour (70,1%), 103 votes against (24,2%) and 24 abstentions (5,6%).

AM 34 (ICV) is adopted with 233 votes in favour (54,8%), 138 votes against (32,5%) and 54 abstentions (12,7%).

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended.

The resolution “On the situation in Syria” as amended is adopted with 8 abstentions

Resolution “On the War in Eastern Ukraine”

Sergey Kurykin, Vice Chair of the Party of Greens of Ukraine, introduces the resolution.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that most of the tabled amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote “en block” for them.

All compromise amendments are adopted “en block” with 18 abstentions.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites to vote on the amendments left to be voted individually:

AM 6 (Die Grünen) is rejected with 136 votes in favour (31,9%), 261 votes against (61,3%) and 29 abstentions (6,8%).

AM 13 (Bündnis 90/Die Grünen) is withdrawn.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended. The resolution “On the War in Eastern Ukraine” is adopted as amended with 4 votes against and 20 abstentions.

Resolution “On Europe’s contribution to protecting Global Commons: the high seas, Antarctica and outer space”

Richard Wouters, GroenLinks, introduces the resolution.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that most of the tabled amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote “en block” for them.

All compromise amendments are adopted “en block” unanimously.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs that AM I (EELV) is withdrawn.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended. The resolution “On Europe’s contribution to protecting Global Commons: the high seas, Antarctica and outer space” as amended is adopted unanimously.

Resolution “On greenwashing in energy production from fossil fuels”

Marko Kaasik, Estonian Greens, presents the resolution.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that most of the tabled amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote “en block” for them.

All compromise amendments are adopted “en block” unanimously.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites to vote on AM II (Estonian Greens). AM II is adopted with 31 votes against.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended. The resolution “On greenwashing in energy production from fossil fuels” as amended is adopted with 3 abstentions.

Resolution “On the integration of the European railway network”

Jakop Dalunde, Miljöpartiet de gröna, MEP, presents the resolution.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that most of the tabled amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote “en block” for them.

All compromise amendments are adopted “en block” with 9 abstentions

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites to vote on AM 3 (Bündnis 90/Die Grünen). AM 3 is adopted unanimously.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended. The resolution “On the integration of the European railway network” as amended is adopted with 5 abstentions.

Resolution “Opposing Trump’s policies and fighting the far-right: building the alternative by deepening democracy in the EU”

Marc Gimenez, ICV, introduces the resolution.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that most of the tabled amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote “en block” for them.

All compromise amendments are adopted “en block” with 17 abstentions and 2 votes against.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites to vote on AM 22B to delete “and plutocracy of the 0,1%”. AM 22B is adopted with 228 votes in favour (55,5%), 151 votes against (36,7%) and 32 abstentions (7,8%).

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended. The resolution “Opposing Trump’s policies and fighting the far-right: building the alternative by deepening democracy in the EU” as amended is adopted with 17 abstentions.

Resolution “On nuclear power”

Jochen Detscher, Bündnis 90/Die Grünen, introduces the resolution.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that most of the tabled amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote “en block” for them.

All compromise amendments “en block” are adopted unanimously.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites to vote on AM 1 (Groen). AM 1 is rejected with 172 votes in favour (41,2%), 232 votes against (55,6%) and 13 abstentions (3,1%).

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended. The resolution “On nuclear power” as amended is adopted with 2 abstentions.

Resolution “On Strengthening the Pillar of Social Rights: an age perspective”

Terry Reintke, Bündnis 90/Die Grünen MEP, introduces the topic and the state of current discussion in the European Parliament on the issue.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that all compromise amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote “en block” for them.

All compromise amendments “en block” are adopted with 4 abstentions.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended. The resolution “On Strengthening the Pillar of Social Rights: an age perspective” as amended is adopted unanimously.

Resolution “On Eastern Partnership and Sustainable Tourism in the Black Sea Region”

Mariia Patrul, Party of Greens of Ukraine, introduces the resolution.

AM 2 (Bündnis 90/Die Grünen) has been withdrawn.

Mar Garcia informs the Congress that all other amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote “en block” for them.

All compromise amendments “en block” are adopted.

Mar Garcia invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended. The resolution “On Eastern Partnership and Sustainable Tourism in the Black Sea Region” as amended is adopted.

Resolution “Tackle environmental destruction! For a binding international environmental law architecture”

Mathieu Béchu Diaz, EELV, and Beatriz del Hoyo, EQUO, introduce the resolution.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that most of the amendments have been incorporated during the compromise amendment session and proposes to vote “en block” for them.

All compromise amendments “en block” are adopted with 9 abstentions.

AM 14 (Groen) revised shortened text, highlighted in bold, is presented to the Congress to add in the last paragraph 2: “2. The architecture of jurisdictions that is needed to enforce a strengthened environmental law at all levels: universal jurisdiction for national tribunals, amending and strengthening the existing EU directive on the protection of the environment through criminal law, a possible European Court for Environment, the International Environmental Court or within the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court.”

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the revised AM 14. Revised AM 14 is adopted with 318 votes in favour (74,6%), 29 votes against (6,8%) and 79 abstentions (18,5%).

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the Congress to vote on the resolution as amended. The resolution “Tackle environmental destruction! For a binding international environmental law architecture” as amended is adopted with 8 abstentions and 1 vote against.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield thanks the Congress for tabling the resolutions and upgrading the level of our common policies, and everybody who participated in the compromise amendments sessions.

Nomination for the Global Greens Convener

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield opens the floor to everybody for clarification regarding the nomination for the Global Greens Convener.

Swedish Greens: We understand that there has been a lot of confusion regarding the nomination procedure, but nevertheless, we were taken by surprise last Friday when the candidate for EGP was presented. We feel that the procedure has been far from transparent. The position of a convener of the Global Greens is an important one, and it’s important that the procedure to nominate our candidate is transparent and as inclusive as possible. We do understand it, the Global Greens do not have a clear procedure for nomination and no regulation exists within EGP. Nevertheless, we would like to ask for a formal vote on EGP candidate.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield informs the Congress that EGP doesn’t have an explicit procedure for such situations when Member Parties ask for a vote that is not foreseen. Based on personal experience within national party, the chair proposes to accept the point to be added to the Congress agenda unless the Congress objects.

Mar Garcia provides further information on the nomination process: the EGP was against this procedure proposed by the Global Greens Coordination, one of the main reasons being the planned change in the Global Greens statutes. The EGP position was to wait until the changes are adopted, and follow the adopted rules regarding co-convenor after the adoption. However, the rest of the federations insisted on implementing the new procedure even before it was voted, and EGP was forced to comply with this decision. EGP had to present a candidate while no rules were in place, timing has not been defined, and no procedure has been decided.

The EGP Committee decided that in those circumstances nominating a candidate as other federations did, would be a possible way out. The EGP Committee has nominated a person, who is experienced and can bring a lot of added value to the Global Greens. Since there was no procedure to follow, the Committee decided to present the candidate during the Council.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield adds that the Secretariat of the Global Greens will not be hosted within the EGP office any longer. The next convenor will also need to be a fundraiser. This is the criteria that was held had at the moment of nomination.

The Swedish Greens appreciate the work that has been done by the Committee. Understand that the GGC will decide on the convenor(s) among the candidates presented by the Federations and bearing this in mind they would like to give the procedure some kind of formality, they would still like to have a vote on it.

Jocelyne Le Boulicaut, EELV: As nomination of the candidate from EGP is an internal procedure and hence the parties should have a say in it as it would be good to receive the information from the EGP representatives to the Global Greens coordination on the candidatures for convenor.

Mar Garcia promises that the delegates will be informed on the decisions of the GGC on the procedure to be followed for selection of the co/convenor.

Efi Xanthou, Cyprus Greens, supports that idea that having open elections would have been better regardless of the procedure to be chosen by the Global Greens.

Mar Garcia points out that it was very unclear how to issue the call for candidates due to lack of clarity on the procedure; whether to have 2 candidates from each federation and when the deadline for nominations would be.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield provides the delegates with an example of how fluid the process was, the Committee was given a deadline of 1 week to provide a name for a nominee and then the deadline was extended as the other federations were not able to find the candidates. However, as the EGP Committee has already contacted and got the commitment of one candidate, it was too late to reverse the process.

Mieke van der Vegt, GroenLinks, while supporting the idea that the process has not been ideal, suggests to not vote on the nomination as it's better to have a candidate, than not to have any.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield clarifies that regardless of the decision the Congress takes, the selection process for the convenor will go on, with or without the nomination from the EGP.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the delegates to vote to decide whether to hold a formal vote on the nomination of the global Greens Co-convenor.

The Congress decides by majority to have a vote on the nomination of Claude Weinber as convenor of the Global Greens.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield invites the delegates to vote on the nomination of Claude Weinber as a candidate for the Global Greens Convenor.

The following votes are cast:

163 votes in favour (39,9%), 154 votes against (37,7%) and 92 abstentions. As a simple majority of the votes cast is required to elect a person, it follows that the nomination of Claude Weinber has not

been supported by the Congress.

All adopted documents of the Liverpool Congress can be found on:
<https://europeangreens.eu/liverpool2017/congress/adopted-documents>

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield concludes the voting session.

Closing plenary

Closing session

13:30 – 15:00

Joon Kim and **Manuel Joel Diaz Capdevilla** open the Closing Ceremony. They introduce each other. They welcome the speakers of the closing session. They introduce a video summary of the Congress.

Joon Kim introduces Amelia Womack.

Amelia Womack starts by thanking everyone for coming to Liverpool on behalf of the Green Party of England and Wales. She says that challenges will not defeat us as we will not face them alone. She says that Congress has proved that Greens are a force to be reckoned with. United in their struggle with Greens from Europe and across the world. She says that our movement is stronger than short-term populism. She says that in the past days our diversity has been our strength.

Manuel Joel Diaz Capdevilla introduces Mar Garcia.

Mar Garcia thanks the participants for their energy and the organizers of the Congress. She pays tribute to those who have lost their lives defending the environment. She says that current generations cannot deprive future generations from the welfare and health they deserve. She commemorates the 60th anniversary of the Rome Treaty establishing the European Union and that the Greens celebrated there that the European Union is the most fair and democratic political and economic body in the world. She congratulates the win of Austrian President Alexander van der Bellen and GroenLinks. She ends her words by highlighting the importance of women in the fight.

Joon Kim introduces **Keli Yen**.

Keli Yen begins by saying the Global Greens is a good place for Greens to learn and grow. She remarks that the purpose of the Global Greens is to inspire one another and that even though we are individuals, we have global impact. Greens are about being kind to each other and engaging in the world around us. She encourages everyone to be kind to each other and take care of each other.

Manuel Joel Diaz Capdevilla introduces a video from **Jesse Klaver**, leader of GroenLinks.

Jooen Kim introduces **Frank Habineza**, presidential candidate of Rwanda.

Frank Habineza thanks the organizers of the Congress. He explains the political reality in Rwanda after the genocide and movement that stopped the genocide and the building of the Rwandan Green Party. He tells about the movement to reform the term of the presidential mandate in Rwanda, which is why he decided to run for president. He explains that they are in a tough region in the world and the victory of a Green President would bring peace to the world.

Manuel Joel Diaz Capdevilla introduces **Pekka Haavisto**.

Pekka Haavisto explains about the history of the Finnish Greens from the first parliamentary elections to being ministers. He tells the story of campaigning and reaching out to those who aren't Greens, explaining them to why we do the things we do. He explains the issues that the Finnish Greens have worked on such as feminism, disabled issues, military and defense issues and that they are realistic, educated. He says there is an alternative to hate speech, crime and that alternative is Green.

Jooen Kim introduces **Evelyne Huytebroeck** to present the Global Greens declaration.

Evelyne Huytebroeck introduces **Dorothy Nalubega**, **Borislav Sandov** and **Jessica Northey** to read the Global Greens declaration.

Evelyne Huytebroeck thanks the organizers and closes the Congress.