

**FINAL AGENDA
AUTUMN ONLINE
CONFERENCE**

2-11 OCTOBER 2020



CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
SECTION A (ENABLING MOTIONS)	10
Enabling Motions A01 Standing Orders Committee (SOC) Report	10
Enabling Motions A02 Amendments to Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference to enable an online and telephone Extraordinary Conference to be held in Autumn 2020	11
Enabling Motions A03 Enabling Motion for an Extraordinary Autumn Conference 2020 to be held online	12
SECTION A – MAIN AGENDA	14
A1 Standing Orders Committee Report	14
A2 Green Party Executive Report	37
A3 Treasurers Report	46
A4 Green Party Regional Council Report	47
A5 Dispute Resolution Committee Report	50
A6 Policy Development Committee Report	54
A7 Complaint Managers Report	57
A8 Campaigns Committee Report	58
A9 Conferences Committee Report	58
A10 Equality and Diversity Committee Report	58
A11 Green World Editorial Board Report	58
A12 Framework Development Group report	58
A13 Climate Emergency Policy Working Group Report	58
SECTION B	60
B1 Food and Agriculture Voting Paper	60
Amendment 2a	60
Amendment 1a	61
Amendment 2b	61
Amendment 1b	61
Amendment 1c	62
Amendment 1d	62
Amendment 2c	64

SECTION C	65
C1 Deforestation (Fast Tracked)	65
C2 Car and vans to go zero carbon by 2030	65
C3 Ban on advertising of high-carbon goods and services	65
C4 The 2019 General Election Manifesto and Climate Change Mitigation	66
Amendment 1	67
Amendment 2	67
C5 Adopt the Principle of Rationing to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions Arising from Travel, Amending the Climate Emergency and the Transport Chapters of PSS	67
C6 Updating the philosophical basis to reflect doughnut economics	68
Amendment 1	69
C7 Self Declaration of Gender	69
C8 Animal Rights: Fireworks; limit use and quiet	70
C9 Access to Fertility Treatment	70
SECTION D	71
D1 Winning over workers is crucial to fighting climate change.	71
D2 Diversity in target seats	71
D3 Leadership Gender Balance Composite	71
D4 Request that the Code of Conduct oversight group append “Antisemitism: A Guidance” to the Code of Conduct	72
Amendment 1	73
Amendment 2	74
D5 Independence of the complaints process	74
Amendment 1	74
Amendment 2	74
D6 Disrepute in the disciplinary process	75
D7 Inconsistency in the Complaints Referral Group membership between the Constitution and Standing Orders for Party Discipline	75
D8 Breach of contract litigation and the disciplinary process	76
D9 An Extraordinary Party Conference to debate a constitution that delivers the recommendations and intent of the Holistic Review Commission and Incorporation of the Party	76
Amendment 1	76
Amendment 2	77
D10 Accessibility and change process for party branding	77
D11 Consultation and Right of Reply for Liberation Groups on Proposed Policy	77
D12 Liberation manifesto approval	78
D13 To require GPEW members to have been members for two years before standing for SOC	78
D14 Allow criticism of other candidates in internal elections	78

D15 Proactive stance for Standing in elections	79
D16 IHRA, Palestine, and Free Speech	79
D17 Make campaigning and advocating voting for other parties subject to disciplinary action.	79
D18 Make membership of the Young Greens an automatic opt-in right for young members 16–29 inclusive.	80
D19 Affiliated Groups	80
Late Motion 1 Accessibility in GPEW Internal Processes	81

SECTION E **82**

E1 Wildlife & Habitats Policy Enabling Motion (Fast Tracked)	82
E2 Teach British Sign Language in schools (Fast Tracked)	82
E3 Atonement and Reparative justice for the transatlantic traffic in enslaved Africans	82
E4 A package of transport measures to respond to the coronavirus crisis	83
E5 Environmental Education learning entitlements	83
Amendment 1	84
E6 Staying close to the single market	84
E7 Recognise trans parents	85
Amendment 1	85
E8 A Local and Public Strategy for Zero Covid Britain	85
E9 Enabling motion for the revision of Green Party Criminal Justice Policy (Fast Tracked)	86
E10 Nuclear power	86
Amendment 1	86
Amendment 2	86
E11 High Speed 2 (HS2)	86
E12 Strengthening the Regulation of Election Spending	87
E13 Enabling Motion for the Security Peace and Defence Chapter (Fast Tracked)	88
E14 Future Referenda	88
E15 Removing a statement on dental health	89
E16 Reaffirm support for BDS and oppose a key IHRA example	89
E17 Ensuring that sex and gender are not conflated.	89
E18 Rights of transgender, non–binary and agender people	90
E19 Directly elected individual positions	90
E20 Protecting trans children and young people	91
Amendment 1	92
E21 Abolish the Office for Students	92

OUT OF ORDER MOTIONS	93
Oo01 Through traffic in urban centres	93
Oo02 Introduce wealth tax to fund the economic recovery from Covid19	93
Oo03 Changes to local planning and built environment and housing policies	93
Oo04 Systemic Safeguarding Review	105
Oo05 Fragment of Protecting trans children and young people	106
Oo06 Fragment of A package of transport measures to respond to the coronavirus crisis	107
Oo07 Fragment of E2 Atonement and Reparative justice for the transatlantic traffic in enslaved Africans	108
Oo08 Section of A2 GPEx Report	109
Oo09 Section of A3, Treasurers Report.	109

COMPOSITES	111
Composite Part 1 Remove the limit on women and gender non–conforming/non–binary people in Leadership and Deputy Leadership positions	111
Composite Part 2 Remove gender balance from Green Party leadership elections	111

CONTACT DETAILS OF MOTION PROPOSERS	112
A Motions (Enabling Motions)	112
B Motions (Policy Voting Papers)	112
C Motions (Accredited Policy Motions)	112
D Motions (Organisational Motions)	112
E Motions (Unaccredited policy Motions)	113

SECTION A (ENABLING MOTIONS)

ENABLING MOTIONS A01 STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE (SOC) REPORT

Claire Nash, SOC Convener

Motion of acceptance.

Conference accepts this truncated Standing Orders Committee Report and Motions Enabling Motions A02 and A03 to be taken at this C

Conference. Conference agrees to commit consideration of Final Agenda – Main Agenda to an Extraordinary Conference to be taken there together with the full Standing Orders Committee Report in that section of the agenda.

If this SOC Report A is not accepted then there will be no Annual Conference and therefore no Extraordinary Conference. One major goal of SOC is to enable a Conference that can take annual reports from party bodies, to ensure accountability and prevent later conferences from being consumed by delayed discussion on organisational matters, which would hold up member policy-making at later conferences. We will also hold policy motion workshops and take some policy motions.

Report 1 – For Annual Conference

The requirement in the constitution is that SOC shall submit a Report with the Final Agenda and shall notify how many motions have been ruled out of order and publish the same. four motions were ruled Out of Order. They are published in Main Section of Final Agenda.

Coronavirus meant either no conference, or the arrangement that Standing Orders Committee have suggested.

The relevant constitutional provisions are:

10 (i) The Party shall hold an Annual Conference each Autumn which shall be the supreme forum of the Party. Its procedure shall be governed by Standing Orders. All paid up members of the Green Party shall be eligible to attend and vote at Conference.

10 (ii) Any Annual Conference may decide to convene a Conference which will take place earlier than the next Annual Conference and which shall have those powers delegated to it by the convening Annual Conference. Such a Conference shall be called an Extraordinary Party Conference and shall be governed by the same Standing Orders as an Annual Conference. Any or all of the powers of an Annual Conference may be so delegated, including the power to amend this Constitution, but the resolution convening such a Conference must specify which powers are being delegated.

A survey of members was carried out which showed 84% in

favour of holding Autumn Conference online. 80% of those responding to the survey (1,095) did not have concerns about their ability to join an online event, but nearly 20% did. The main reasons given were technology problems (10.41%) and unfamiliarity with online meetings (9.5%). 11 people cited disability.

Many members expressed concern that if not done this way, then the Party would have gone eighteen months without policy making, accountability of elected representatives, or addressing some necessary organisational issues. A face-to-face Spring Conference cannot be guaranteed. Concerns were raised about lack of individual contact with other members if held online, distractions at home, lack of childcare, difficulties of debating online and the reliance on members having suitable hardware, software and internet access. A decision was taken to proceed but to provide for telephone as well as online access if possible and to encourage local parties to assist those who might have difficulties.

It was clear by May 2020 that Annual Conference would have to either be cancelled or be curtailed to the numbers as permitted by the government. At the time of the decision to proceed, this was thirty people, socially distancing within a venue. Although all members are eligible to attend the Annual Conference, Conferences Committee is entitled to limit the places available to members on a first-come-first-served basis. Twenty-seven places were then made available after allocating two for SOC and one for staff. With possible proxies, this allows up to one hundred and eighty members to vote at this Annual Conference on the three motions proposed to be taken, if a card vote is called for.

Due to the government changes to rules on social gatherings made on 10th September, the face to face conference had to be cancelled. Even though this was carefully designed not to be a social gathering and political activities are expressly exempted from the restrictions, our venue cancelled and another suitable venue could not be found at short notice. SOC was asked to rule on this. It ruled that due to the exceptional circumstances the motions to be taken at the face to face gathering could be delayed to a special Conference to be convened immediately prior to the Extraordinary Conference if GPRC agreed to this, in its role of oversight of democratic processes.

Ruling on using online decision making.

LG asked SOC: if it was not possible for the party to book a venue to run a face to face conference, and every possibility to book a venue had been exhausted, is there an alternative approach which could be taken.

SOC Rules as follows:

The Standing Orders for the conduct for conference make it clear in a number of places (Notably Section B 5, Section F, 6, b in the standing orders for the conduct of conference.) that conference should take place in a face to face setting. However, the standing orders in Sections A and B in particular, which covers booking the conference venue assume that it will be possible to book a suitable venue for conference. The Standing Orders and Constitution are silent on the issue of not being able to book a venue for conference due to venue interpretation of government regulations.

In light of this, SOC rule that this situation where government regulation and the reaction to that from conference venues means it is impossible to book a face to face venue in line with the Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference is not covered in the standing orders and as such it is within the purview of Standing Orders Committee to outline the approach which should be taken in this situation in line with Section 10 part iii of the constitution.

SOC Set out the following intentions for their approach:

- The process should involve as many members as possible
- That the question of process is agreed and debated prior to the main body of the conference taking place,
- That the question of running conference online is separate from the rest of the SOC report

In order to facilitate conference taking place, in line with the will of the membership expressed in the survey, the following approach should be used:

When the online conference convenes on the 10th of October, the first order of business should be to take Enabling Motions A01–3 in the final agenda.

The passing of these motion will form the Autumn Conference, and following their passing the standing orders for the conduct of conference will be updated to allow and online conference to take place using the changes in the standing orders. Then the Extraordinary Online Conference will start with the full A01 Standing Orders Committee Report from the main agenda.

For the purposes of making decisions on Enabling Motions A01,2 and 3 then in section F, 6, h of the standing orders for the conduct of conference “A quorum shall consist of one third of voting cards issued for that day at Conference.” The phrase “voting cards issued that day at conference” shall be interpreted to mean the number of voting members registered to attend the conference online that day.

SOC Rule that in these circumstances that Standing Order F1 should be interpreted to allow the Hustings for elections at conference to take place during the week of conference activity in the run up to the 10th of October.

Ruling Ends.

This ruling has been sent to the GPRC On–Call Councillors for their support to allow it to be published in the final agenda, and will be put on the agenda for the next GPRC meeting for their support prior to the conference itself.

SOC proposes and recommends three motions to this Annual Conference. These are in Subsection Enabling Motions A of the A motions and are:

Enabling Motions A01 A motion to accept this Report and defer the full SOC Report A01 to an Extraordinary Conference, and to defer Part Two of the Final Agenda to an Extraordinary Conference.

Enabling Motions A02 A motion to make minor adaptations to Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference (requiring a 2/3 majority) for online conferences and to allow voting to be online and by telephone, including (as usual) by proxy.

Enabling Motions A03 A motion to enable an Extraordinary Online Conference to be held to take the agenda and elections that would normally take place at Annual Conference (requiring a simple majority) and to delegate all the powers of an Annual Conference to that Extraordinary Conference.

In passing Enabling Motion A03 the consequential of this is a committal of any remaining business of Annual Conference in the Final Agenda to the Extraordinary Online Conference.

ENABLING MOTIONS A02

AMENDMENTS TO STANDING ORDERS FOR THE CONDUCT OF CONFERENCE TO ENABLE AN ONLINE AND TELEPHONE EXTRAORDINARY CONFERENCE TO BE HELD IN AUTUMN 2020

Standing Orders Committee, Claire Nash, Alan Borgars, Doug Rouxel, Kemal Cufoglu, Marcus Grant, Rachel Collinson, Steve Leyland.*

Synopsis

No synopsis supplied.

Motion

To approve the following changes to Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference that will apply to all conferences:

Amendment to A6: Delete “SOC shall submit a Report with the Final Agenda and shall notify how many motions have been ruled out of order and publish the same.” Replace with “A6: SOC shall submit a Report with the Final Agenda. SOC shall divide this Report into sections covering the Final Agenda and the Ordering of Motions for Conference; a notification of how many motions or amendments have been ruled out of order and publishing the same; a report on SOC’s participation in the Agenda preparation process including any motions or amendments that SOC is submitting to Conference; timetabling, chairing and other procedural matters affecting Conference with the recommendations of SOC; a report by SOC of any changes that they have adopted to their Standing Orders; progress on Organisational Statements; any other matters or recommendations that do not affect the running of conference; rulings requested and made since the Previous Conference.

Amendment to F7(i) Insert after “speaker slip” the words “as defined by SOC”

Amendment to J. After, “This period shall consist of one minute’s silence during which the doors of the Conference Hall shall remain closed.” Insert “For an online and/or telephone conference, this period shall consist of one minute’s silence after the chair has opened the session with no admission of new participants in that time.”

Appendix A 5(g) Add after “At the Conference” the words “or prior to it at an online and/or telephone workshop, but at least three days after publication of the Final Agenda”

Also to approve the following changes to Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference to be valid for Extraordinary Conferences only:

Amendment to A3: Add at the end: “For an Extraordinary Conference only the deadlines in Section A may be set aside by SOC for motions and amendments that were correctly submitted in accordance with the deadlines in Section A to the Agenda of the conference that resolved to hold the Extraordinary Conference and were found to be In Order. Such items from the Agenda of the conference that resolved to hold the Extraordinary Conference may be republished in the Agenda of the Extraordinary Conference.”

Amendment to B3: Non–members may attend any session of Conference on payment of the appropriate fee but they may be excluded from any session by a majority vote of those members present at that session.

Add at the end: “This provision may be set aside or limited to specific non–members, for an Extraordinary Conference only, by the motion and subsequent resolution that establishes the Extraordinary Conference.”

Amendment to F1 SOC shall ensure that adequate plenary time is made available at the AGM for full and frank hustings to be held for all elections to be held during Conference. Delete “plenary” and “the AGM.” Add at the end “at a suitable time that does not conflict with plenary or scheduled workshops. For an Extraordinary Conference only the motion calling for such a Conference can provide for hustings to be held prior to the commencement of the Conference.” so that it reads “F1: SOC shall ensure that adequate time is made available for full and frank hustings to be held for all elections to be held during Conference, at a suitable time that does not conflict with plenary or scheduled workshops.”

Amendment to F3: insert two additional clauses at the end of F3.

a) “Workshops shall normally be held at Conference for motions on the Final Agenda. Workshops for motions to an Extraordinary Conference only may be held online and by telephone up to seven days prior to the commencement of that Extraordinary Conference. All those who have registered for the Extraordinary Conference by a date two days before the workshop is held shall be entitled to register for the workshop.”

b) “A definition of the floor of conference shall be agreed in advance between SOC and Conferences Committee for any online and telephone or non–physical conference. For any

decision on a motion or amendment, but not for discussion on a motion or amendment, the floor is required to be quorate.”

Amendment to F4d). After “The ERO shall prepare and issue voting papers,” insert “which for an online and telephone Extraordinary Conference shall be issued electronically to those registered to participate electronically in that Conference for the day of the election. There shall be no proxy votes for such elections. Reasonable efforts will be made by the Party, SOC and the ERO to facilitate voting in these elections by those participating in the Conference for the day of the election other than online but the ERO may exclude them from voting in the election if no suitable secure arrangements can be made. The ERO shall”

Amendment to F6 a). Add at the end: “For an Extraordinary Conference for any one attendee voting cards and ballot cards may be issued in either electronic form or in physical form.”

Amendment to F6 b) Add at the end: “or by a comparable method established by SOC and Conferences Committee for an Extraordinary Conference. Reasonable steps shall be taken to ensure that all members registered and attending the session can vote.”

Amendment to F6(e) Add at the end of the first sentence: “or by a comparable method established by SOC and Conferences Committee for an Extraordinary Conference.”

Amendment to F(6)h. Delete “A quorum shall consist of one third of voting cards issued for that day at Conference.” Add “The quorum for Conference shall be calculated as one third of voting cards issued for that day at Conference, or for an online Extraordinary Conference as three hundred available to vote.” Title: Amendments to Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference to enable an online and telephone Extraordinary Conference to be held in Autumn 2020

ENABLING MOTIONS A03

ENABLING MOTION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY AUTUMN CONFERENCE 2020 TO BE HELD ONLINE

Standing Orders Committee, Claire Nash, Alan Borgars, Amelia Womack, Carina Moravec, Doug Rouxel, Gregory Lupton, Joanna Collins, Kemal Cufoglu, Maggie Hunter, Steve Leyland.*

Synopsis

No synopsis supplied.

Motion

That an Extraordinary Autumn Conference 2020 be held as an online conference and that for this Extraordinary Autumn Conference 2020 any changes to Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference approved by this Annual Conference 2020 shall apply.

The Extraordinary Autumn Conference 2020 will convene on 10th and 11th October 2020 and is hereby granted all the powers of an Annual Conference, including the power to hold elections.

Nominations processes, hustings, workshops and straw polls for motions on the Agenda of that Extraordinary Conference 2020 may be held in advance of the dates of the Extraordinary Conference 2020 where agreed by Standing Orders Committee.

The Final Agenda proposed for the Extraordinary Autumn Conference 2020 shall be the Final Agenda proposed by Standing Orders Committee for the Annual Conference 2020 with the addition of any Emergency Motions duly received and found to be in order by Standing Orders Committee, and with a new and revised Standing Orders Committee Report but omitting this motion and the Standing Orders Committee motion to change Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference.

Local parties are recommended to support attendance at this Extraordinary Autumn Conference 2020 by their members if they can, especially any members that may not have access to relevant hardware or software.”

SECTION A MAIN AGENDA

A01

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE REPORT

[[Section 20 part v of the constitution states: Where errors arise within the numbering, lettering and references within The Constitution, Standing Orders Committee are permitted to correct and republish them without recourse to conference for prior approval. All corrections made by Standing Orders Committee outside of conference will be reported to the next conference as part of the Standing Orders Committee report.]]

Claire Nash, Convener of Standing Orders Committee (SOC)

Introduction

In Autumn 2019 Alan Borgars, Emma Chan, Timothy Kiely, Claire Nash and Douglas Rouxel were elected to Standing Orders Committee. Emma and Claire were chosen as Co-convenors, and from June onwards Claire as Convenor.

It has been a difficult year for two particular reasons. Coronavirus led to the considerable work put into the Spring Conference Agenda by members and SOC having to be abandoned and also contributed to Emma giving permanent apologies from the onset of lock-down in March 2020. SOC would like to thank her for her important contribution to SOC since 2018. The second difficulty was a high level of demand for rulings. In the past, ruling requests were rare. This plus the cancellation of Spring Conference led to demands for SOC to publish rulings when made and not leave this until they had been reported to Conference.

Final Agenda and the Ordering of Motions for Conference

SOC prepared the Final Agenda for Annual Conference in two parts:

Part A, recommended by SOC to be taken at a face to face Annual Conference, to include only motions enabling the holding of an online conference.

Part B, the main Final Agenda, recommended by SOC to be committed by the Annual Conference to a later online Extraordinary Autumn Conference and if that online conference was not given consent, then not to be taken.

Due to the government changes to rules on social gatherings made on 10th September, the face to face conference had to be cancelled. Even though this was carefully designed not to be a social gathering and political activities are expressly exempted from the restrictions, our venue cancelled and another suitable venue could not be found at short notice. SOC was asked to rule on this. It ruled that due to the exceptional

circumstances the motions to be taken at the face to face gathering could be delayed to a special Conference to be convened immediately prior to the Extraordinary Conference if GPRC agreed to this, in its role of oversight of democratic processes.

The ruling which followed this situation is contained the SOC Report in the Enabling Motion section of the Final Agenda.

Main Agenda

Motions are divided into 5 types or sections (A–F). Standing Orders allow SOC to create subsections within these sections. The main Agenda, for the Extraordinary Conference, and The of the A motions. Several officer and committee reports were not received by 5th September and will be submitted to Conference as amendments to the Final Agenda.

Section A Reports

This includes the SOC Report, the officer and committee reports that were submitted by the Final Agenda deadline on 3rd September and the reports that were submitted after the deadline but before the SOC Final Agenda meeting on 5th September which are noted as late. In addition there are two reports by temporary working groups established by Conference and asked to report to Conference. They are the Framework Development Group and the Climate Emergency Working Group. SOC Report Part B will be taken first, as required by Standing Orders. No report was received from Campaigns Committee which, so far as we know, has no members at present.

Amendments: Several officer and committee reports were not received by 5th September and will be submitted to Conference as amendments to the Final Agenda. Amendments to reports are accepted from the floor of Conference once approved by SOC as In Order. You are advised to submit proposed report amendments to SOC for checking prior to commencement of the session where the relevant agenda item will be taken so that if not in order, you have time to alter it. Amendments must be submitted prior to the item being taken, either by the proposer of the report or by a member who has filled in a speaker slip.

SECTION B Voting Papers

There is one Voting Paper on a revised chapter of Policies for Sustainable Society. This is the Food and Agriculture Voting Paper B01 which has been through the accredited process for wholesale revision of chapters.

Amendments: There are 2 amendments which SOC have split into parts and ordered to enable them to be taken in such a manner that allows debate on all of the issues raised.

SECTION C Accredited Policy Motions

Accreditation is not for the content of a motion but is only to confirm that the correct process for consultation as laid down in Standing Orders has been followed. Policy Development Committee is responsible for accrediting policy motions. Some E motions had not had accreditation confirmed at the time of the Prioritisation Ballot being published and for this reason the prioritisation ballot listed C and E motions in the same section. There are 9 accredited motions.

Amendments: There are 3 amendments.

SECTION D Organisational Motions

20 organisational motions were accepted. SOC proposes a composite of two motions on Leadership Gender Balance. If the composite is not accepted by Conference, then the motions will be taken separately in their original position on the basis of their points total in the prioritisation ballot. A composite does not change the wording but if one is passed, then it may be that the other cannot be taken as it would contradict the first. Compositing allows Conference to debate the motions and the different options they present as if they are one motion with possible amendments.

Amendments: There are 6 amendments.

SECTION E Unaccredited Policy Motions

28 E motions were accepted as in order for the First Agenda, but several were later accredited as C motions. The Final Agenda has 23 E motions.

Amendments: There are 5 amendments.

SECTION F

There are no Draft Voting Papers. A Draft Voting Paper must be submitted to Conference within 2 years and 3 months of the passing of an Enabling Motion or else the Enabling Motion will be considered to have lapsed.

Late Motions

One received. Late Motions are only taken if time allows.

Out of Order

4 motions were found OoO, fragments of 2 other motions were OoO and a part of 2 Reports were OoO. These are published as an Appendix to SOC Report B as required by Standing Orders.

Emergency Motions

Not part of the Final Agenda.

Summaries and synopses

Conference Standing Orders state that all motions must be accompanied by a synopsis of not more than 50 words (300 for policy papers). In practice, we do not reject motions without a synopsis although SOC reserves the right to do so. It is the practice of SOC to cut synopses at the appropriate length and note that this has happened.

Additional information

Standing Orders required background information to be given in notes not in the motion itself. Where provided, this is linked to in the Agenda.

Contacts for motions in this agenda

The names of those signing motions are included in each motion. The principal contact for each motion is indicated by (*) after the name with their contact details.

Improvement of the Agenda

If you notice any errors in the final agenda please notify SOC by emailing soc@greenparty.org.uk

Prioritisation ballot

SOC has in the past been criticised by conference for the low turnout in the prioritisation ballot. The Committee went into the Autumn conference with a clear plan for improving turnout which included posting in the more active Green Party related Facebook groups and publishing an article in "Bright Green" encouraging members to vote. In addition to this, there was a specific "All Members" email and the information was included in emails on booking for conference.

SOC felt it was worth putting the turnout in this ballot in the context of other ballots historically, so that conference can see what the variation over time has been, and see where the turnout for this Prioritisation Ballot sits in an historic context.

Spring 2013	109
Autumn 2013	197
Spring 2014	253
Autumn 2014	174
Spring 2015	473
Autumn 2015	744
Spring 2016	275
Autumn 2016	529
Spring 2017	360
Autumn 2017	104
Spring 2018	111
Autumn 2018	84
Spring 2019	130
Autumn 2019	160
Spring 2020	268
Autumn 2020	603

The prioritisation ballot fell into two parts: Section D 472 valid ballots, and Policy Motions 603 valid ballots. The initial data for the prioritisation ballot was collected using webforms on the members' site that only allowed one submission per user and was restricted to Green Party members only.

The C and E motions were taken as a single block to prioritise, with the motions being separated out afterwards because there were a number of E motions submitted which were in consideration for accreditation as a C motion. As such, we needed to be able to compare all of the C motions with all of the E motions, as SOC were not made aware which ones might be moving, and there was no guarantee that they would move.

The ballot results were calculated using the Borda Count methodology and the "points" value each motion achieved is detailed against each motion in the agenda. The ballot data is available on the SOC section of the website here: <https://spaces.greenparty.org.uk/s/soc/>

SOC is proposing some deviations from the agenda order suggested by the prioritisation ballot, and makes the following proposals for timetabling and agenda order.

Standing Orders allows SOC to use its discretion to vary the order from the ballot as follows:

i) in consultation with the Policy Development Committee to give special priority to any motion in section c) because of the lack of policy in a specific area where it is needed.

ii) because of the need to debate motions which affect other motions in an appropriate order, or the desirability of placing motions on the same subject together.

iii) to give special priority to any motion in section D which SOC considers to be urgent for the resolution of controversy or for the continuing functioning of the Party or any part thereof.

iv) having regard to the previous Conference history of motions and papers, including whether they have been submitted for debate previously. Any exercise of this discretion shall be notified to Conference in the report of SOC. The decision of SOC to exercise, or not to exercise, this discretion in regard to any motion may be overruled by Conference by the passing of an amendment to the SOC report.

Under i) PDC made no recommendation for priority and additional priority has not been given to climate– related motions.

Under ii) and iii) SOC have brought motions D5 and D6 together, relegating D5 from 4th and promoting D6 from 10th place in the Prioritisation Ballot as they are promoted by Disciplinary Committee, are considered urgent for the resolution of controversy and it is desirable to take them together. A large number of ruling requests to SOC this year have related to controversy on disciplinary processes.

Under iv), SOC agreed to higher prioritise the motion on Teaching Sign Language having regard to its previous Conference history as having been proposed for conference 3 times but not having yet been debated. This was 6th in the ballot and has been promoted to 2nd and recommended for Fast–track.

Compositing

SOC is proposing one composite, motions D3, relating to gender balance in internal elections. Under E2 of Standing Orders “The composite motion shall be put by SOC to Conference for acceptance or rejection and shall be accepted or rejected on a simple majority. In the event of such a rejection, the individual motions shall be voted upon in an order to be determined by SOC subject to approval by Conference.”

The composite has been agreed by the motion proposers of both motions. If the composite is rejected by conference, part 1 of the composite will appear at D3 in the Agenda and Composite Part 2 will appear at D20 which were their positions on the basis of the Prioritisation Ballot.

SOC makes the following proposals for timetabling and agenda order:

C motions:

C1 Deforestation (Fast Tracked)

C2 Car and vans to go zero carbon by 2030

C3 Ban on advertising of high–carbon goods and services

C4 The 2019 General Election Manifesto and Climate Change Mitigation

C5 Adopt the Principle of Rationing to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions Arising from

Travel, Amending the Climate Emergency and the Transport Chapters of PSS

C6 Updating the Philosophical Basis to reflect doughnut economics

C7 Self Declaration of Gender

C8 Animal Rights: Fireworks; limit use and quiet

C9 Access to Fertility Treatment

D motions:

D1 Winning over workers is crucial to fighting climate change

D2 Diversity in target seats

D3 Remove the limit on women and gender non–conforming/ non–binary people in Leadership and Deputy Leadership positions (Composite of D3 with D20)

D4 Request that the Code of Conduct oversight group append “Antisemitism: A

Guidance” to the Code of Conduct

D5 Independence of the complaints process

D6 An Extraordinary Party Conference to debate a constitution that delivers the

recommendations and intent of the Holistic Review Commission and Incorporation of the

Party

D7 Accessibility and change process for party branding

D8 Consultation and Right of Reply for Liberation Groups on Proposed Policy

D9 Liberation manifesto approval

D10 Disrepute in the disciplinary process

D11 To require GPEW members to have been members for two years before standing for SOC

D12 Allow criticism of other candidates in internal elections

D13 Proactive stance for Standing in elections

D14 Inconsistency in the Complaints Referral Group membership between the

Constitution and Standing Orders for Party Discipline

D15 Breach of contract litigation and the disciplinary process

D16 IHRA, Palestine, and Free Speech

D17 Make campaigning and advocating voting for other parties subject to disciplinary

action

D18 Make membership of the Young Greens an automatic opt-in right for young

members 16–29 inclusive

D19 Affiliated Groups

D20 Remove gender balance from Green Party leadership elections

E motions:

E1 Wildlife & Habitats Policy Enabling Motion

E2 Teach British Sign Language in schools (Fast Track)

E3 Atonement and Reparative justice for the transatlantic traffic in enslaved Africans

E4 A package of transport measures to respond to the coronavirus crisis

E5 Environmental Education learning entitlements

E6 Staying close to the single market

E7 Recognise trans parents

E8 A Local and Public Strategy for Zero Covid Britain

E9 Enabling motion for the revision of Green Party Criminal Justice Policy (Fast Tracked)

E10 Nuclear power 120

E11 High Speed 2 (HS2)

E12. Strengthening the Regulation of Election Spending

E13. Enabling Motion for the Security Peace and Defence Chapter

E14. Future Referenda

E15. Removing a statement on dental health

E16. Reaffirm support for BDS and oppose a key IHRA example

E17 Ensuring that sex and gender are not conflated

E20 Rights of transgender, non–binary and agender people

E21. Directly elected individual positions

E22 Protecting trans children and young people

E23 Abolish the Office for Students

*For the original order, see end of Report.

Fast-tracking

SOC propose the Fast Tracking of two enabling motions (E1 and E 10) the motion on Teaching Sign Language (E2) and Deforestation (C1). We propose taking the top–ranked E motion (E3 after fast tracking) in the first plenary on Sunday if time allows, otherwise in the second plenary. Other

E motions will only be taken if time allows.

Voting

Our voting system for the conference is a platform which enables online and other types of voting. Postal voting has not been enabled as it is not our usual Party practice for conferences.

Proxy votes

Members unable to attend Conference may give a Proxy to a member who is able to attend. This can be done via a webform on the members' website [here \[link\]](#). A member may hold a maximum of five proxy votes. Proxies are only used for 'card votes' as sometimes called for by the Chair or by ten members.

SOC Desk

At an online Conference we cannot have a physical desk. Instead you can communicate with us via soc@greenparty.org.uk and we will have someone in attendance as much as possible throughout the conference to give advice, accept speaker slips and advise on emergency motions and procedures.

Committee Elections

Elections will take place at this Conference for vacancies on committees elected at Autumn Conference. The vacancies were notified in advance and nomination and hustings procedures have been completed as agreed by a resolution to Annual Conference 2020. The vacancies for election are as follows:

5 places on Campaigns Committee

5 places on Standing Orders Committee

5 places on International Committee

5 places on Dispute Resolution Committee

5 Places on Equality and Diversity Committee

Voting is open until 4pm on Sunday and results will be announced at the end of the Sunday session. For information on voting in these elections please contact the ERO at ero@greenparty.org.uk

Submission of Emergency Motions – deadlines at conference

There will be Emergency Motion slots at the end of the Saturday and Sunday sessions but there is no guarantee that any emergency motions will be heard in these slots. Emergency motions must deal with items that have arisen since 3rd September and be motions which could not have been brought before that date. They require 50 signatures or co–proposers. The deadline for handing signed emergency motions to SOC for discussion on Sunday will be 6pm on the Saturday. Emergency motions may be submitted before the start of Conference. Emergency Motion texts have to be agreed by a member of SOC as falling within the requirements.

Emergency Motions can be submitted via the agenda forum space on the members website. and you will be able to access and propose them [here \[link\]](#) The more members' 'likes' on the agenda space you obtain the more likelihood there is of it being discussed in your desired slot. The maximum word count is 250 words.

Section H(1)(b) of the Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conferences (SOCC) states:

- b) Emergency motions shall only be accepted provided
 - i) the issue has arisen, or has substantially changed, since the deadline for Late Motions; an explicit commentary must be provided by the lead proposer which explains why the issue is an emergency including evidence that the issue has arisen or has substantially changed since the deadline.
 - ii) the motion is consistent with PSS (Policies for a Sustainable Society) and neither changes nor adds to the text of the PSS
 - iii) the motion has been proposed by a minimum of 50 individual members
 - iv) the motion is no longer than 250 words
- c) No amendments to the Constitution or Standing Orders are permitted
- d) An emergency motion shall not:

Commit the Party to expenditure of more than one hundred pounds without the approval of the relevant budget holders
Or significantly alter the party's agreed strategy.

Agenda Preparation and SOC motions or amendments

Once again Agenda Preparation was affected by the difficulties that many members encounter in using the member website for proposing or commenting on potential motions. The old site automatically listed the motions being proposed and created a new stream for comment on each, whilst the current one requires a volunteer to list the motions, and all motions and their comments are in one stream. Our thanks to Adam, a former member of SOC, for carrying out this work. The current site requires a higher level of computer familiarity for members to use than the previous one, takes several clicks to achieve entry, and the search facility is hiding in a blank space next to the bell on the top line. It is not clear who can moderate comments on the Pre-Agenda.

The process for submission of motions to SOC was slightly changed this time by using a Survey Monkey form rather than an in-house webform, allowing for easier access from a mobile phone. Use of email means SOC and staff may have to check dozens of memberships, whereas going via the website checks membership directly, and due to lack of volunteer and staff time we agreed not to accept email submission. We provided both a word and a pdf version of the First Agenda which was appreciated by several members. We have advised those who felt disadvantaged by the process to address their concerns to GPEx and to request involvement in the redesign of the member website.

SOC motions to Conference

SOC have brought one motion to this conference. This is to require members to have been members for 2 years before they put themselves forward for SOC. This is to ensure that members have had more time to experience Conference and the Agenda process as members before they apply.

Timetabling, chairing, elections and other procedural matters affecting Conference with the recommendations of SOC

There are to be four long plenaries, each with a short break in the middle.

Plenary One (Saturday a.m) will take A motions and fast-tracked motions.

Plenary Two (Saturday p.m) will take the single B motion, D motions and in the last 15 minutes, one Extraordinary Motion and (if time) the Late Motion.

Plenary Three (Sunday a.m) will take remaining A motions, C motions and (if time) one E motion.

Plenary Four (Sunday) will take remaining C motions, remaining D motions and (if none taken in Plenary Three) at least one E motion. In the last 15 minutes, it will take one or more Extraordinary Motions

The ballot result of January 2019 required the Transition Team to progress the introduction of electronic voting to conference. This required amendments to the constitution or Standing Orders but none were brought and the resignation of the Transition Team halted progress on this. Covid-19 led to SOC having to consider how to run a conference using secure online and telephone voting. SOC therefore brought some minor changes to Standing Orders to Annual Conference as Motion A02. We have retained the current proxy system for non-attending members, and this aspect has caused the most difficulty and will cause delays. We ask for your patience. For this conference, very luckily, there are fewer amendments than usual. We are trialling new systems of voting for the Extraordinary Conference. SOC's aim is to allow members who wish to vote on Agenda items to do so. Trying to do this within our existing Conference structure, such as 5 proxies per person attending, is complex and will cause time delays at any online conference. Trials of technology have been carried out to iron out some problems, but others remain. We ask participants to be patient.

Speaking at Conference

Speakers should fill in an online speaker slip. Details will be provided online [here \[link\]](#) and must be submitted before the motion is proposed and discussed, not during the debate. If you are not accessing Conference online then you can request to speak by email to soc@greenparty.org.uk. It will also be possible to request to speak on Zoom via the "Q&A" function but speaker slips may be given priority. If you have a disability issue that affects your ability to speak within the guidance time, then please state this on your speaker slip or use the Inclusion Card system.

If speaking, then please give your name and local party first and ensure you mute and unmute your microphone as swiftly as possible if this is not done for you. We are allowing the following guidance times for speakers:

- 5 mins for proposing a motion or amendment
- 3 mins for speaking to a motion or amendment, or for right of reply.

A host screen with a countdown clock should be visible if you are online and in the correct View. At the end of this period you will be prompted to finish although the times are guidance and are not obligatory.

Some conferences ago we trialled “Procedural Motion Cards” for Procedural Motions, Points of Information, and Points of Order. Feedback on this was not positive. For the online Conference we are trialling new methods of doing this electronically. Inclusion Cards and Procedural Motions can be put without having submitted a Speaker Slip.

Changes to our Standing Orders

At its meeting on 12 July 2020, SOC agreed a change in its Standing Orders to state, “A ruling by SOC on the constitution, bylaws and Standing Orders made under the constitution, made in response to a request, will be published by SOC on the members’ website within 7 days of being supplied to the person who requested the ruling.” Previously, rulings were supplied to a requester, but were usually only published to members in the Final Agenda for Conference.

Organisational Statements from RoOS (Record of Organisational Statements, or minutes of Conference)

The Autumn 2019 states:

Standing Orders Committee to undertake:

1. To update and maintain the Record of Organisational Statements (RoOS)
 - We updated RoOs in Autumn 2019 and created a new Green Space for it at <https://spaces.greenparty.org.uk/s/roos/>
2. To ensure that the annual ballots for the Green Party Executive (GPEX) and the Policy Development Committee (PDC) are well publicised and fully engaged with by the membership as per the instructions given by Autumn Conference 2018. Green Party Spring Conference 2019 Outcomes.”
 - We delegated Doug Rouxel to work with the Returning Officer and Deputy Returning Officer to increase publicity by way of the member website and the member newsletters.
3. To ensure that its appointee to the role of ERO takes their role in overseeing the conduct of the elections seriously and takes an active role in responding to complaints and concerns raised about conduct during elections. Green Party Spring Conference 2019 Outcomes.
 - SOC approved a new ERO Manual to assist with this. A large number of complaints and concerns were raised during the 2020 Annual Ballot and House of Lords procedures. The RO has actively replied to these and has sought SOC advice when necessary. The RO has also made recommendations to SOC for changes to the regulations to prevent future complaints. The changes relate to candidates being asked to make pledges.
4. To insert three clauses passed in D01 Autumn 2018 ‘Facilitating Incorporation of the GPEW’ into the constitution “when the MAA have been agreed and the transfer happens”.

- The MAA were agreed, but no transfer has happened.
5. Together with the continuing Transition Team, the party lawyers and appropriate others to find a way to finish the implementation of the changes recommended in the Holistic Review and bring it to a future conference.
 - The ballot result of January 2019 required a new constitution that would introduce changes approved by the ballot but leave other constitutional provisions substantially the same. The Transition Team tasked with overseeing the process brought forward proposals to Spring and Autumn 2019 but substantial parts were ruled Out of Order by SOC. One major reason was non-compliance with the ballot. SOC is required to declare a motion out of order if it: “seeks to overturn, or fundamentally amend, the result of a party-wide ballot held under the provisions of clause 13(ii) or clause 20 (ii) of the Constitution, or to initiate a new party-wide ballot seeking to do so, within two years of the result of the original ballot being announced.” GPRC were tasked by Conference in Autumn 2019 with bringing together the Transition Team, the Party lawyer and SOC to resolve some issues. Record of Organisational Statements (RoOS, or minutes of Conference) also stated:

Constitutional committee established by GPRC and/or GPEX to undertake:

In November 2019, perhaps at a Constitutional assembly, agree an In Order text to submit to Pre-Agenda for Spring Conference 2020 by the required date.” The snap GE of Autumn 2019 intervened, followed by resignation of the Transition Team and then Covid-19. No constitutional committee was established, there was no Spring Conference, and no text has been brought to this Conference. Members of GPEX, GPRC and SOC met informally online earlier in 2020 to discuss a way forward. January 4th 2021 ends the two-year requirement to comply with the ballot and it was agreed that given Covid-19 and the demands on the agenda for Autumn Conference, attempts to introduce a new constitution would be postponed until after that date.

Other matters or recommendations that do not affect the running of this conference

- a. Proxies. SOC recommends that in any new constitutional documents, the 5 per person limit be reconsidered for online conferences and a different proxy system be designed for online conferences.
- b. Framework Oversight Body. The resolution in Spring 2019 to establish a Framework Oversight Body to oversee documentation within a Framework for Ethics and Conduct named the SOC Convenor as a member of that Body and the CEO as Convenor of it. The Body’s constitutional basis is that it has been established by Conference as a working group responsible to Conference, as was the Framework Development Group and Transition Team. SOC made several attempts to have this Body established but it was only convened for the first time in August 2020. This has meant a long delay in establishing an up-to-date database for reference by Disciplinary Committee and Appeals

- Committee and in ensuring all relevant documents are easily available to members on the member website in a suitable form and within a Framework. The Governance Assistant is now assisting with this ongoing work and we recommend that the member website redesign take it into account.
- c. We recommend that in the ongoing member website redesign GPEX recognises the difficulties that members have encountered with the Agenda process for the past three conferences and that the design process seeks to overcome these and involves past SOC members and those who have difficulty with accessing the site, such as those with disabilities or lower levels of computer familiarity, in the design process.
 - d. We recommend that GPEX, if it is not possible to make the webform submission process more accessible via the member website, puts in place staff support to assist SOC in dealing with email proposals and co-proposals so that we can return to using email. We also recommend that GPEX and Internal Communications put in place additional promotion for internal elections in order to raise participation rates, which were low this year.
 - e. We recommend that the next SOC seeks to improve the webform for submission of motions, whether using an outside provider or designed in-house, in three ways:
 1. to make it easier for members to go straight to the section where they know that they wish to promote a motion
 2. to clarify to users the impact of filling in the form more than once (e.g. that proposing a second motion from a second completion of the form will not invalidate a previous proposal of a different motion)
 3. to find a way to return to separation of the main proposer from the co-proposers, as before.
 - f. We recommend that the next SOC in the Pre-Agenda process numbers motions on the Pre-Agenda if all of the possible motions continue to be listed in one stream on the member website. This has been requested by members.
 - g. In early 2020, we revised the Policy Process Presentation to match the new member website. This is at <https://members.greenparty.org.uk/node/59>. We recommend that the incoming SOC ensures that this is updated promptly by appropriate people if the member website changes again.
 - h. We agreed a new edition of the SOC Handover Manual (Handbook) during the year for our successors.

Internal Elections Autumn 2019, Spring 2020 and Summer 2020

The results of the Autumn Conference elections were announced at the end of Autumn Conference 2019. An error was made by SOC and the RO as a valid nomination to Green World Editorial Board was overlooked. The list of who had been elected was published soon after Conference by SOC in its space at <https://spaces.greenparty.org.uk/s/soc/?contentId=19025> and the full ballot details were then published by staff at <https://members.greenparty.org.uk/node/127>.

Disciplinary Committee: Nicole Griffiths

Standing Orders Committee: Emma Chan, Alan Borgars, Claire Nash, Doug Rouxel, Tim Kiely

International Committee: Mirka Virtanen, Sam Murray, Louis Williams, Evelyn Leslie, John Street

Disputes Resolution Committee: Adam Clarke, Marisa Johnson, Wendy Armour, Nick Barnett
 Conferences Committee: Jenny Vernon, Peaceful Warrior, Tom Milburn, David Newman

Equality & Diversity Committee: Claudine Letsae, Richard Firth

The casual vacancies to be filled at Spring Conference 2020 as notified to SOC by the Returning Officer were:

5 vacancies on Green World Editorial Board, 1 vacancy on Disputes Resolution Committee, 2 vacancies on Conferences Committee, 5 vacancies on Campaigns Committee. As the Spring Conference 2020 was cancelled, the vacancies on DRC and CC could be filled by co-option, but as there were no member of GWEB or Campaigns Committee, there was nobody who could clearly co-opt to fill these. The procedure for accepting nominations for GWEB was subsequently agreed (see Rulings) and the vacancies were filled.

Annual Ballot 2020 Results

The ballot closed on 31st August and the results were announced on September 9 2020. 23 postal ballots were accepted which arrived after 31st August but were posted prior to that (see Rulings).

The total electorate for Leadership, GPEX and Policy Development Committee elections was 47,691 a total of 7,503 ballots were cast giving a turnout of 16%.

The House of Lords election included members of The Green Party of Northern Ireland. The total electorate was 48,283 a total of 6,721 ballots were cast giving a turnout of 14%.

Members can download full details of the turnout and votes cast for each candidate on the members' website at <https://members.greenparty.org.uk/your-vote-counts/internal-elections-2020/election-results>

The turnout was disappointingly low despite SOC compiling a handbook for the ERO which outlined the approach which SOC expected to see in the promotion of the internal elections. Members of SOC followed up with the relevant people within the party to see how this would be implemented, but were not given sight of a comprehensive the plan for electoral engagement which we have liked to have seen.

SOC would like to thank the ERO and the Deputy ERO for all of their hard work on this and previous elections. As of this conference both of these roles will be vacant and going out to advert, so if you are interested in taking on the role then you should contact SOC on SOC@GreenParty.org.uk.

House of Lords nominee

1. Molly Scott Cato
2. Amelia Womack
3. Rupert Read
4. Andrew Cooper

Leader: Jonathan Bartley & Sian Berry (job share)
Deputy Leader: Amelia Womack
Campaigns Co-ordinator: Britta Goodman
Chair: Liz Reason
Elections Co-Ordinator: Kai Taylor & Claire Stephenson (job share)
External Communications Co-Ordinator: Molly Scott Cato
International Co-Ordinator: Claudine Letsae
Management Co-Ordinator: Matthew Browne & Florence Pollock (job share)
Policy Development Co-Ordinator: Vix Lowthion
Publications Co-Ordinator: Julia Lagoutte
Trade Union Liaison Officer: Kefentse Dennis
Policy Development Committee: Andrea Dexter, Natalia Waring, David Carlyon, Mick Gregg and Edward Gildea

ERO Report 2020

Martin Hemingway (ERO), Sara Dryden (DERO)

As with so many things this year Covid 19 had a significant effect on the national elections, and led to changes in procedure that will almost certainly alter current practice.

The major concern about the elections was the low turnout of voters. Although postal voters did not show a higher rate of return, the Party should consider whether to explore using an external provider such as the Electoral Reform Society (ERS) to administer a completely postal ballot.

One clear factor was the difficulty many members found in accessing the system, with many requests for help, particularly in the last few days, most of which the DERO could resolve, but which took up considerable time for both of us. The seriousness of this problem has been highlighted by comments on social media following the results. Complicating access were membership details that were sometimes inaccurate, which is a separate issue that need to be addressed by the Party Office

Weekly reminders were sent after the initial circulation of ballot papers together with additional last minute reminders. This in itself may be an issue, with overload and members no longer opening e-mails from the Party. It might be worth looking at using regional and local parties to encourage participation through their local networks.

The fall in turnout as the ballot paper continued probably reflects the number of elections and the number of candidates.

The biggest innovation was the use of Zoom hustings organised both nationally, and by regional parties and some other party groups. This meant candidates for the leadership positions did not have to travel around the country visiting regional hustings, but also broadened the roles for which hustings could be held beyond Leader and Deputy Leader. I cannot anticipate that demand for such hustings will decline, and the number of these needs to be managed more strictly in

future elections.

The most striking positive was the large number of members coming forward to fill roles. This was most striking with Policy Development Committee where the three candidates for five places in 2019, became eleven candidates in 2020. One can hope that this will lead to a strong GPEx, which, linked to a focussed GPRC promises well for the future.

Various issues arose during the campaign, and pressure was put on the ERO/DERO by various candidates. While there were no reports this year of local or regional parties promoting local candidates, candidates had repeatedly to be stopped from attending and speaking at meetings outside their own local party, or seeking to publicise themselves through other Party channels. Most of the concerns related to candidates already in elected positions. The position can be eased in future by making candidates individually responsible for their actions.

There has been increased use of questionnaires by various groups. Not all of these referred their questions to the ERO for checking, some did not allow nuanced answers to be given – the same applied in at least one hustings – and this will be clarified in future regulations. Party groups must also be aware of the demands on candidate time in the number of questions asked and in the detail expected.

One issue the Party may need to address in the interests of justice relates to section 8(iv) of the Constitution which requires that in the event of a single Leader being elected, then the two Deputy Leaders be “two individuals of a different gender”. In this election three of the five candidates for Deputy Leader identified as female and came in the first three places, with the candidate placed third polling more first preference votes than the other two candidates combined, and the candidate placed second polling more than three times as many as these two.

There will be a full review of the regulations for national elections, and the ERO/DERO welcome contributions, comments and proposals in relation to this.

Results of National Elections 2020 with an indication of first preference votes gained:

An asterisk (*) indicates ‘elected’. The election for Policy Development Committee was run twice with Vix Lowthion, as elected Policy development Co-ordinator, excluded on the second run.

ROLE	CANDIDATE NAME	FIRST PREFERENCE VOTES
HOUSE OF LORDS	Molly Scott Cato*	3185
ORDERED LIST	Amelia Womack	1988
	Rupert Read	935
	Andrew Cooper	584
LEADER	Sian Berry/Jonathan Bartley*	3600
	Rosi Sexton	1978
	Shahrar Ali	1735
DEPUTY LEADER	Amelia Womack*	3006
	Cleo Lake	2153
	Andrea Carey Fuller	684
	Tom Pashby	309
	Nick Humberstone	282
GPEX CHAIR	Liz Reason*	1596
	Ewan Jones	1034
	Adrian Spurrell	947
	Ashley Routh/Benjamin Smith	633
CAMPAIGNS CO-ORDINATOR	Britta Goodman*	1878
	Hannah Graham	1632
	Daniel Laycock	727
ELECTIONS CO-ORDINATOR	Kai Taylor/Claire Stephenson*	1044
	Zoe Nicholson	1038
	Laurie Needham/Joe Levy	685
	Louis Williams	621
EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS CO-ORDINATOR	Molly Scott Cato*	2810
	Peter Underwood	865
INTERNATIONAL CO-ORDINATOR	Claudine Letsae*	1425
	Alice Hubbard/Sam Murray	1070
	Alex Horn/Erwin Schaefer	460
	Frank Sheridan	386
MANAGEMENT CO-ORDINATOR	Matthew Browne/Florence Pollock*	2122
	Richard Bearman	1015
POLICY DEVELOPMENT CO-ORDINATOR	Vix Lowthion*	1438
	Mick Gregg	632
	Peter Sims/Sam Alston	591
	Liam McClelland	502

ROLE	CANDIDATE NAME	FIRST PREFERENCE VOTES
PUBLICATIONS CO-ORDINATOR	Julia Lagoutte*	1740
	Jack Lenox	1111
	Danny Keeling	240
TRADE UNION LIAISON OFFICER	Kefentse Dennis*	1702
	Theo Simon	957
	Matthew Hull/Paul Valentine	748
POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	(Vix Lowthion)	(852)
COMMITTEE	Andrea Dexter*	639
	Natalia Waring*	532
	David Carlyon*	276
	Edward Gildea*	232
	Mick Gregg*	183
	Martin Osborne	123
	Robert Beggs	66
	Martin Blake	66
	Luke Balnave	61
	Nick Bowett	20

* Footnote: The Prioritisation Order for C (Accredited) and E (Unaccredited) policy motions as prioritised together in the ballot was:

- C1 Deforestation
- C2 Car and vans to go zero carbon by 2030
- E1. Wildlife & Habitats Policy Enabling Motion
- C3 Ban on advertising of high-carbon goods and services
- E2 Atonement and Reparative justice for the transatlantic traffic in enslaved Africans
- E3 A package of transport measures to respond to the coronavirus crisis
- C4 The 2019 General Election Manifesto and Climate Change Mitigation
- C5 Adopt the Principle of Rationing to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions Arising from Travel, Amending the Climate Emergency and the Transport Chapters of PSS
- C6 Updating the philosophical basis to reflect doughnut economics
- E4. Environmental Education learning entitlements
- E5 Staying close to the single market
- E6 Self Declaration of Gender
- C7 Animal Rights: Fireworks; limit use and quiet
- E7 Teach British Sign Language in schools

Then remaining E motions in same order as in the Final Agenda.

Rulings requested and made since the Previous Conference

Please note that Standing Orders Committee rulings are not retrospective as such, but as the documents on which they are based were already in existence then decisions based on those documents may be challenged in the light of a ruling.

Several ruling requests have related to the powers of GPEx to over-rule disciplinary decisions. SOC's response to these has followed previous rulings given by SOC and accepted by Conference. It remains the view of SOC that under the constitution and Standing Orders, GPEx has no right to set aside disciplinary decisions by Disciplinary Committee or Appeals. It has been queried whether decisions are automatically void, if there is evidence that they were not taken in accordance with Standing Orders. The situation with regard to what happens if disciplinary decisions may be void because they have not been made in accordance with the constitution and Standing Orders is not clear in Standing Orders. SOC has taken the view that as the constitution and SOPD are silent on this then it is for Conference to consider during the Complaints Manager Report and the Disciplinary Committee Report whether any action can be taken to clarify the situation by amendment.

SOC rulings take time as we need to study past rulings or case law, check all relevant documents and sometimes previous versions of them, deliberate and often re-write and re-deliberate. We rushed the following ruling (0) through because

a quick answer was wanted, and in doing so made an error as we allowed ourselves to be waylaid by the framing of the question. We therefore ask Conference's permission to amend the following ruling for SN which says 'co-option' when it should say 'appointment'.

O. Ruling for SN on GPEX appointments to DC

SN asked:

The North–East region has a co–opted member (from London) on the Disciplinary Committee as their representative, which occurred as a result of the NE rep resigning in September 2019 and no–one in the NE region volunteering to take on the role. The current co–optee was co–opted by GPEX in January 2020 and informed by the then–Governance Manager at the time. The regional co–ordinator confirmed their acceptance of that person to be their co–opted DC rep prior to GPEX cooption. Following elections in the NE region, and a change of regional coordinators, there are new interested individuals from the NE who wish to apply to be the NE DC rep, via formal election. It appears there is dissatisfaction with a non–regional person being their co–opted rep now there are locals who wish to undertake the role (as well as deep appreciation for the work undertaken by that co–optee). I therefore respectfully request a ruling from SOC, on whether the co–option is for a full term, if there is regional desire to hold a formal election and appoint their own person please? If not, what is the process for that co–optee to vacate the role?

The constitution and standing orders state the following on the co–option and election of members of the Disciplinary Committee:

In the constitution:

“4 x) There shall be a Disciplinary Committee, elected to handle all complaints of a disciplinary nature which have not been resolved at Regional or Local Party level. The committee will comprise eleven members, one member from each region, one from the Wales Green Party and a member elected biennially at the autumn conference. The term of office will be two years.”

In the Standing Orders for Party Discipline:

“2.2 The members of the Committee are elected to serve for a two year period.

- i) Each GPEW region and the nation of Wales should elect one member to the Committee.
- ii) Annual Conference should elect one member to the Committee.
- iii) If fewer than eleven members are elected by the Regions, the nation of Wales and the Annual Conference then GPEX shall appoint the remaining members.”

The constitution states that the term of office for Disciplinary Committee will be two years. The Standing Orders further clarify this to state that committee members are elected for 2 years. In addition to this, section 2.2 i and ii make it clear that elections to the post are the preferred process. e.g. “should elect one member”.

SOC rules as follows:

The cooption of candidates is not for a full 2 year term, and their cooption lasts from the point of cooption until such a time that the role is handed over to a properly elected member either by conference, the relevant region, or Wales. The region should advise GPEX that they are carrying out elections and of the timetable for this, so that GPEX can advise their cooptee. The hand over will take place following the next meeting of DC after the election is completed to ensure continuity in the role. If a member has been coopted and the relevant region or conference is unable to elect a member of DC within a period of two years from that point then the coopted member will end their term and GPEX will go through the process of cooption again.

SOC requests permission of Conference to reissue this ruling as:

SOC rule that the appointment of candidates is not for a full 2 year term, and their appointment lasts from the point of appointment until such a time that the role is handed over to a properly elected member either by conference, the relevant region, or Wales. The region should advise GPEX that they are carrying out elections and of the timetable for this, so that GPEX can advise their appointee. The hand over will take place following the next meeting of DC after the election is completed to ensure continuity in the role. If a member has been appointed and the relevant region or conference is unable to elect a member of DC within a period of two years from that point then the appointed member will end their term and GPEX will go through the process of appointment again.

We do not usually supply a list of rulings but due to high demand and no Spring Conference, there are more than usual, so this is a reference list:

1. Ruling for JC September 9 on reviewing Appeals and DC decisions
2. Ruling for RC September 9 on filling Equalities and Diversity vacancies
3. Ruling for SA September 2 on deadlines for postal ballots in annual ballot
4. Ruling for PV (4 rulings) on
 - a. who can dismiss a complaint,
 - b. substitution for Chair of GPEX
 - c. power of GPEX to overturn disciplinary decisions
 - d. when Appeals decisions take effect
5. Ruling/advice for PU on holding online Appeals meetings
6. Ruling for AS August 12 on voting requirements for no–fault suspension
7. Ruling for AF and MH August 4 on Project Together and GPRC working groups
8. Ruling/advice for MSC on External Communication Co–ordinator post

9. Ruling for AMG on July 7th on whether a body rather than a person can be Respondent

10. Ruling for MH on Incorporation

11. Ruling for DR re. GPEx powers with respect to disciplinary matters

12. Ruling for RG (3 rulings)

a. on GPEx powers

b. on co-options to GPEx

c. on GPEx papers and proceedings

13. Ruling for LL on membership of DC

14. Ruling for LG on staff standing for election

15. Ruling for MH (2 rulings) on Deputy Chair

Also rulings made prior to Spring Conference:

16. Ruling for DRC on returning to committee posts beyond maximum term

17. Ruling for EJH on Disciplinary Committee rulings

18. Ruling for a member of GPRC on House of Lords nominee selection process

19. Ruling for SA on House of Lords appointment

20. Ruling for BH on Election Campaign Material Publication

There is one outstanding ruling request, on which SOC has been unable to reach agreement, on whether a Complainant member who leaves the Party can continue to be Complainant.

1. Ruling for JC September 9 on reviewing Appeals and DC decisions

JC asked:

1. Can the GPRC Appeals Committee review and vary a decision it has taken on an appeal?

2. Can Disciplinary Committee review and vary a disciplinary decision it has taken?

Constitution 4x) "There shall be a Disciplinary Committee, elected to handle all complaints of a disciplinary nature which have not been resolved at Regional or Local Party level."

Constitution 4xii) "Members have the right to appeal to the Green Party's Regional Council's Appeals Subcommittee against decisions of the Disciplinary Committee" [on specified grounds]

Constitution 4 xiv): "The Disciplinary Committee and all appeals against it considered by the GPRC Appeals sub-committee shall be governed by Standing Orders for Party Discipline, which can only be amended by a simple majority conference."

Constitution 20 iii) "No amendment to the Constitution shall be retrospective in nature/effect."

SOPD 7.10 "The Appeals Committee appeal decision shall be final and binding and not subject to further appeal."

SOPD 6.16 regarding the Disciplinary Committee "The

Committee's decision as regards any disciplinary measure shall have immediate effect (subject to any deferral direction in the case of suspension) and be final and binding subject only to the Respondent's right of appeal to GPRC."

SOPD 7.10 makes it clear that under Standing Orders a decision by Appeals is final and binding, and therefore Appeals cannot vary its own decision. 6.16 makes it clear that a decision by DC cannot be varied by DC itself, as it has immediate effect and is final and binding subject only to appeal to GPRC (whose rights have been delegated to Appeals Committee).

The requirement 'final and binding' means that neither Appeals nor DC can, of their own accord, vary a decision that they have made. Appeals Committee can review and vary decisions by DC, but it cannot require or give consent for DC to review or vary a DC decision. Both bodies can of their own accord review whether a supposed decision of theirs was void because it was not an actual decision i.e. it was taken by those entitled to vote, on matters that they were entitled to decide, at a quorate meeting that was validly called. They can also review whether a decision they took was constitutional.

The question then is whether a 'higher body' can order Appeals Committee or DC to review and/or vary decisions they have made. Conference has delegated DC and GPRC Appeals Committee to manage disciplinary processes for complaints which have not been resolved at Regional or Local Party level and appeals on behalf of The Party as a whole. Conference is the supreme forum of the Party and the powers it confers on DC and Appeals Committee in Constitution 4x) and 4xi) are subject to Constitution 4 xiv). If there were cases where DC or Appeals decisions had not been governed by the relevant version of SOPD then this should be brought to the attention of Conference in the Complaints Manager Report. Conference could then decide whether it can order Appeals or DC to review a decision because it was taken contrary to Constitution 4xiv).

2. Ruling for RC September 9 on filling Equalities and Diversity vacancies

Rachel Collinson, one of the London reps on GPRC, requested a ruling on the following:

"In the case where:

a) no members of the Equality and Diversity Committee are in post because they have neither been appointed nor elected; and

b) the Equality and Diversity Co-ordinator is either not contactable, or not in post

...what constitutional methods could be used to rectify this situation? Whose responsibility would it be to co-opt or organise the election / appointment of people to the committee?" Constitution:

19 i) There shall be a Green Party Equalities & Diversity Committee (hereafter called the Equalities & Diversity Committee) which shall be convened by the Equalities & Diversity Co-ordinator.

19ii) The Equalities & Diversity Committee shall include 5

members elected by Annual Conference with vacancies filled by election or by co-opt to be ratified at an intervening conference.

In this case, the committee currently has no elected members and therefore no members other than any that fall under 19iii) "The Equalities & Diversity Committee shall also include a representative of each group that is recognised as a Members Working Group by the Equalities & Diversity Committee."

Under 19ii) "vacancies filled by election" it is not specified that election to vacancies can only take place at a conference. It would therefore be possible for the ERO to hold by-elections with the consent of the Treasurer.

Under 19iii) it is not clear if any additional representative members of the committee who may have been appointed by groups are voting or non-voting members. SOC cannot find any Standing Orders for the committee. If they are voting members, they would be able to co-opt five people to replace the elected members until the next election, but only if convened.

Under 19i) there is no provision in the constitution to convene the committee if the Equalities and Diversity Co-ordinator is absent or not in post. The phrase "shall be convened by the Equalities & Diversity Co-ordinator" means that the constitution is not silent. The co-ordinator would not need to be present or to participate, but the committee would have to be convened in their name and with their consent.

If the post is vacant, then under 7xvi) "In the event of casual vacancy for a GPEX Chair or a Co-ordinator post a replacement shall be appointed in an acting and non-voting capacity by the Party Executive until the next ballot is held."

SOC ruling:

If the post holder cannot be contacted and is neglecting their duties, which are to ensure that the needs of the Party are being met in their own area of responsibility, to report to Conference on equalities, and to convene the committee, then GPEX should suspend them under 7xiii) to create a casual vacancy and then implement 7xvi) above, or GPRC should recall them under 6x) "By a two-thirds majority of its voting membership the Regional Council may recall the GPEX Chair or a Co-ordinator post holder, who shall be under suspension until a new ballot has been held for that post at a date to be determined by the Regional Council."

3. Ruling for SA September 2 on deadlines for postal ballots in annual ballot

SA asked:

The ERO is delaying the count for the annual ballot by 9 days, it appears that this is on the basis that he considers ballots being posted on the 31st August still to be valid. Can SOC rule if this is a correct interpretation of the constitution and standing orders, or if the count can be moved forward and only consider the ballot papers received up to the end of the day on 31st August.

Constitution

"9iii) Voting shall close on receipt of the last post on the last week-day of August or five week-days before the start of the Autumn conference, whichever is the sooner.

17 iv) SOC shall be the final authority for the interpretation of the regulations, and within that interpretation the decision of the RO shall be final."

Election Regulations 2011 approved by Conference, on which current regulations are based:

"Deadline for Receipt of Ballot Papers: after the last post on Wednesday August 31st 2011."

Election Regulations 2020

"Deadline for Receipt of Ballot Papers: last post on Friday 31st August 2018"

"The counting of any postal ballot will take place as soon as convenient after the published deadline for receipt of ballot papers. In extreme circumstances the ERO may accept ballot papers returned after this deadline and/or authorise a delay to the count."

"The ERO shall determine the timetable, subject to the requirements of the constitution. The counting of any postal ballot will take place as soon as convenient after the published deadline for receipt of ballot papers. In extreme circumstances the ERO may accept ballot papers returned after this deadline and/or authorise a delay to the count."

Ballot papers sent out to members for the annual ballot 2020 said:

"Voting Closes

Online: Monday 31 August at 10pm

Post: Last post Monday 31 August"

Election Regulations 2011 approved by Conference and also Election Regulations 2020

"Subject to the additional regulations below, the method of election and count shall follow the guidelines set down in How to Conduct an Election by the Single Transferable Vote, 3rd edition, published by the Electoral Reform Society of Great Britain and Northern Ireland."

SOC Ruling:

The words "last post" in the constitution are ambiguous. It is not clear if they refer to the last post posted at a postbox by a member, or to the last delivery of post containing that ballot to an office. That is, 9iii) can be interpreted as either:

9iii) Voting shall close on receipt of, "the last post on the last week-day of August", meaning the last post put in a postbox on that weekday.

or as:

9iii) Voting shall close on "receipt of the last post", on the last week-day of August, meaning the last postal delivery to an office on that weekday.

SOC rules that regarding the ballot deadline the constitution

and regulations are ambiguous and that under Constitution 17iv) the ERO can interpret the constitution and regulations if SOC and Conference have not provided clear guidance. Some previous SOC's and EROs have interpreted 9iii) as meaning the last post received on August 31st (or last weekday). In 2019 and 2020, the ERO has interpreted it as meaning the last post posted by members on August 31st. The deadline accepted by Conference in 2011 was "after the last post" on 31st August which implies that a later deadline may have been envisaged by Conference.

SOC will seek to have the clause clarified in the constitution and in future regulations dependent on the constitution.

Regarding the acceptance of ballot papers after 31st August, the wording provided to members in 2020 is that voting closes with the "last post" Monday 31st August, which is ambiguous. The ERO is of the opinion that he should accept all ballots despatched prior to 31st. SOC rules that the wording provided to members should not have been ambiguous, but that to then deprive members of their vote because they took it to mean that they could despatch their vote by post up until the 31st August, would be an extreme action and so extreme circumstances apply.

Regarding the date for counting of the ballot, the constitution does not directly cover the ballot. The ERO has taken the view that, due to Covid-19, items posted prior to 31st August may arrive as late as 4th September, and that also Covid-19 has affected the working practices of the DERO and the Party Office. The regulations say: "The counting of any postal ballot will take place as soon as convenient after the published deadline for receipt of ballot papers." It is for the ERO to decide when is convenient. How to Conduct an Election by the Single Transferable Vote, 3rd edition, also does not lay down when the count shall take place.

4. (a) Ruling for PV regarding Clause 4xii of the Constitution

PV asked:

After a decision by the Disciplinary Committee has been upheld on appeal, can clause 4.xii of the Constitution still apply? i.e. can the stated people still dismiss a complaint?

4x) of the constitution says: "There shall be a Disciplinary Committee, elected to handle all complaints of a disciplinary nature which have not been resolved at Regional or Local Party level."

Clause 4xii) of the constitution says: "Complaints may be dismissed by the collective agreement of the Chair of GPEX, the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee and the senior manager of the GPEW whose job description specifies the processing of complaints, if they fall outside the terms set out in section 4 part xi above."

This group "may" dismiss (i.e. decide that it is not a disciplinary complaint). However, under Standing Orders for Party Discipline (SOPD), the Referral Group is also given powers to dismiss a complaint. Referral Group includes the Chair of Disciplinary Committee (DC) but not the Chair of

GPEX, and is advised by the Senior Manager who processes complaints but does not include that Senior Manager. SOPD is subject to the constitution, but says:

SOPD 1.5 The Referral Group shall be made up of the Chair of the Committee (or their Deputy), a Co-Chair of GPRC and the Convenor of Disputes Resolution Committee (or their Deputy).

SOPD 1.6 The Referral Group will consider whether a complaint has been brought on one of the grounds specified in 1.2 and decide whether it should be referred to the Committee, to another appropriate body or be dismissed.

In practice, it appears that the group in Clause 4xiii) have not been dismissing complaints since the Referral Group was established, although their right remains in the constitution. Their right to consider dismissal of non-disciplinary complaints has effectively been delegated by Conference, if not formally by the group and changes to the constitution, to the Referral Group since SOPD was passed. This is because the Chair of GPEX is obliged to implement the will of Conference (SOPD as passed by Conference) as well as the constitution, and the Chair of DC is obliged to follow their Standing Orders (SOPD) as well as the constitution. Neither GPEX nor DC brought an amendment to the motion that brought in the Referral Group. In practice, it should not make any difference to DC whether it was the group in Clause 4xiii) or Referral Group that dismissed a complaint as non-disciplinary.

SOC rules as follows:

It is stated in the request that a complaint was not dismissed. It went to DC who accepted that it was a disciplinary complaint (i.e. one that could result in disciplinary action, if found to be justified) and investigated it. It went to Appeals who upheld the DC findings and did not find that DC was mistaken in treating it as a disciplinary complaint. It is not possible subsequently for the Chair of DC to agree with the Chair of GPEX, and an officer employed by GPEX to work to DC, that it was all along a non-disciplinary complaint and dismiss it.

4. (b) Ruling for PV on substitution for the Chair of GPEX

PV asked:

4xii) lists "the Chair of GPEX" as one of the people required to dismiss a complaint. If the Chair is suspended, can GPEX appoint another member to make that decision?

Constitution 4xii) "Complaints may be dismissed by the collective agreement of the Chair of GPEX, the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee and the senior manager of the..."

SOC rules as follows:

GPEX is not authorised by the constitution to appoint another member. If there is no elected Chair of GPEX then a complaint cannot be dismissed by this route. It requires the "collective agreement" of all three to dismiss it. The constitution requires GPEX to appoint another Chair if the situation is vacant but this would then be a non-voting position – 7xv) "In the event of casual vacancy for a GPEX Chair... a replacement shall be appointed in an acting and non-voting capacity by the Party Executive until the next ballot is held." A non-voting Chair

cannot be involved in a “collective agreement” as this implies a right to vote. So during a period of vacancy a complaint could not be dismissed by this route. There is an alternative route in Standing Orders for Party Discipline 1.6 (the Referral Group) for dismissing complaints which does not include the Chair of GPEX.

4. (c) Ruling for PV on overturning an Appeals or Disciplinary Committee decision

PV asked:

Are there any grounds on which GPEX as a collective can overturn a decision by the Disciplinary Committee which has been upheld on appeal?

SOPD “7.10 The Appeals Committee appeal decision shall be final and binding and not subject to further appeal.”

SOC rules as follows:

If an Appeals decision has been taken, then there is no further process within the constitution. There may be issues as to whether an apparent Appeals decision was not a decision. Although a decision is not subject to further appeal, it is open to Appeals to agree that it has not yet made a decision and to make that decision. It is also open to Conference, at the Complaints Manager Report to Conference, to consider whether the report is a correct record.

The only body authorised to overturn DC decisions is Appeals Committee. There has already been a ruling about the role of GPEX this year (Ruling for DR June 2020) and another in 2018. The authority of Appeals Committee as a committee of GPRC is conferred on it by Conference (i.e. local parties and their members) and GPRC (the regions and their members), not by GPEX whose main role is to provide staff support and budgets to the disciplinary process and to appoint to DC vacancies. GPEX have no right under the constitution to overturn an Appeals Committee or Disciplinary Committee decision. They, or any other member of the Party, can only challenge whether a decision was actually taken.

4. (d) Ruling for PV on when certain Appeals decisions take effect

PV asked:

Once a decision has been made by the Appeals Committee, does that decision take instant effect?

“SOPD 7.13 An Appeals Committee decision that itself imposes suspension or expulsion on a member shall have the effect of suspending or expelling their membership from any Party group of which they are a member and it is the Complaints Manager’s responsibility to inform the Coordinator and Secretary of the relevant groups of a decision to suspend or expel and its effect.”

SOC rules as follows:

The decision takes effect from when the Complaints Manager informs the relevant local party (“the relevant group”). Most members become members of the national party by virtue of their local party membership.

Constitution 4(ii) Membership shall be of the smallest appropriate Party. Such membership shall automatically impart membership of The Green Party, and, in each of the Regions defined in Clause 5(ii) below, membership of the appropriate Regional Party, once the national proportion of the membership has been paid.

5. Ruling/advice for PU on whether Appeals can be heard online

PU asked:

Can DC or Appeals hearings be held by Zoom or other technology?

SOPD says:

5.1 The Complaints Manager must liaise with the Committee Chair to arrange the date, time and place for the Committee to convene to consider the complaint. The venue for the Committee meeting must meet the accessibility and any other additional needs of Committee members, Complainants, Respondents and any supporting members.

5.5 Both the Respondent and the Complainant may be accompanied by another Party member to assist them in explaining their position to the Committee. A Complainant has the right to request to be able to arrive at the venue of the hearing at a different pre-arranged time to the Respondent. The Complainant also has the right to be present at a different room at the venue of the hearing, interacting with the hearing via video, audio or text-based technology as appropriate.

SOC advice:

SOPD was written with a physical venue in mind but the wording does not prevent use of a virtual venue. The Complainant watching the proceedings using video, audio or text-based technology is already mentioned. There are key requirements such as accessibility and any other additional needs and to allow the Respondent and Complainant to be accompanied by another Party member. The latter may be difficult for them to do physically at present due to coronavirus and you would need to consider how that support can be provided.

Rulings and guidance for ERO

September 2 re. closure of postal ballot

The closure date for postal ballots only should have been 28th, the last weekday, as a Bank Holiday is not a weekday. The date was advertised as 31st and it was not clear from the deadlines as published if that meant posting by or receipt by 31st. The ERO was directed to accept postal ballots posted up until 31st August.

6. Ruling for AS on GPRC votes for no-fault suspension

AS asked:

I am writing on behalf of GPRC to clarify exactly what is the correct vote required to instigate a no-fault suspension, whether accompanied by a complaint or not. You will see below various extracts from our Handbook and GPRC Standing Orders.

SOC rules as follows:

There is a difference in what the constitution says for no-fault suspension without a complaint to that with a complaint.

4 viii) paragraph one: “The Green Party Regional Council shall have the power to expel or suspend any person from membership and/or refuse membership to any person for a specified period if in its opinion it is in the Party’s interest to do so.”

4viii) paragraph two: “Where necessary to avoid or reduce the likelihood of further harm to the Party, a member under investigation may be suspended temporarily by decision of the Regional Council or those members of it empowered to act on its behalf while that takes place.”

Paragraph one covers situations with or without a complaint or investigation, paragraph two only covers temporary suspensions for the duration of an investigation. Paragraph two specifically empowers delegation not just in emergencies: Paragraph one does not specify but this does not exclude GPRC from delegating its powers if it chooses.

Standing Orders for GPRC do not delegate powers specifically, under paragraph one or two. The Handbook states: “No fault suspensions require the consensus of both co-chairs, or a majority of 3 On Call Councillors and Co-chairs, between GPRC meetings and must be ratified by GPRC at the next quarterly meeting during the Confidential Session which excludes Appeals Sub Committee members.”

As this is not a Standing Order but only a Handbook entry, the question is the status of a Handbook entry. It is not a delegation of powers under paragraph one or paragraph two of 4viii) unless there has been a resolution of GPRC delegating these powers, and this would usually have then been entered into the Standing Orders which this has not been.

Standing Orders specify when co-chairs and on-call or consultative councillors are empowered generally to act on behalf of GPRC in an emergency situation. They do not exclude the following clause being used for suspensions under paragraph one or two of Constitution 4viii).

“Standing Orders 3.10 The need to address emergency issues that arise between full Regional Council meetings may be met by means of electronic mail or telephone conference. Emergency issues shall be defined as those which, in the opinion of both Co-Chairs, if not addressed before the next full Regional Council meeting, may result in outcomes considered to be detrimental to the well-being of the Green Party. Such interim decisions shall be subject to the agreement of four out of the five following Regional Council Officers: two Co-Chairs and three Consultative Councillors. The Co-Chairs and consultative Councillors are empowered to take decisions on behalf of GPRC under these circumstances. All such decisions shall be reported to the next full Regional meeting for discussion, irrespective of agenda deadlines.”

If a member is under investigation then Constitution 4viii Paragraph two and Standing Orders 3.10 (emergency)

apply, and the vote for a temporary suspension during the investigation is “four out of five” of the co-chairs and three consultative councillors. No ratification is then required.

However, Standing Order 3.15 appears to say that 3.10 does not apply when there is no complaint:

“If, in the opinion of both Co-chairs and Emergency Councillors there is a need to suspend or expel, or refuse membership where there is no complaint this decision will be taken and will carry by simple majority.” This must refer to a full meeting of GPRC as the vote is to be taken after the co-chairs and emergency councillors have already formed their opinion.

Alternatively, if the use of 3.10 and a four out of five majority is not feasible, then the Handbook could be invoked, but a decision made in this way would need ratification.

7. (a) Ruling for AF and MH on Project Together Board

AF and MH asked:

1. What is the constitutional status of the “Project Together Board” it has been suggested it is a “working group” of GPRC?

SOC contacted GPRC to establish the status of the “board”. The reply was as follows:

“The Project Together Board is not a constituted working group of GPRC” (Adrian Spurrell of GPRC, July 25th 2020).

GPEX is entitled under the constitution to establish committees for which GPEX is answerable to members:

Constitution 7x) “The Party Executive may from time to time create such Committees as it considers necessary for the efficient conduct of its business and shall determine their terms of reference, powers, duration and composition, retaining responsibility for the conduct of such Committees and accounting for the conduct of those Committees to the Annual Conference. Any such Committee shall include at least one member of the Regional Council.”

SOC contacted the Chief Executive Officer to establish whether the board was a GPEX committee. The reply was as follows:

“The team is a group of staff and volunteers working together with approval and support of both GPEX (who approved budget for external support to the group) and GPRC who oversee the creation of the Political Strategy. If anything you might think of it as a Task-and-Finish Group e.g. a group brought together for a fixed period of time to deliver an outcome and then disband. In this instance the outcome is research and information to support both the creation of the Political Strategy and to inform approach to communication and fundraising e.g. it works with Development Committee and GPEX in this regard.”

This made it clear that the board is a group of staff and members who are working on the Political Strategy. “Task and Finish group” is not used in the constitution but describes a temporary (as opposed to standing) committee or working group whose terms of reference specify a task and a fixed duration for completion of the task. No terms of reference

for the board have been discovered in GPEX minutes. The Party Executive has created a time-limited body but this was not established as a temporary committee “for the efficient conduct of its business” under 7x) of the constitution.

Constitution 6. “Green Party Regional Council. There shall be a Green Party Regional Council which shall provide a forum for dialogue between Regions, responsible for keeping under review the general well-being of the Party and for supporting and advising the Green Party Executive, particularly on matters of political strategy.”

The Political Strategy 2018–2022 drawn up by GPEX and GPRC was published to members 09/03/2018. It was not approved by Conference and is not a constitutional document. It says: “Review processes: Clear success criteria will be identified for each strategic objective against which progress with the Strategy can be reviewed quarterly by GPEX and GPRC, and a formal review of the Strategy will take place each year after the round of local elections in May. The review will involve a joint meeting of representatives from GPEX, GPRC, AGC, Political Committee and senior paid staff. Any substantive revisions in the Strategy will require approval of GPEX and GPRC by the end of June each year.”

SOC concludes that the board has no constitutional status. Actions taken without constitutional force may be void and unenforceable. The board appears to be reviewing the Political Strategy but not in accordance with the process identified in the Political Strategy 2018–2022. The constitution states that support and advice to the Executive on matters of political strategy should come from GPRC not from unelected members and staff, although GPRC may choose to involve staff employed (by GPEX, as the Party’s employer of all staff) to work for GPRC. There is no authority for staff and unelected members to revise the political strategy without this being initiated by GPRC. One route authorised by the constitution would be for GPRC to form a working group under Standing Order 2.8.

7. (b) Ruling for AF and MH on GPRC working groups

AF and MH asked:

What decisions can GPRC working groups make, and do all decisions of GPRC working groups need to be ratified by GPRC before being implemented?

GPRC is entitled under its Standing Orders to establish working groups for which GPRC is answerable to members:

GPRC SO 2.8 “Regional Council shall create Working Groups. The composition, terms of reference, power, frequency of meetings, duration and quora shall be determined at a full meeting of Regional Council. Any member of the Green Party may be a member of such working groups. Outside experts may also be consulted.”

GPRC is responsible for the use of its powers and the carrying out of its responsibilities as set out in the constitution or granted by Conference. Working groups are usually established to carry out research and make recommendations to a parent body, rather than to take decisions. The terms of reference of each working group should specify whether the working group

has any powers to make any decisions and whether any of those decisions can be made without ratification. If the terms of reference do not specify then decisions will need ratification before implementation.

8. Ruling for MSC on External Communication

Co-ordinator

MSC asked:

Can the External Communications Co-ordinator also be a spokesperson for the Party?

SOC rules as follows:

There is nothing in the constitution to prevent the External Communication Co-ordinator from being a speaker, or to prevent speakers standing as the External Communication Co-ordinator. The constitution only says:

“xi) The Party Executive shall appoint the following posts: (c) a Panel of Speakers, who shall each be responsible for covering a designated area of policy.”

It does not say the speakers cannot be members of the Executive.

There is a code of conduct for speakers which gives the External Communications Coordinator as a line of report and oversight for the spokesperson roles. This code of conduct for speakers does not prevent a speaker also being External Communications Coordinator and has no constitutional force (it is not made under the constitution). It can be changed by GPEX without Conference endorsement and under the constitution GPEX can also appoint and remove speakers as they wish. It would be good practice to appoint another person to ‘line manage’ and support the External Communication Co-ordinator in their role as speaker and to alter the Code of Conduct accordingly, if an External Communication Co-ordinator is also a speaker.

9. Ruling for AMG July 7 on Respondent in Standing Orders for Party Discipline

AMG asked: The Standing Orders for Party Discipline state in 3.4 that a Respondent is defined as “The member against whom the complaint has been made”.

Further references to the Respondent in SOPD which imply that they are one or more individual member(s) include:

3.13 iii) “the name(s) and local party(s) of the Respondent(s)”

4.6 “To contact the Respondent the investigators may use the email, phone and postal address of the Respondent held by the Green Party membership database.”

6.3 “If the Respondent attends the Committee, the Committee will hear them in person ... If the Respondent has brought another member of the Party, to assist them in presenting their case to the Committee that other member will be permitted to assist the Respondent under the same principles that pertain with a McKenzie friend.”

Are complaints under SOPD only valid where the Respondent is one or more individual members, or may valid complaints be submitted where the Respondent is an entity that is not an individual member, such as a local or regional party; a

committee or working group at local, regional or national level; or the Green Party of England and Wales itself?

SOC response:

Section 4 part xi of the constitution states: "Complaints will be considered on the following grounds:

- a) that a member has contravened the Constitution of the Party as interpreted by Standing Orders Committee (SOC)
- b) that a member has made a serious breach of one or more of the number of Standards in the Party's Code of Conduct
- c) that a member has brought the Party into disrepute."

In addition to this, the Standing Orders for Party Discipline, section 3.4 state that a Respondent is defined as "The member against whom the complaint has been made".

In light of this SOC rule that complaints can only be valid through the complaints process where they are made against one or more individual members, and that a complaint against a committee, group or body within the Party cannot be considered to be a single complaint. In a situation where a member makes a complaint against a committee, group or body, then the Complaints Referral Group, Disciplinary Committee or any other body dealing with the complaint shall consider it to be a complaint against the relevant members of the said committee, group or body individually. Complaints cannot be brought against the whole Party membership.

10. Ruling for MH on Incorporation

MH asked: "The memorandum and articles of association agreed at Conference in Spring 2019 require a body referred to as the 'Council' to appoint the members of the 'Board' of the new company when incorporation takes place. In the absence of the new structure proposed by the Holistic Review, but not yet agreed by the members, can the existing Green Party Regional Council be regarded as the 'Council' for the purposes of incorporation and the establishment of the Board of the new company?"

The ruling is:

- i) Giving an opinion on the projected Articles of Association approved by Conference Spring 2019 for future use by the incorporated Green Party is not directly a matter for Standing Orders Committee under the current constitution. Any definition for 'Council' attached to the Articles at the time of their adoption and subsequently would have a bearing on the issue. We would recommend that legal advice is taken.
- ii) Record of Organisational Statements (which SOC compiles) records a decision by Conference that directly links the proposed constitution to incorporation. It says: "Linking the new constitution to the incorporation of the party into a limited liability company because although not explicit in the referendum this link is, on advice from the appointed lawyers, critical to the party's well-being."

This is a recommendation accepted by Autumn Conference 2019 and is therefore a resolution of Conference.

11. Ruling for DR on GPEX declaring DC and Appeals

proceedings void

DR asked:

"At their meeting on Tuesday 2nd June, after considering legal advice, GPEX agreed that there was sufficient evidence of procedural irregularities at both the DC & AC stages of the disciplinary proceedings to declare the process, and the outcome, null & void."

Please can you rule if GPEX have any constitutional authority to make a decision of this nature, and if they were to decide this, then what the effect of such a decision would be."

SOC rules as follows:

Constitution Article 7 i) grants GPEX responsibility for the 'overall and day-to-day direction of the party'. This is not interpreted so as to give it discretionary powers to investigate the findings of DC or any other committee.

Article 7 xvi) sets out the responsibilities of GPEX in more detail at a national level, and includes; the implementation of decisions made at Conference; ensuring proper expenditure administration and fundraising; employing Green Party staff; keeping records of business; and presenting a written report to the Annual Conference. This list appears to be exhaustive.

Therefore GPEX has no constitutional authority to make a decision of this nature. The Constitution makes the Disciplinary Committee responsible for disciplinary matters, and GPRC for Party Wellbeing and Democratic Procedures. Were GPEX to make a decision of the kind proposed here, they would be exceeding their powers under the Constitution.

Since we don't know what the 'procedural irregularities' referred to by GPEX are supposed to be, and haven't been asked about them or Article 6 as part of this request for a ruling, they are not addressed here.

12. (a) Ruling for RG on GPEX powers in relation to disciplinary processes

RG asked:

What grounds do GPEX have to investigate, amend or overturn disciplinary processes and decisions?

Section 7 (i) of the constitution outlines the responsibilities of The Green Party Executive (GPEX):

"There shall be a Green Party Executive (hereinafter referred to as the Party Executive) which shall be responsible for the overall and day-to-day direction of the Party."

Section 7 (ii) further clarifies what areas of day to day responsibility this will entail through the role names it identifies and there are GPEX role descriptors which further clarify this.

The responsibility for disciplinary issues is clearly outlined in Section 4 (x) in the constitution:

"There shall be a Disciplinary Committee, elected to handle all complaints of a disciplinary nature which have not been resolved at Regional or Local Party level."

In addition to this, Green Party Regional Council (GPRC) is given a clear line of accountability over the disciplinary process

through their roles in undertaking appeals under Section 4 (xiv) of the constitution:

“The Disciplinary Committee and all appeals against it considered by the GPRC Appeals Subcommittee shall be governed by Standing Orders for Party Discipline, which can only be amended by a simple majority conference.”

In addition to this, GPRC has overall responsibility for keeping under review the general wellbeing of the party under section 6 (i) of the constitution:

“There shall be a Green Party Regional Council which shall provide a forum for dialogue between Regions, responsible for keeping under review the general well-being of the Party and for supporting and advising the Green Party Executive, particularly on matters of political strategy.”

Standing Orders Committee (SOC) rules as follows:

That GPEX has no authority in the constitution to initiate its own investigation into the disciplinary process as a whole, or into specific disciplinary decisions. GPEX also has no authority to amend or overturn any disciplinary process outcomes. In initiating an investigation of this type GPEX is stepping beyond its responsibilities as outlined in the constitution.

12. (b) What ability does GPEX have to delay, disrupt or cancel a co-option process to a GPEX chair or coordinator post?

SOC has previously ruled on an adjacent issue, which was agreed by conference in Autumn 2018 – the relevant sections of which are copied below:

“SOC note above there is only one process permitted under the Constitution for filling a vacancy on GPEX, which is that set out in the GPEW Constitution s.7(xv): “In the event of casual vacancy for a GPEX Chair or a Co-ordinator post a replacement shall be appointed in an acting and non-voting capacity by the Party Executive until the next ballot is held.”

This would then require the co-option process set out above.

In 2017 SOC ruled on a related issue (SOC Report to Conference Autumn 2017) that:

“the issue relates to how far the Deputy Chair can act in the role of the Chair allowing that they have not been elected to that role in a party wide ballot (as part of a job-share) but are an internal appointment among members of GPEX. SOC are being asked in their role as “final authority for the interpretation of the Constitution and Standing Orders” (Constitution Section 10(iii)) to decide on the scope of Section 7(xii) of the Constitution.

Both Constitution and Standing Orders (of GPEX) agree that the Deputy Chair can substitute for the Chair in relation to the internal activity of GPEX. (the words in parenthesis have been added by SOC for the sake of clarity). SOC are of the view that Section 7(xii) is designed to allow the activity of GPEX to continue during a temporary absence of the Chair eg. on holiday, due to illness ie. “at any time when the chair is unable to do so”.

SOC are of the view that Section 7(xii) does not cover taking over long term the function or any of the functions of the Chair. This latter scenario is similar, but not identical to, the position if the Chair of GPEX were to leave post completely. In this circumstance the role of Chair would be filled by co-option (Constitution Section 7(xv)).

SOC rule that in the event of the resignation etc of the Chair of GPEX the post must be filled by co-option, following the co-option process set out in the Standing Orders of GPEX.”

SOC rules as follows:

As per the previous SOC ruling, the Deputy Chair can only take on the function of the Chair over the short term, and if there is a situation where the Chair leaves that role completely for any reason, that the co-option of a new Chair is required. In light of this, similarly to the situation in 2018, the decision of GPEX to delay co-option is contrary to the constitution and cannot be considered valid.

12. (c) Ruling for RG on sharing of GPEX papers.

RG asked:

Following the refusal of members of GPEX to allow papers from meetings to be shared with GPRC, and the creation of GPEX Loomio threads that are hidden from GPRC co-chairs, is it appropriate for GPEX to decide that their papers, discussions or minutes are not to be seen by GPRC?

Section 6 (i) of the GPEW Constitution states that GPRC is:

“responsible for keeping under review the general well-being of the Party and for supporting and advising the Green Party Executive, particularly on matters of political strategy”

Under 6(iii) it has “overall responsibility for agreed democratic procedures within the Party.” This would include procedures for freedom of information within the Party, freedom of information being a democratic procedure with details given in Constitution Section 12. “Decision-Making, Openness, Accountability & Confidentiality.”

GPRC also have an oversight function in relation to GPEX as indicated by Constitution 6(x), 6 (xiii), and 7(xvii):

6 (x) “By a two-thirds majority of its voting membership the Regional Council may recall the GPEX Chair or a Co-ordinator post holder, who shall be under suspension until a new ballot has been held for that post at a date to be determined by the Regional Council.”

For it to perform this recall function on behalf of the Party it clearly needs to know what decisions GPEX are making and why.

6 (xiii) “The Regional Council may request with reasonable notice any member of the Green Party Executive to attend one of its meetings to report on their area of responsibility.”

7 (xvii) “The Chair, and other Executive members that the Regional Council may from time to time invite, shall attend every meeting of the Regional Council to report on the work of the Party Executive, without prejudice to Clause 6(xiii).”

6 (xiii) and 7 (xviii) would include GPRC requesting the Chair

or Deputy Chair of GPEX to attend GPRC to report on their responsibility for ensuring access to GPEX meetings and GPEX minutes in accordance with Constitution Section 12.

SOC rules as follows:

That whilst the constitution and GPEX standing orders allow for a split between public and private sessions of GPEX, in order for this oversight function to be discharged, the constitution requires that private sessions of GPEX be fully open to members of GPRC in order to facilitate them undertaking their oversight role in relation to GPEX.

Constitution Section 12(v) provides for confidentiality of discussions in certain circumstances such as a general agreement or a specific undertaking or lack of notice. Constitution Section 12(vi) says that a decision to exclude those designated and notified by the Regional Council as its observer(s) from an Executive meeting shall require the unanimous assent of the Executive members present.

It is not constitutional for GPEX to deny GPRC access to discussions that are virtual meetings of GPEX other than in accordance with 12(vi). A Loomio thread could count as an Executive meeting if this is a discussion between Executive members on the basis of which a decision is then made. It is not constitutional to deny GPRC access to GPEX minutes of decisions.

If the Regional Council is not being notified of the discussion and not being given an opportunity to observe the thread, as it would be given notice and allowed to observe a face-to-face meeting, or it is not receiving minutes of decisions, then under 6(iii), 6(xiii) and 7 (xviii) the Regional Council should take this up with the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Executive.

The matter of agenda papers is less clear. There is no specific constitutional requirement to make agenda papers available, but also nothing to say that they should not be made available and Section 12 implies openness where items come under Section 12(v).

There may be situations where specific papers, discussions and minutes may need to be withheld from members of GPRC's appeals committee in order to facilitate its role in the appeals process, however it is up to GPRC to manage this through its own processes and not for GPEX to decide.

13. Ruling for LL on filling Disciplinary Committee vacancies

LL asked:

According to the Standing Orders for Party Discipline, Section 2.2 the members of the Committee are elected to serve for a two year period.

- i) Each GPEW region and the nation of Wales should elect one member to the Committee.
- ii) Annual Conference should elect one member to the Committee.
- iii) If fewer than eleven members are elected by the Regions, the nation of Wales and the Annual Conference then GPEX shall appoint the remaining members.

Custom and Practice within the Committee, since its foundation, has been that should a region (or Wales) fail to organise an election for a DC rep within the prescribed two years, that that region and nation's incumbent represent remains on the committee as a co-optee until such time as the region (or Wales) is able to organise such an election. This is based on the fact that, should a position be vacant, it can be filled by appointment. Historically, we had to chase GPEX to appoint in order to maintain adequate numbers on the committee. However, this situation has now been challenged. Can we please have a ruling on whether we need to alter our custom and practice by asking GPEX to appoint whenever a region (or Wales) is slow to hold an election, or can we carry on as before?

SOC rules as follows:

- i) The constitution clearly states at s 4(x) of the constitution "The term of office will be two years." Therefore, at the end of two years a person elected by a region is no longer in post.
- ii) Standing Orders state that if a vacancy is unfilled by a region, GPEX shall appoint to it. There is no provision for DC itself to co-opt nor for the region to co-opt as 4(x) clearly states that representatives shall be 'elected' by the region although it does not specify the process for that election.
- iii) There are no general provisions within the constitution to allow officers elected by a region or with a set term of office to continue beyond the stated period.
- iv) If by the end of the two years a region has failed to fill the forthcoming vacancy, then GPEX should appoint either a new person or the original postholder if willing to remain until their region has elected, noting that there is no requirement for GPEX to appoint on a regional basis.

14. Ruling on staff standing for election

A member of staff asked: Can staff can stand in internal elections?

The Constitution Section 4iv) "Membership of The Green Party shall entitle members to vote on the business of the Party and hold office in it, in such ways as are laid down in this Constitution and Standing Orders made under it."

The Constitution does not prevent members who are employed by the Party from standing for office, nor do any current Standing Orders that we are aware of. There may be constraints in employee contracts but that would be a matter for the management.

There is one specific constraint. The Constitution specifies that:

4 xii) Complaints may be dismissed by the collective agreement of the Chair of GPEX, the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee and the senior manager of the GPEW.

This implies that the senior manager of GPEW cannot also be Chair of GPEX or Chair of the Disciplinary Committee.

There may be issues over conflict of interest and confidentiality which would be covered by GPEX Standing Orders and by Section 11v)(a). These might prevent a member of staff who is also on GPEX from participating in particular decisions of GPEX that relate to staff.

15. Ruling for MH on Deputy Chair (2 rulings)

MH requested a ruling about the specifics of section 7 clause xii of the constitution which is set out below.

“The Executive shall elect from among its elected members a deputy chair, to assist the chair in their duties, and to act in the role of the chair at any time when the chair is unable to do so. Such elections are to take place at least annually.”

Two questions were asked specifically:

- 1 Is the role of Deputy Chair of Green Party Executive (GPEx) limited to those members elected to GPEx, or can it include those elected in other capacities and serving ex-officio on the Executive?
- 2 Does the reference to annual elections refer to the year beginning with the formation of the new Executive?

Question 1.

Section 7 clause xii of the constitution regarding the Deputy Chair of GPEx is very clear that the eligibility for this role is related to whether or not the role holder was elected to their position. This is the defining factor which should be considered when assessing the eligibility of any individual member of GPEx for the role. There are two routes to becoming a role holder on GPEx. The first most straight forward route is that you are elected to that role. Within the constitution being an elected member means being a full voting member of the executive. This is the case for all role holders elected to those roles outlined in Section 7 Clause ii of the constitution. All role holders elected to these positions are eligible to be Deputy Chair of the executive. The second route to becoming a role holder on GPEx is via appointment, this is outlined in Section 7 clause xv of the constitution as follows: “In the event of casual vacancy for a GPEx Chair or a Co-ordinator post a replacement shall be appointed in an acting and non-voting capacity by the Party Executive until the next ballot is held.”

Role holders on GPEx who are appointed to those roles operate in an acting, and non-voting capacity. It is this distinction which the Section 7 clause xii seeks to invoke when it set out the eligibility for the role of Deputy Chair. For the avoidance of doubt, anyone appointed or co-opted to roles of GPEx in an acting and non-voting capacity are not eligible to be Deputy Chair of the executive. In light of these factors, SOC rule that: Anyone appointed to a role on GPEx by virtue of Section 7 clause xv of the constitution is not eligible to be elected by GPEx as the Deputy Chair. All other role holders on GPEx, as set out in Section 7 clause ii are voting members of GPEx and eligible to be elected by GPEx as their Deputy Chair.

Question 2

Section 7, clause xii of the constitution does not provide a significant amount of information with regards the schedule of such elections, the only direction which it provides on the regularity of elections comes on the following two elements of the clause: “The Executive shall elect from among its elected members a deputy chair”

This is an important clause to consider because it deals

directly with situations where there is no deputy chair, and in those circumstances the constitution is clear –the use of the word “shall” indicates that GPEx are compelled to go through the process of electing a Deputy Chair from among their number should there not be a Deputy Chair. This potential disruption to any timescale needs to be taken into account when considering what the timescale for elections should ideally be. There are a number of reasons why GPEx could be without a Deputy Chair, and not all of them confirm to a pre-defined timetable. The part of the clause which most clearly sets out the need for regular elections to the role is as follows: “Such elections are to take place at least annually.”

The wording in this section is not as clear as the first part of the clause, it does not state that the elections “shall” take place at least annually –which would place a direct imperative on the GPEx chair to organise elections on a clear annual timetable as well as electing to the role as soon as possible after it becomes vacant. The phrasing used is “are to take place” which is not considered by SOC to be as strong a wording, and has been taken to mean as such as a way of providing the level of continuity which the first section of the clause implies. In light of the combination of these factors, SOC rule that;

- Elections to the role of Deputy Chair must take place at the earliest possible opportunity in the event of the role becoming vacant.
- Due to the myriad of possible reasons why someone might end their tenure as Deputy Chair, SOC considers “annually” to be taken as “one year following the election to the role in the first place”.
- Elections to the role where it is not left vacant will take place within 1 calendar year following the initial election, and GPEx should make every effort to schedule this to take place.
- If an election at the one-year anniversary of the initial election as Deputy Chair is not possible for whatever reason, then the role holder should continue in post until such a time that an election can be organised due to the compulsion which the Constitution places on GPEx to have a role holder in place.
- GPEx should undertake the process of amending their standing orders to provide clarity on the election of a deputy chair.

16. Ruling for DRC on returning to committee posts beyond maximum term

Members of the Disputes Resolution Committee (DRC) asked if it was permissible to co-opt a member who had served their maximum term back on to the Committee, providing they had a ‘break’ in service on that committee for a short period of time. SOC’s ruling on the constitutional position was: “It is the view of SOC that this is not permissible under the Constitution, which states (5.xxii), ‘No member may be elected to the same post or sit on the same body for more than 5 terms consecutively’. It explicitly says that a person may not sit on a committee for more than five terms regardless of how they have been put in that position (i.e. by election or co-option).

It is our view that any ‘break’ must be a minimum of a full term. Otherwise, someone is sitting on a body within a term of already having been on it. This would constitute an additional ‘consecutive’ term. We would like to point out that as a committee you are free to consult and make use of the advice and experience of other members as you feel appropriate.”

17. Ruling for EJ on Disciplinary Committee rulings

Member EJ quoted the following sentence attached to Disciplinary Committee rulings on three related Complaints – “We have also recognised that committees sometimes make decisions outside of standing orders for the benefit of the party”.

Member EJ asked “What is SOC’s perspective on how the sentence honours both the spirit and the letter of GPEW’s Constitution and Code-of-Conduct?” and went on to ask “... in the light of Disciplinary Committee’s recent written statement via Ruling to the Complainants in the three related Complaints (above), could SOC please Rule upon whether (a) Disciplinary Committee, (b) Green Party Regional Council, and (c) the Complaints Referral Group are required to abide by • The Standing Orders for Party Discipline, • The GPEW Constitution, • The GPEW Code of Conduct, and • GPEW’s Policy on Harassment, Bullying and Discrimination (especially 4. Policy on Whistleblowing)?

SOC’s ruling on the constitutional position was: “We are unable to express an opinion on the inclusion of the sentence you highlighted (‘we have also recognised that committees sometimes’ etc.) in rulings from Disciplinary Committee; this is the provenance of Conference.

Yes, the Disciplinary Committee, Green Party Regional Council and Complaints Referral Group are required to comply with the Standing Orders for Party Discipline, the GPEW Constitution and the GPEW Code of Conduct, the GPEW Anti-Harassment, Bullying and Discrimination Policy including the Whistleblowing Policy.

Article 4 (xi) and (xiv) of the Constitution state that the Disciplinary Committee, and the Complaints Referral Group, must comply with the Constitution in dealing with complaints by only dealing with complaints on grounds specified with clauses a, b, and/or c of article 4 xi) and not any other grounds, and that because DC is governed by the Standing Orders for Party Discipline, it must comply with those Standing Orders as only Green Party Conference can agree upon changes to them. Article 5 (xvi) of the Constitution states that GPRC is governed by its Standing Orders.”

18. Ruling for a member of GPRC on House of Lords nominee selection process

A member of GPRC asked that, as the members ballot had not taken place, would the process for selection have to start again? Furthermore, they asked that if it did not, would the two candidates who had previously withdrawn from the emergency shortlist process be included?

SOC’s ruling on the constitutional position was:

“6i) There shall be a Green Party Regional Council which shall

provide a forum for dialogue between Regions, responsible for keeping under review the general well-being of the Party and for supporting and advising the Green Party Executive, particularly on matters of political strategy.

6 iii) The Regional Council shall have overall responsibility for agreed democratic procedures within the Party.

The selection process to the House of Lords (HoL) is an agreed democratic procedure and specifies a member ballot. SOC advised that it was a matter for GPRC under its responsibilities for well-being and for democratic procedures to decide what to do. It would then have to answer to Conference for its decision.

SOC advised that if GPRC did decide to select a nominee outside of the constitutional procedure, then it should do so from the shortlist of 6 with their consent and should consult GP Northern Ireland as it is a joint nomination. GPRC resolved to use its representation of the membership, and its responsibility for wellbeing of the Party and for agreed democratic procedures, to make a nomination itself. It based this on the shortlist of 6 and obtained the consent of the 6 to do so. GPRC reported this to Autumn Conference 2019. The report was accepted by Conference without amendment. SOC then had a request for a ruling from GPRC, as to whether their selection of a nominee meant that the whole process was required to start again. Deciding this meant re-considering the question of constitutionality, SOC’s conclusion was that the nomination of one of the 6 people on the shortlist to the House of Lords was outside the process laid down in the constitution, and therefore the constitutional process has not been completed. The person already nominated should be treated as having withdrawn and selection should continue from the remaining 5.

19. Ruling for SA on HoL appointment

Prior to Autumn Conference 2019, member SA asked for an SOC ruling “on the constitutionality of Green Party proposing a name to the House of Lords Appointments Commission without a member ballot for selection of our nominees. We recently proposed a candidate without a member ballot whilst in the middle of a proper selection process, begun in July 2018. It appears that that process was subverted at final stage and in high secrecy.”

SOC was unable to make a ruling prior to Autumn Conference 2019. At that Conference, GPRC submitted a report on the process it had used to nominate Natalie Bennett for the House of Lords, which Conference accepted, endorsing the actions of GPRC. SOC have no power to change or further add to this. SOC was subsequently asked for a related ruling by GPRC. Following this (given above, as Ruling 17) SOC was able to agree a ruling for SA on the constitutional position.

“Under 5xxiii) of the Constitution, selection for nomination to the House of Lords shall be conducted in accordance with the byelaws approved from time to time by Annual Conference. The approved byelaws have been adopted both by GP England and Wales and by GP Northern Ireland. They specify that nominations are invited, that a shortlist of at least 3 be drawn up, that those on this are interviewed by an Interview Panel,

and that the names then go to member ballot with a report on each candidate from the Interview Panel. At the time when the Party was requested for a nominee, a shortlist of 6 had been drawn up, but no member ballot had yet taken place.

SOC then advised SA of the ruling given to GPRC and went on to say: The answer to your request is therefore:

1. Yes, the process used was unconstitutional in that it did not conform to 5xxiii)
2. Under the constitution, GPRC has ultimate responsibility for agreed democratic procedures and it chose to select a candidate by other than the agreed procedure, in order to further the well-being of the Party. It reported this to Conference and Conference endorsed its report, so Conference endorsed this departure from the constitution.
3. The SOC ruling for GPRC is that the current constitutional process was not terminated by the selection of a candidate by GPRC, as that selection was outside the process, and it should therefore continue.”

20. Ruling for BH on Election Campaign

Material Publication

During the general election of 2019, member BH asked the following:

‘Does the rapid response sub-committee of GPRC have the constitutional authority to:

- a) make the decision below
- b) block the publication of the LGBTIQ+ Commitment publication based on the fact that it includes policy from the manifesto

For context, an email from the Rapid Reponse Sub Committee of GPRC was also forwarded. This requested that the LGBTIQ+ Greens to alter some campaign material in line with a decision made by that Sub Committee.

In answering this question, SOC looked at the constitutional rules around policy statements and election materials.

Policy Statements: The process of approving and publishing policy statements is outlined in the constitution as follows:

Section 6. ii: The Regional Council shall have overall responsibility for policy statements between Conferences.

Section 13.v: Major elaborations of policy shall be considered as Policy Statements by Green Party Regional Council in accordance with its Standing Orders. When such policy statements are approved they shall be published in the Party’s ‘Record of Policy Statements’ (RoPS). Section 13.vi: The contents of manifestos for Westminster and European elections shall be considered as Policy Statements by Regional Council. The final editing and presentation of such manifestos shall be the responsibility of the Elections Co-ordinator.

The GPRC Handbook further extrapolates this and give a clear definition of what a ‘policy statement’ is:

10. Approval of Policy Statements

1. Definition

1.1 Policy Statements are an expansion, extension or extrapolation of existing Green Party policies and are normally approved by Conference.

1.2 Between conferences such statements may be adopted by GPRC.

1.3 GPRC approved policy statements shall not contain new policy and must be clearly supported by existing policy.

1.4 Spring Conference 2018 voted to adopt Interim Policy Positions (see 9.below) and this does make new policy between conferences.

However there are specific rules as set out in the constitution.

SOC notes that the content of the document (‘Our Commitment to LGBTIQ+ People’) is drawn from already existing policy and the already approved and published manifesto, and as such is not a ‘major elaboration of policy’. In light of this it does not meet the definition of a policy statement as outlined in Section 13 v of the constitution, and does not need approval by GPRC, on this basis. The document (‘Our Commitment to LGBTIQ+ People’) is not a manifesto, it is a commitment. As such, it does not meet the definition outlined in Section 13.vi of the constitution as requiring approval by GPRC.

If a document were to add commitments that were not official GPEW policy nor in the manifesto or Record of Policy Statements, then it would require GPRC approval. However, the content of the document (‘Our Commitment to LGBTIQ+ People’) is drawn from already existing policy and the already approved and published manifesto. As such is not an expansion, extension or extrapolation of existing Green Party policies. It therefore does not meet the definition outlined in section 10 of the GPRC handbook which defines Policy Statements.

In light of this, it is the view of SOC that GPRC has no authority to require amendments, block publication or insist on approval from GPRC of this document. before distribution. It does not meet any of the definitions of documents which require their explicit approval. In this specific situation, it is clear that the document (‘Our Commitment to LGBTIQ+ People’) is election campaign material, drawn from our existing policies and as such the overall responsibility for it lies with the Elections Coordinator on GPEX to ensure it fits within the overall election campaign requirements. In the same way there is no system for GPRC to require that they sign off every leaflet used in a general election campaign, there is also no system by which they can require that they can sign off this document, which carries the exact same status.

Other advice given

In addition to making rulings, SOC is often asked to give advice on constitution-related issues. Some of this advice is for the ERO appointed by SOC and has not been included here. Below is a sample of other advice given since Autumn Conference 2019.

1) Green World Editorial Board (GWEB)

A member of the Green Party Executive (‘GPEX’) requested

advice on co-opting members to GWEB. Green World is an online communication to which the board are elected annually at Conference. It was discovered, when this was discussed, that although SOC and the RO believed that no members had come forward for GWEB at Autumn Conference, in fact a member had put their name forward but due to an error had not been included in the ballot paper. They believed that they had been elected by default, but were never duly elected to GWEB, through no fault of their own, and therefore could not co-opt other members. SOC and the Acting RO apologise for this error and have advised that anyone wishing to be a member of GWEB should stand for election to this post at Spring Conference 2020.

2) Transition Team

The Transition Team asked a series of questions to SOC relating to their ongoing work, as well as their responsibilities, status and power in relation to the Holistic Review and the original instructions of the all-members ballot. In response to the points that were raised, SOC's advice was that:

- The Transition Team are not a 'time-limited' group. Previous instructions have asked them to submit specific work on a specific timescale. They are only to be 'wound-up' when the new bodies that are to be implemented come into existence, not by a specific date.
- The work of the Transition Team cannot be and has not been delegated to GPRC through amendments to the GPRC report to Autumn Conference 2019.
- The Transition Team has not been granted specific powers by the ballot. However, they are given specific responsibilities, such as drawing up a new Constitution with SOC and lawyers in such a way that it is compliant with the all members' ballot, as well as overseeing the delivery of the Holistic Review recommendations. These responsibilities cannot be delegated. Additionally, they extend to such a time as the new bodies specified by the ballot are themselves in existence.
- In carrying out their work in this area, the Transition Team and GPRC where relevant, are still bound by the terms of the original ballot motion.
- SOC's and GPRC's recommendations in their reports to Autumn Conference become instructions and not advisory, once the recommendations have been validated by Conference as such.

3) An Eastern Region officer asked for advice on who can initiate the process to split a local party into more than one local party. SOC looked at Constitution Sections 5ix) and 5x) "when a new local party is proposed" and advised that a suitable motion would usually be needed to an AGM or EGM of the existing local party. In the case of a dispute within or between local parties, under 5 xi) the regional party should in the first instance attempt to resolve it, involving GPRC and/or DRC as appropriate.

4) A member asked for advice on whether a Facebook Group attached to a recognised Party Equality and Diversity working group with a Party website page had to allow all members to join, as they were being blocked from

membership. It is a requirement under the constitutional byelaws that all members are allowed to join such groups if they are to be recognised by the Party. SOC agreed that if the Facebook Group was linked to a recognised group then it must allow all members to join. If it wanted to restrict membership, then it was a separate group that had to remain unrecognised. This will remain the situation until either a new constitution or constitutional amendments are in force, allowing Affiliated Groups to restrict membership but still be recognised. The issue of unconstitutional behaviour was taken up with Equality and Diversity, and the link between the FB Group and the Party website was subsequently removed.

A2

GREEN PARTY EXECUTIVE REPORT

CHAIRS REPORT

[[SOC Note, this report was received late.]]

Liz Reason, Chair

"There shall be a Green Party Executive which shall be responsible for the overall and day-to-day direction of the Party."

It is hard to understand quite how the world has changed since the last GPEX report. An election in December 2019 which changed the face of British politics very much for the worse, months of Covid-19 disruption and anxiety, including leading to the postponement for a year of COP26, and the prospect of a chaotic agreement/ exit from the EU. But a world in which Green philosophies, politics and action can potentially thrive in ways they never have before.

Membership of GPEX

All coordinator positions were filled at the last election. Towards the end of this year, Publications, and Policy Development Coordinators resigned, at a stage where filling the posts by co-option proved difficult. A job-share Campaign Coordinator also resigned in August. All roles will be filled by candidates in this latest round of elections.

GPEX members are increasingly understanding that GPEX is in a non-executive body and appreciating the boundaries between non-executive roles, GPEX sub-committees and staff. Dialogue and engagement towards decision-making, consensus and solutions from a majority of members of GPEX have been positive, robust, constructive and supportive and I thank them for their contributions over the last year.

Staffing and achievements

New CEO, Mary Clegg, joined the team on 7th October 2019, just weeks before the General Election and hit the ground running. Quite a baptism of fire! The party had its second ever highest number of votes. Other new appointments include a Chief Operating Office, Head of Development, Head of Elections and Head of Communications, as well as a new finance team under Head of Finance, Fiona Shaw. A new Digital Manager is

finally modernizing our digital systems which will enable the national and local parties to engage much more actively and accurately with members, and overall improve the member experience.

Fundraising and Development

This year we have also stepped up our focus on fundraising, identifying six funding streams ripe for focused activity so that the party goes into elections properly resourced. Membership, which had been declining slowly, has now started to increase. A new emphasis on bringing in supporters as 'friends' who make regular donations is proving successful. [[SOC note: A section at this point of the report was ruled out of order and can be found under Oo08 at the end of the agenda.]]

The shop is undergoing a revamp and a name change to the Green Living Room highlights a move to selling experiences, rather than stuff.

Individual donations are the bedrock of our party. That is why we have been identifying themes and discussion points that engage with members and beyond – those who are exploring 'green', maybe to become Green. Better is Possible, launched in early September, is the manifestation of the exploration that has been done through Project Together. Project Together has undertaken research internal and external to establish views as to the role that the party should be taking in a moment that requires profound change. The findings will inform the revision of the Political Strategy managed by GPRC.

But the amount of money we need to deliver on our ambition to change the world needs much greater resources. So we need to explore how to engage with those willing to make major donations. That means being able to demonstrate that we have an inspiring vision, backed up by a meaningful case for support and a business plan that shows that we will deliver on our ambitions.

Greens of Colour

At its meeting in August, GPEx was pleased to invite Azzees Minott, Chair of GoC to come and talk to us about GoC strategy for development of the GoC network and its ambition for action. The party has long recognized its lack of diversity in membership and election candidates. We are pleased that the role of the new Activism Manager, Emma Leigh (a senior member of the Field Team), has improving diversity at its heart. That, and other planned activities, including staff and governance member training and development on a variety of issues, mean that there is every intention for the party's ambitions for change to be translated into reality.

Holistic review

The Holistic Review still remains to be implemented. GPEx continues to work with GPRC and SOC to try and ensure that the modernization of our governance systems and corporate structure happen in 2021. The changes are long overdue.

Rights and Responsibilities

Spring Conference 2019 passed an enabling motion to facilitate a re-write the Rights and Responsibilities chapter of Policies for a Sustainable Society. One aspect of this motion

was to bring a Draft Voting Paper to Autumn Conference 2019. Unfortunately, progress has been slower than anticipated and little progress has been made. GPEx funded a workshop in January 2020 in Nottingham to explore how the use of non-violent communication techniques could help 20 workshop participants to come together and find common ground. Unfortunately, further work on that was also stymied by Covid and the move to put conference online. We still intend to resolve the conflict that is all too apparent in the party between different groups who feel that their rights are threatened by others.

Coordinator reports follow. All GPEx members are thanked for their work during the year.

Finance Coordinators Report

A joint report between the Finance Coordinator and Treasurer roles was submitted, this can be found under A03.

LEADERSHIP TEAM REPORT

[[SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.

Section 8 part x of the constitution states:

The Leader and Deputy Leader(s) or Co-Leaders will present an Annual Report to Conference alongside other Executive members.]]

Amelia Womack, Jonathan Bartley & Siân Berry.

The leadership election meant that for three months (on the instruction of the Electoral Returning Officer) the leadership team had its own unprecedented "lockdown" enforced upon it. From 1st June to the end of August leaders could receive no external communications support from party staff, and the party was not allowed to put out any formal statements, reports or papers from the leadership. In addition the leadership were not allowed to take up any invitations to visit (virtually) local parties, or be supported in any public speaking engagements.

Despite this we have been very busy. Just before June, Jonathan was able to put out a report "Whatever It Takes: Our Plan to Leave Noone Behind in this Crisis", which makes the connections between social and environmental justice and has been used extensively by the party in its response to Covid-19. In July, Amelia worked with musicians, artists as well as the Musicians Union on a call to Rishi Sunak for a Universal Basic Income.

We were thrilled too that for the first time ever Green Party leaders approval ratings by pollsters – and Green Party leaders have consistently been polling above the Lib Dem leadership. A testament to our record electoral success in the council elections and European elections, as well as so many second and third places at the general election – we have truly moved to the next level as a party. We have been thrilled too to see that we have now moved from being the official opposition on 5 councils, to playing a part in running 18 councils in less than two years (with Brighton the most recent addition). We are a

party that is serious about elections!

It is important that the evidence-based strategy we have followed to bring the party success continues. As we did following both the 2015 and 2017 General Elections, extensive in-depth research has been commissioned and is being carried out. We know already that around 10% of the population were willing to vote for us at Westminster elections – but many were put off by the First-Past-the-Post electoral system. However it is clear that for the first time in four years, Labour have vacated political space both in terms of their move to be more authoritarian and more centrist, which we must now seize. We believe that the time is now to build a mass-membership movement with the Green Party as its political wing.

Jonathan has invited Liberation Groups to attend the regular meetings of the Political Committee, which he continues to chair. These have increased in frequency, now meeting every two weeks rather than every six weeks. Jonathan has also been working with the Comms team on the new campaign for the party, “Better is Possible” as well as “Project Together” which will input into the parties political strategy. The political strategy is being taken forward by GPRC, which has now established a working group. Sian and Amelia have both been part of the Constitution Working Group which is now putting a proposal to this conference for a special conference to consider a new constitution that fulfils the goals of the Holistic Review.

We have all worked during the past year to support growing the capacity of local parties, both those who have yet to elect councillors in visiting many target wards and speaking at meetings aimed at recruiting more volunteers and members, and those who have councillors and groups by helping to link up councillors across the country better to share ideas.

As lockdown started, we set up a new regular zoom call to which all Green councillors were invited, organised with the AGC team, and we have helped link councillor work in with our national communications on coronavirus issues through these meetings. This helped, for example, to lead to clear proposals for local track and trace, and letters to ministers about the handling of the crisis, and many other new issues have been discussed and joint working between our councillor groups set up as a result of these valuable new meetings. We continued and even increased our local meeting attendance after lockdown, and often attended more than one online meeting in different parts of the country on the same day. Unfortunately, despite this opportunity to work more efficiently and cover more ground, the summer programme of visits that had been arranged was forced to be cancelled due to the terms of the internal election regulations. We believe these rules need to be revisited in future.

Each of us has continued to campaign on specific issues as well as the ones we lead on as spokespeople:

Jonathan has continued to campaign for the rights of refugees. He wrote to the Permanent Secretary at the Home Office, following a video that the Department produced

which attacked lawyers for defending asylum seekers facing deportation. The Permanent Secretary subsequently withdrew the video.

Jonathan also wrote to the Equality and Human Rights Commission about the injustice of the A-level exam algorithm asking them to intervene, and earlier this year asking them to investigate into the deaths of disabled benefit claimants. Jonathan led calls to end UK arms exports to the US, following their use against People of Colour. His letter to the National Audit Office about Government procurement of PPE, and its Test, Trace and Isolate system brought a promise of further investigation.

Sian’s focus has been on housing and policing, and she has helped challenge protest policing, holding the Met police to account over their treatment of Extinction Rebellion and other protests including Black Lives Matter, and their unlawful and unsuccessful attempt to use Section 14 of the Public Order Act to ban protest across London. She has repeatedly challenged the use of facial recognition technology by police and has exposed the disproportionate use of coronavirus powers on Black Londoners.

Renting rights have seen some major wins in the past year, although the Government’s pledge to remove section 21 of the Housing Act which allows for ‘no fault’ evictions has yet to be followed through, campaigning with renters groups and housing campaigners has led to the ban on evictions during the pandemic being extended twice. Working collaboratively with renters’ groups and with the help of Greens in Bristol, Sian has also helped expose and shift Labour’s policy on cancelling arrears built up by renters during the coronavirus crisis, and Sian has also pushed the Mayor of London into a position of supporting rent forgiveness as well as rent controls more generally.

Immediate, costed plans for bringing in a Universal Basic Income were a major plank of our General Election platform for the first time in 2019 and the coronavirus crisis has led to a sea change since then in how this policy is being discussed, bringing in issues of resilience as well as social justice and rights. Sian has been very pleased to see a network of campaign groups under the ‘UBI Lab’ banner being created across the country and she has addressed a number of launch events for these groups. UBI is also a major part of plans set out by Jonathan to leave no-one behind in the crisis.

Amelia has continued her work on the environment and women’s rights. At the start of Lockdown she coordinated a cross-party letter demanding a clear strategy on supporting victims of violence in their communities ahead of government announcements on this issue. She’s also worked to expose the inequalities that Covid would entrench from a feminist perspective.

Back in January she also called for long-term planning and risk strategy on flooding based on her years of work on the issue. She worked to expose the gap between previous investment promises that have failed communities, as well as link the winter floods to the climate and ecological

emergencies. She stated that climate change isn't just here – it's now in people's hallways and lounge's with the rising flood waters.

In communication and media terms, each of us continued – up to June – to make regular contributions to national debates through the major political outlets. As lockdown approached there was also growing interest in the London elections and several interviews and profiles were recorded or in planning at the point the elections were called off, and the national and London local election broadcast was also postponed.

Since our last report, the main period of media activity was of course during the General Election where we were excited to have excellent messages and a clear set of policies to promote, thanks to hard work by the policy and communications teams within the party. We were pleased to be treated as a main party by broadcasters and to be included in every debate except those that were restricted to Labour and Conservatives. In line with our team approach to leadership, the main TV debates, flagship interviews and leadership Q&A programmes were shared between Sian, Jonathan and Caroline Lucas MP, and Amelia picked up on a number of interviews and led our election launch in Bristol alongside Sian. Amelia also had a weekly column in the Independent during the election, providing a Green analysis throughout the campaign. Reaction to all of the major debates and interviews online was overwhelmingly positive, and our performances were favourably compared with those of other leaders, in particular with Jo Swinson from the Liberal Democrats.

We began this leadership term very skeptical about alliances and maintained a position of 'our door being closed' and not to be the instigators of any arrangements, amid concerns about our candidates coming under external pressure to stand down in earlier elections where there were no formal agreements but widespread talk of alliances. Learning these lessons was important and put us in a strong position where we could say only serious approaches from other parties would even be considered by our party.

To our surprise, just such a serious approach was made as the threat of a no-deal Brexit approached alongside clear data that no single party was able to beat the Conservatives in any 2019 election. We are proud to have worked closely through summer and autumn 2019 with our Elections Coordinator colleagues on GPEx, the Head of Elections and the Interim CEO to proceed carefully and democratically through the long process from being approached for talks by the Unite to Remain group and leaders of Plaid Cymru and the Liberal Democrats to making the first formal multi-seat electoral agreement between parties in a General Election for decades.

Working together, the party's elections team did this the right way. Getting the views of members first through an online consultation, putting a proposal to Autumn Conference in 2019 to vote on, and making sure every local party made its own decision whether to be part of it. The final arrangement was scrutinised and agreed by GPRC. We are pleased that a process was established for this kind of eventuality through

this work but believe that further review and thought should go into how things could be done more openly and with more clarity in terms of future elections.

The results did not in the end win more seats for our party and the overall performance of the Liberal Democrats' election campaign was disappointingly poor. However, polling analysis shows that parties working together is a more popular concept to voters than would be expected just by adding up each party's vote and that, across the seats targeted, the party standing for Unite to Remain significantly increased its vote share, with a slightly stronger effect where Greens were standing.

In future we would recommend a similarly cautious approach towards election co-operation, with a position of not instigating proposals but listening and weighing up the benefits, alongside wide engagement with our members, only if approached in a serious, collaborative and fair spirit by other parties. Our focus should also remain on winning the argument for electoral reform, as this is the only long-term way to fix an election system that leaves many voters excluded.

MANAGEMENT COORDINATORS REPORT

[[SOC Note, this report was received late.]]

Zoe Nicholson Management Co-ordinator Report October 2019 – October 2020

Below is a report on my activities as Management Co-ordinator in the last year, this covers the specific work I have done rather than the wider role on GPEx. I see my role as a subject expert providing advice to the Chair, and CEO and other members of GPEx and staff.

Safeguarding Lead for GPEx

As an outcome of the Verita Report, GPEx agreed that the Management Co-ordinator would be the Safeguarding Lead for GPEx. I have contributed to and reviewed various iterations of the revised safeguarding policy as well as advising on its implementation. I receive monthly confidential reports on all safeguarding issues across the party and advise on the appropriate action via the Safeguarding Lead and Chief Executive. Party members can email the Safeguarding Lead for advice, which is a continuous process and on a day to day basis is overseen and implemented by the Safeguarding Officer. I have also been consulted on some specific safeguarding issues over the last year in consultation with the CEO and safeguarding officer.

HR advice and input

Advice given to managers on a wide range of confidential issues, including redundancies, contractor status, mentoring and coaching. My focus has been on ensuring that the party follows its own policies and seeks legal and specialist HR advice where necessary. I have also been involved in commenting on HR policies and contractual issues as part of the overall review process put in place with the commissioning of Senatus to review and update all our HR policies, my role has been to input into this process and then feedback the results of the overall process, which engages staff and the

unions to GPEX for sign off via AFCOM. I have investigated a complaint made by a member about an ex staff member and drew this to a conclusion.

Substantive CEO support

I have provided the CEO with support as and when needed as a sounding board, and advised the Chair and Deputy Chair on the objective setting process for the Chief Executive, including the appraisal process and also probationary period.

Administration and Finance Sub Committee of GPEX.

The Management Coordinator is a member of this subcommittee, whose remit is to support the CE to take day-to-day decisions on the HQ budgets and HR issues. As part of this group I have been involved in budget management, organisational restructure, policy, and HR issues.

ELECTION COORDINATORS REPORT

[[SOC Note, this report was received late.]]

[[SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.

Section 5 part xix of the constitution states that:

The elections and equality and diversity coordinators on the Green Party Executive will be tasked with working with local and regional parties to promote the training and conditions within the Green Party to enable it to work towards the proportion of female candidates reaching at least 50% in candidate lists in PR elections such as European elections and at least 50% of General election candidates. Taking into account the need to put forward effective candidates, they will work with local/regional parties to try to ensure that female candidates will comprise at least 50% of those selected to stand for winnable seats. A report on the gender balance of candidates and elected members will be included in the Gpex report to conference after each relevant election.

In the constitution under the bylaws referred to in Clause 5(xvii): Selection of Candidates for the House of Commons it states that:

GPEW will set targets for the proportion of candidates and proportion of target candidates in respect to self-identified gender, race, disability, socio-economic status, age, and sexual orientation based on their respective proportion of the England and Wales population. The Elections Coordinator will report on this to conference. If targets are not met, the Elections Coordinator will present actions to meet them as part of their report to conference.]]

Judy Maciejowska and Tom Beament

The latter part of 2019 was dominated by preparations for the December snap election. Last year's autumn conference approved proposals to continue discussions with other parties on electoral arrangements. One of the criteria for those discussions was that they should lead to significant increase in the number of Green Party MPs. 'Unite to Remain' agreements were made with the Liberal Democrats and Plaid Cymru in 60 seats in England and Wales, in 50 of which the Green Party

stood aside. The Green Party was the only Unite to Remain candidate in ten seats. In two of those seats (Bristol West and Dulwich & West Norwood) we came second place, overtaking the Conservatives, and saved our deposits in all ten (31 deposits were saved nationally, compared with 8 in 2017). The average swing in our favour in those UTR seats was +6.9% compared with +1.1% nationally.

The Labour Party would not enter into the UTR project, and the outcome is now history.

Unfortunately, the criterion of an increase of Green Party MPs was not achieved. Nevertheless we firmly believe that the project was the right one, as demonstrated by the results. The distortions of our unfair electoral system will always hamper our progress; it will be through similar arrangements with other parties, both at local and national levels that we will be able to make the advances needed if we are to implement our policies. We would therefore advocate for similar arrangements to be considered in the future

In March the Government confirmed that, due to the Covid pandemic the May elections would be postponed. This was disappointing for the whole party but particularly for those regions where campaigns were well underway. Elections that were postponed include Mayoral elections in the cities of Bristol, Liverpool and Salford; several Metropolitan mayoral elections in the north and midlands; Police and Crime Commissioner elections, and of course, the elections to the London Assembly and London Mayor. These will now take place on 6 May 2021, the same day as the very important elections to the Welsh Senedd and English County Councils.

We have been working closely with staff and colleagues in these areas to ensure the best possible outcome for the party. We would like particularly to highlight the campaign for the Welsh Senedd, where the political environment and the electoral system, combined with a highly organised and motivated campaign management give us a real opportunity finally to breakthrough in the nation where we have struggled previously.

Elections to the Greater London Assembly were on track earlier to achieve some excellent results and we are confident that they will continue to make a significant impact next year, in spite of the delay to the polling day.

We would like to pay huge tribute to the wonderful staff team: Head of Elections, Chris Williams and all the field team. The sum of their wisdom and strategic advice has been incalculable, as has the amount of sheer hard work that they put into their roles. We are very lucky to have them.

We are not seeking re-election this year, and wish our successor(s) a rewarding and fruitful coming year. Judy has held this post, on and off, for eleven years, and feels it's certainly now time for a change. Without doubt the zenith of that period was the 2010 election of Caroline Lucas MP to Brighton Pavilion, but other high points include the 2015 general election (the Green surge) and the 2019 local elections when we more than doubled our councillors. We must now

commit to putting our efforts into gaining more MPs, to provide greater force behind the magnificent work of Caroline and our other elected representatives. The work must begin now, so 2021 will be an exciting year.

LOCAL PARTY SUPPORT COORDINATORS REPORT

Dawn Furness.

Continuing Casework

- Ongoing safeguarding issue at local party police investigation referred to CPS
- GDPR guidelines for local party constitution

GPRC friend Relationship

- Ann Forsaith (removed as 'Friend') reallocated to Marth James, July 2020
- Continuing Revision of 'Party in a Box' – updating of information & potential development of instructional video assets

Target to win

- Development of new chapter focussing on digital assets and social media

Disciplinary & Disputes Resolution

- Revision of disciplinary process to incorporate mediation
- Acquirement of Job Description for National Disciplinary Panel

Accessibility of governance body information:

- Development of Regional handbook for local parties to be rolled out to other local parties through regional co-ordinators.

Campaigns Committee (CamComm)

- Establishment of CamComm meeting on 13 AUG 2020
- Working closely with Britta Goodman (GPEX Campaigns Officer)
- Draft of survey for Local Party co-ordinators on current Climate Campaign analysis

Issues requiring Resolution

1. CamComm Request GPEX for Staff time allocation to create and implement framework of ACE Campaign Officer.
2. CAMCOMM Complete ACE Campaign project implementation strategy.
3. HQ sanctioned Template of GDPR policy for local party constitutions – currently seeking advice from Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). Need to seek additional advice from IT Head Jordan Harp on template content.
4. Development of Local Party Mediation & Disputes resolution Training. Discussions with Clare Spence (colleague of 2 NVC trainers from GPEW Policyfest NVC 2–Day training session). Approached to provide costings to run a trial 45 min Nonviolent communication Introduction session followed by 6 week mediation training workshops consisting of 1 hr training sessions (20 instruction followed by 40 min role playing session).
5. Working with HQ to have timely & transparent dissemination of meeting minutes & body rulings (SOC, AFCOM, etc) direct to local parties in Local Party Bulletins.

INTERNATIONAL COORDINATORS REPORT

[[SOC Note, this report was received late.]]

Michal Chantkowski and Alice Hubbard

Introduction

International work has significantly expanded over the past year, with the start up of multiple new projects together with sister parties in the Balkans and East Africa, as well as development of the legacies of previous projects. The International Committee remains one of GPEW's most active committees and International Coordinators have worked hard to ensure strong foundations are developed to provide the necessary internal foundations for international work, improve outreach to members, and work to ensure GPEW is more internationalist.

Westminster Foundation for Democracy

Our work with WFD (Westminster Foundation for Democracy) has expanded, as we are now delivering a number of activities across East Africa (Kenya, Burundi, Uganda), including capacity building for local current/emerging leaders and activists in areas such as communication, IT and election strategy.

North Macedonia

Over the past year, we have worked closely with MODOM, youth wing of DOM (aka Greens) in North Macedonia in developing and delivering a Young Greens of England and Wales '30 under 30'–inspired training programme (aka Green Academy) for young green activists in North Macedonia. This is the first training programme ever to be offered by the youth wing of a political party in North Macedonia. One key outcome of this programme is the ongoing development of a LGBTIQ+ cross border campaign and virtual exchange project between Green Academy 'graduates' and young greens from England and Wales to help support DOM's efforts to reintroduce the anti discrimination law for LGBTIQ+ peoples.

Albania

In June 2020, we carried out an online scoping visit together with the Albanian Green Party and civil society organisations in Albania. Going forward, the project will involve training and capacity building activities for local and prospective councillors in Albania, in areas such as campaigning and support for councillors. Having been inspired by the GPEW Association of Green Councillors model, councillors in Albania are also keen to set up a similar structure for their councillors. Sessions are expected to start in October 2020.

East Africa

– Green Talent Accelerator – Supporting Greens in East Africa (Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda)

Following the success of last year's Green Talent Accelerator programme, we have relaunched the Green Talent Accelerator (GTA). The GTA is a training and mentoring programme tailored to aspiring green politicians in East Africa and forms an important part of our work with sister parties in the Global South. The GTA has received 24 applications from greens across the East Africa Federation and 10 have been shortlisted for interview.

- Kenya and Rwanda

We are working closely with the Green Congress of Kenya (GCK) to assist in developing their website (offering a paid position to a GPEW website expert) as well as help with their communications material via the production of party promotional videos and video editing training for GCK staff.

We are also in the initial planning stages of launching two localised youth programmes for young greens in Kenya and Rwanda. Programmes will be led by youth coordinators in the country, with remote support from GPEW. The programmes aim to provide a safe space for discussion and debate, combined with opportunities to develop skills and cross-border relations with young greens in England and Wales and local NGOs working on sustainability issues. Key issues will be centred on women in politics, disabilities, being a young green councillor, amplifying the youth voice in politics.

Also in initial stages is a programme to support local election candidates in Rwanda and provide opportunities for GPEW councillors to help support and train election candidates, mentor, and participate in knowledge exchange between the two parties.

We look forward to working closely with the Association of Green Councillors and Field Organising team for this project.

- European Green Party (EGP)

We have organised and led delegations to two EGP councils—in Tampere (November 2019) and Skopje (which in the end was held online). We have been able to strengthen our relationship with a number of EGP member parties and improve GPEW's recognition within the EGP. We have been successful in getting our members elected to EGP positions, including the election of Jean Lambert, former MEP to the EGP Executive Committee, the election of Eleanor Morrissey as a substitute member of the Global Greens Coordination (representing GPEW and the EGP), and the election of Emma Carter, former GPEW treasurer and acting chair to EGP Finance Advisory Board.

Global Greens

We continue to have a positive working relationship with Global Greens, who are currently in the planning stages of their upcoming congress, which will take place in Seoul, South Korea in January 2022. This congress will have a robust online element, with local International Coordinators ensuring congress is as accessible as possible to members, coordinating online interaction and participation. As part of congress preparation for this, they have asked all parties to hold at least one international event/panel/webinar as well as produce an introductory video for the Global Greens website. These preparations are underway.

COP26

We have been working closely with the GPEX chair, the campaign coordinators to ensure GPEW's involvement in the preparation for the summit. Our role has been to liaise with the EGP, Global Greens and the Scottish Greens in setting up a framework for the green movement to take an effective part in shaping the agenda connected to the summit and ensuring GPEW's political objectives are advanced by the UK's hosting

of the summit. Also part of our COP26 strategy is to ensure Global South voices are front and centre. Our projects with Greens in the East African region and close cooperation with the Global Greens will be instrumental to this strategy.

Interisles Network

We have been able to organise a meeting with the Irish Green Party to discuss the formation of the coalition government in the Republic of Ireland, as well as the road to the successful establishment of the government and the current party strategy. The International Committee has also organised a panel meeting on the implications of Brexit and the possible Scottish independence on cross-country cooperation within the UK and Ireland, however, due to the Spring conference being cancelled, it did not happen.

Non-Eu States network

—We have created a plan for an alliance between non-EU EGP (European Green Party) member parties and successfully engaged with a range of non-EU parties in initial discussions to establish a more formal network. This network will help GPEW to fulfil its European and international objectives in the light of UK's departure from the EU and would include parties from countries such as Norway, Georgia, Moldova or Switzerland (and many others)

Communications

International Committee Bulletin

In striving to improve communications with GPEW members and showcase international work, the International Committee published their first International Committee Bulletin in an all members email, published on Saturday 26th July. We hope to continue producing and disseminating the International Committee bulletin on a regular basis, alongside the greens_ic channel on twitter. We hope it becomes a permanent feature, so that we can better share the international work of our party.

Note from GPEX Chair: a special thank you to the IC Coordinators who undertake a massive amount of work outside GPEX, and to Michal Chantkowski, who is not standing for office in the coming year.

INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATORS REPORT

[[SOC Note, this report was received late.]]

Peter Barnett and Hazel Pegg – job-share

Internal publications

The role of the Int Comms Coordinator has totally changed over recent years from one of predominantly of producing and despatching the internal members' magazine, Green Activist, which covered a multitude of things from news, campaigns, internal reports, contact info, etc. etc. It was too long and ambitious in scope, and less useful because of it.

As the Party has significantly grown from a membership of around 15,000 to nearer 50,000 over the past few years, it has been able to massively expand the number of permanent staff. We currently have 53 staff in post across all central Party departments and regions: 40 permanent and 13 fixed term staff.

One result of this is that most of the work previously done by GPEX coordinators, who are of course volunteers and amateurs, is now performed by fully-qualified paid professionals. This has vastly improved the quality and quantity of materials and services delivered to the membership, leaving GPEX members a more appropriate role of overseeing their areas of responsibility and offering guidance and advice to the staff undertaking the work.

So Green Activist no longer exists, but much of its content is now delivered by the Membership Team in regular, well produced publications like Local Party Bulletin, Officers Bulletin, special Election Bulletins and so on. See an example here <https://localbulletin.greenparty.org.uk/oct2019part5electionedition/>

IT – members’ website – membership database – crm

The nightmare that is the Members’ Website remains in place and has continued to frustrate and infuriate members attempting to use it. It’s especially terrible at this time of year as members’ attempts to negotiate the incredibly challenging tasks of submitting motions to conference, prioritising them, and voting in the internal elections for GPEX and leadership candidates. We can only say we’re deeply sorry you have had to go through this again. It is not SOC’s fault – they do the best they can with a system that’s significantly worse than its predecessor.

We promised to make this issue a top priority in our pitch to you last year, and we can assure you that a huge effort has been put into resolving these problems and is continuing. This should be the last time you experience the nightmare.

Under our new Digital Manager, Jordan Harp, a root and branch analysis including wide consultation has been conducted to identify all the problems, and sufficient resources have been allocated to ensure the new systems we are investing in are fit for purpose. Many of you will already have been introduced to Action Network, and are currently being trained to use it. This will replace CIVI as the platform for local parties to use for membership admin, emails, fundraising and host of other features which should revolutionise their ability to run well organised and successful operations.

Meanwhile work continues on building a decent members’ website, support for local party websites, creating a national system where joining the party, donating or volunteering to help will become very easy and reliable. All this will greatly improve the Party’s fortunes and potential to grow without pain. Much of the work is nearly complete. Action Network is currently being rolled out – other systems are due in the next couple of months.

Re-establish campaigns and communications committee

We have revived CamCom Committee to enable co-ordinators and staff to provide strategic advice on campaigns and communications, to ensure they support and deliver political and electoral objectives. Their role is to review the strategy for the use of the new digital tools for campaigning at local level; to test the effectiveness of different campaign messages and calls to action; and to advise on appropriate materials

to support agreed campaigns. A second meeting is planned shortly to discuss and decide on the Terms of Reference.

Reform conference voting working group

The final stage of this working group is imminent. Its purpose was to seek ways to increase members’ participation in decision making. A ballot will be sent to the membership later this year asking them to rank the six possible solutions determined by the Reform Conference Voting Working Group after several years of debate, consultation and conference motions:

1. The Status Quo

The Spring and Autumn Conferences are open to all members on a self-appointed basis. When taking part in plenary sessions, members are free to vote on motions as they wish.

2. Delegates Conference

Elected members from local parties and groups are mandated to vote on Conference motions on behalf of their members and as determined by those members prior to Conference.

3. Representatives Conference

Members from local parties and groups attending Conference are expected to broadly represent the views of their members when voting on motions.

4. Online/postal voting when conference opinion is divided

Conference voting takes place as it does now but a motion supported by between 1/3 and 2/3 of conference requires endorsement by an electronic ballot of all members, with the option of a postal ballot for those unable to vote online.

5. Regional Conferences and one Annual Congress with indicative voting online

One day Spring conferences to be held in each of our 10 regions with motions submitted by local parties and/or individuals or members of locally based groups to be followed by a two days Autumn Conference. Live streaming and online indicative voting for all events to be available to all participants.

6. Online voting plus conference

Streamed live plenary sessions now being well established, online voting on motions debated at Plenary sessions is made available to all members. The online votes to be added to those of physical conference participants.

The results will be advisory, and passed on the appropriate members working on getting the Holistic Review implemented.

See video here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Bus2hGSoQWeYRk4vK7n_SAZoTGwp3okh/view

EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY COORDINATORS REPORT

[[SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.

Section 5 part xix of the constitution states that:

The elections and equality and diversity coordinators on the

Green Party Executive will be tasked with working with local and regional parties to promote the training and conditions within the Green Party to enable it to work towards the proportion of female candidates reaching at least 50% in candidate lists in PR elections such as European elections and at least 50% of General election candidates. Taking into account the need to put forward effective candidates, they will work with local/regional parties to try to ensure that female candidates will comprise at least 50% of those selected to stand for winnable seats. A report on the gender balance of candidates and elected members will be included in the Gpex report to conference after each relevant election.

Section 4 part vi of the constitution states that:

GPEW will carry out equalities monitoring of members, candidates, officers and office holders. The aggregated anonymised data will be presented to conference as part of the Equality and Diversity coordinator's report. This section of the report will include national, regional and local actions to address issues of underrepresentation.]]

No Report Receive by deadline.

WALES LEADERS REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

YOUNG GREENS REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT COORDINATORS REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATORS REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

TRADE UNION LIAISON OFFICER REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

CAMPAIGNS COORDINATORS REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

PUBLICATIONS COORDINATORS REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEES OF GPEX

[[SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.

Section 7 part x of the constitution states:

The Party Executive may from time to time create such Committees as it considers necessary for the efficient conduct of its business and shall determine their terms of reference, powers, duration and composition, retaining responsibility for the conduct of such Committees and accounting for the conduct of those Committees to the Annual Conference. Any such Committee shall include at least one member of the Regional Council.]]

UNKNOWN GPEX COMMITTEE REPORT

[[SOC Note, this report was received late.]]

No name attached to this report.

I take this opportunity to report progress back to conference and ask for this work to continue and bring a Draft Voting Paper back within the constituted timescales of 2 years and 3 months at the latest.

At the workshop session at Spring Conference 2019 I was asked to convene the steps to get this work up and running. It was a well-attended session and a number of these people have continued their involvement in the work plan. A space has been created on the members' website and a call out to the membership has been made through several routes to gain a broad representation of members across the breadth of matters covered by the chapter. This group now grows beyond forty in number and has interest across many issues and matters within the chapter.

A draft work plan has been circulated for comment and whilst some aspects are supported others are not supported across all group members. This approach has been reviewed and other routes to build the work ahead being discussed. One really interesting approach suggested by a group member is to build this from the UN Articles on Human Rights as a point of first principles.

A number of members, including myself, consider that some aspects of the topics are sensitive within the party and indeed the wider community and would benefit from external support and engaging experts in Non-Violent Communication techniques. Efforts have been made to raise funds to support this approach both through interested parties and the GPEW governance structures. This has proved to be slower than expected and work continues to raise funds and engage appropriate professionals.

A workshop has been arranged for Autumn Conference 2019 to make more progress and further work continues to build a chapter balanced across our collective rights and responsibilities.

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

DONATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

GENERAL ELECTIONS STEERING GROUP REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

POLITICAL COMMITTEE REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

CAMPAIGNS COMMITTEE REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

A3 TREASURERS REPORT

Jon Nott, Party Treasurer.

[[SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.

Section 7 part xvi, clause e of the constitution states:

[GPEX] to present a full written report on its activities and on the financial state of the Party to the Annual Conference.]]

2019 accounts / 2020 finance update

Please see the attached accounts for 2019. It was a year of much change and many surprises. We ended 2018 in a very difficult financial situation and set a very tight budget for 2019 with a small number of senior staff taking temporary reductions in hours to avoid making redundancies in the staff team. The huge success in the May local elections led to a surge in membership and the unprecedented results in the rapidly re-scheduled European Elections following the delay to Brexit led to a further, smaller surge in membership. The year ended of course with the snap general election. The combined effect of the planned and expected success in the local elections and the two unexpected elections meant that we ended the year with a significant surplus. Surplus funds donated for the General Election campaign have been ring-fenced for investment in future General Elections and the remaining surplus has been largely deployed to overhaul the Party's creaking infrastructure. By the end of 2020 we aim to have completed the move from CiviCRM to a new 'tech stack' including Action Network, new payment collection services and a new underlying database – all with better integration with our finance systems. This will make better tools available to local Parties and, crucially, reduce the amount of staff time dealing with problems with Civi and membership payments – freeing up capacity to support local Parties and activists.

In 2019 we had three Chief Executives (Nick Martin left in April and Rob Buckman was acting-CEO until Mary Clegg started in October). With Rob stepping up from Head of Finance to acting-CEO and then the new role of Chief Operating Officer, we had three interim Heads of Finance. This turnover, combined with the increased compliance work arising from the unscheduled elections meant that this was a particularly challenging time for the Finance Team. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank all the staff and particularly to thank Mamadou and Vainetta in the Finance Team for supporting this seemingly ever changing cast of managers and for the welcome that they have given to our new, permanent, Head of Finance Fiona Shaw who started in April 2020.

Electoral Commission compliance

As mentioned above, more elections means more reporting to the Election Commission. On top of the routine quarterly reporting cycle, we had the European Elections and the

General Election. Both of these elections have regulated periods which stretch back 12 months from the date of the election – overlapping with each other and with the local Election regulated period. Normally we would have good notice of national elections and plan how to support local Parties with their record-keeping and reporting well in advance. This was simply not possible in 2019 and I would like to thank all local Treasurers for their incredible work – it was not just Party Office which saw a massive increase in finance and electoral compliance work.

It has been my ambition since I was appointed Party Treasurer at the start of 2019 that we improve and increase the support we provide to local Treasurers – unfortunately the circumstances meant that we were not able to make as much progress I we had hoped and there was more chasing and less supporting than we are striving for. The ambition remains and, despite the additional complications of Covid-19 and lockdown, we continue to make small improvements and look forward to the full implementation of the new tech stack which will improve systems and free up more staff time to support local Parties.

Sadly, despite the best efforts of local volunteer Treasurers and our Party Office staff, we slipped up on several occasions, leading to Electoral Commission investigations and fines for non-compliance. The first fine relates to an historic failure to update local Party office details with the Electoral Commission which meant that the wrong person was chased and reporting deadlines were missed. It is a continual task to keep the list of local, regional and Wales (Accounting Units in Electoral Commission terminology) officers up to date and one that is absolutely vital. Having inaccurate records registered with the Electoral Commission is a compliance breach in its own right as well as making other breaches more likely as this example proves. The second fine relates to a failure of an Accounting Unit to report a donation to Party Office in time for us to report it to the Electoral Commission. Although the duty to report lies with the Accounting Unit, ultimate responsibility lies with me as Party Treasurer to ensure that we have the systems in place to ensure that Accounting Units comply with reporting requirements. You can understand why I place such a priority on improving support to our volunteer Treasurers. The third fine relates to the late filing of a nil return in one quarter due to a misunderstanding about whether nil returns were required which was not cleared up until after the deadline had passed.

Finally, the Electoral Commission are investigating our European Election return due to a number of technical reporting breaches. These largely fell into two categories: 1. Failure by local Parties to provide the appropriate supporting paperwork on time and a lack of capacity to support them in their compliance duties, 2. A mismatch between the way Facebook invoice for online advertising and how the Electoral Commission require us to report expenditure. This affects not only the Green Party, but all major Parties and we had a very productive meeting with the Electoral Commission to clarify how to avoid this in future in advance of the submission of the General Election return.

I hope that is the last compliance breach that I have to report to conference and look forward to focusing our efforts on improving and increasing the support we are able to offer to local Parties.

[[SOC Note, a section of this report was ruled out of order and can be found in the Out of Order Section of the agenda.]]

A4 GREEN PARTY REGIONAL COUNCIL REPORT

Kat Driscoll and Rob Grant, GPRC Co-chairs

The two key roles of GPRC of party wellbeing and oversight of party strategy are still core. Party wellbeing has, once again, been the greatest challenge.

Party wellbeing involves the external reputation of the party and, internally, discipline and due process. It also involves the wellbeing of our members, how they treat each other and whether they find the Green Party a welcoming and a safe space. We are very conscious of this, and so we seek to change our culture where we see this is not happening and we aim always to lead by example.

GPRC Membership

Membership currently stands at 19 out of the 20 potential members.

Our newest members are from the Eastern, North East x2, South East x2, South West regions & Wales.

GPRC Meetings

DATE
16/17 Dec 2019
LOCATION
London
ATTENDANCE
9 in person 5 by Zoom
KEY GUEST PARTICIPANTS
Mary Clegg – CEO

DATE
22/23 Feb 2020
LOCATION
London
ATTENDANCE
Sat: 13 in person; 2 by Zoom Sun: 10 in person; 4 by Zoom
KEY GUEST PARTICIPANTS
Mary Clegg – CEO Chris Williams – Head of Elections & Field Operations (Zoom) Wendy Armour (Zoom) Observer – Phil Vabulas – London Region

DATE
30/31 May 2020
LOCATION
Zoom
ATTENDANCE
Sat: 17 Sun: 16
KEY GUEST PARTICIPANTS
Mary Clegg – CEO Jordan Harp – Digital Manager Wendy Armour, Marisa Johnson, Jan King – DRC Jon Nott – Treasurer / Finance Coordinator Amelia Womack – Deputy Chair of GPEx

DATE
19/20 Sept 2020
LOCATION
Zoom
ATTENDANCE
Meeting will occur post submission of this report
KEY GUEST PARTICIPANTS

The agenda varies from meeting to meeting but always includes regional reports. There were also a number of additional extraordinary meetings of GPRC which were not open to observers due to the confidential nature of their agenda.

The Co-Chairs plus three 'on-call' GPRC members, acting on a rota basis, make urgent decisions between quarterly meetings.

These decisions are then ratified by the full council (except Appeals subgroup if it needs to be heard in our confidential session) at the next physical meeting.

Where a decision may be very controversial, or where several people may need to recuse themselves, we may ask for the whole GRPC council except Appeals subgroup to discuss and vote on the matter, but this decision will still be ratified at the next meeting.

Agreed minutes of GPRC meetings are placed on the members' website as soon as practicable after the quarterly meeting when they have been approved.

Co-chair meetings are bi-weekly typically. Minutes of these meetings are shared on the Drive for other members of GPRC to see.

GPRC work during the year

Work we have done and been involved with this year:

1. Relations between GPRC and GPEx
2. Staff and HR
3. GPEx Candidate Approvals
4. Holistic Review / Constitution

5. Political Strategy
6. House of Lords
7. Disputes, Complaints and Disciplinary (DCD) Working Group
8. Equality and Inclusivity: Values and Process
9. Population Matters
10. Unite to Remain
11. Training
12. Motions from Autumn Conference 2019
13. Policy and Policy Statements

1. Relations between GPRC and GPEX

We have worked very hard this year to improve relationships between GPRC and GPEX and to work constructively with both our staff and the Executive. We have the greatest respect for our colleagues, and we understand that we all want what is best for the Green Party.

GPEX's role is the day to day running of the party and ours is to ensure that this is done with the party's wellbeing in mind and in the best interests of its members. We can do this by collaboration and consensus. In fact, we must – because working without collaboration, without respect, is not Green and is on no-one's best interest or well-being, least of all our members.

Co-chairs participate in GPEX meetings whether physical or online. GPRC has voting representation on all GPEX Committees.

We also act as (critical) friends to all GPEX co-ordinators. We are not afraid to ask difficult questions on behalf of our members, or to make recommendations for change, or issue a statement of concern. But we do so respectfully and with the offer of help where it might be needed. Friends understand that they have different responsibilities, are truthful to each other, but are prepared to support each other. This is the relationship we wish to have between our two groups.

2. Staff and HR

GPRC were approached by the staff Trade Union representatives regarding HR policies and their implementation. GPRC met with the Chair of GPEX to ask that these be reviewed and later one of the co-chairs met with the CEO to discuss this further. This work unfortunately has been delayed by the General Election and events since but is ongoing and progress is being monitored by GPRC co-chairs and our representative on the Administration and Finance Committee (AFComm), which is a subcommittee of GPEX.

3. GPEX Candidate Approvals

There is a requirement for candidates who wish to stand for GPEX to have been a member of the Party for two complete years, those who have been a member for only one year are able to request dispensation from GPRC to be able to stand. GPRC received four applications for dispensation ahead of the annual ballot, these were considered and GPRC granted dispensation to three of the four candidates.

4. Holistic Review / Constitution

Following on from conference last year GPRC started to try and resolve the issues surrounding new constitution and getting

this brought to conference for a vote. Initial conversations between the Transition Team and SOC were derailed by the General Election. GPRC, following conversations with SOC, TT, GPEX and the CEO did try and put a motion regarding the constitution to Spring Conference, but this was ruled out of order. We did, however, put a number of amendments to a motion placed by Martin Hemingway. In the end though Spring Conference never took place.

Since then GPRC has been convening a group including representatives from GPRC, GPEX, the Holistic Review, the CEO and SOC. This group has put two motions to this conference, one calling for an Extraordinary Conference to take place near Spring conference next year at which a full set of documents will be represented for discussion debate and a vote.

5. Political Strategy

Following the election late last year, Jonathan Bartley contacted GPRC earlier this year to request that the political strategy be updated. Progress on this was disrupted by the pandemic, but despite that an initial kick off meeting involving representatives from GPRC, GPEX, the national office, AGC, Wales, liberation groups and regional coordinators took place in April. Following on from that we have been working closely with the work being done by the national office and the development team who are preparing, among other things, a Case for Support. To support that work and also to involve wider numbers of members across the country in shaping the political strategy, we conducted with the sport of national office staff, a series of consultation exercises built around a planning process called Future Backwards.

We have now had feedback using this structure from all the regions, GPRC, GPEX, most of the liberation groups (all were invited) and AGC. This produced a significant volume of ideas which were synthesised and presented back to members for their reactions in August of this year.

It has always been GPRC's desire that the political strategy isn't something that is created by a few people in the party, but represents the hopes and aspirations of the party and involves as many members as possible; and the process this year has seen us take another step along this path. It is our hope that we will be presenting the final output of that work to conference in Spring once the document has received the support of GPRC and GPEX.

6. House of Lords

Last year saw the elevation of Natalie Bennett to the House of Lords. Unfortunately, due to timings, the final choice had to be made from the short list of nominees without a member's vote. Following Natalie's elevation, GPRC commenced re-starting the selection process, but a ruling by SOC clarified that the old process hadn't finished properly and as a result, members had to vote against the original short list. The candidates were advised accordingly, and it was agreed to include the House of Lords ballot as part of this year's internal elections. Sadly prior to the ballot one candidate withdrew from the process leaving a list of four candidates to vote on.

The House of Lords Liaison group has been meeting two

monthly as far as has been possible to support our peers and maximise the impact they can have for the Party.

7. Disputes, Complaints and Disciplinary (DCD)

Working Group

The Disputes, Complaints and Disciplinary (DCD) Working Group has built on the work carried out previously in its remit to make DCD procedures across the party more robust. It prepared a motion for Spring Conference 2020 that would have required all Local, Regional and Affiliated groups to have their own DCD procedures. The motion was ruled out of order; however, the work has restarted recently and with a larger membership. The remit has also been broadened in order to address other areas of our DCD processes that require clarification and streamlining.

The aim is for there to be a One Stop Shop on the new party website, where anyone concerned with matters that they think have gone wrong in the party will be able to receive the necessary and appropriate guidance and support. It is hoped that sufficient progress will have been made for there to be a fringe event at Conference to elaborate on the work that is underway on DCD procedures.

8. Equality and Inclusivity: Values and Process

In the past few months GPRC has established a working group with a brief around Equality and Inclusivity: Values and Process. It is currently comprised of four GPRC members, from four different regions, and is mainly focused on helping to move the party forward towards a review and rewrite of the Rights and Responsibilities policy chapter. We are also considering options to help the party to address internal conflict around contentious issues, building on some positive work which took place with facilitators in association with PolicyFest, held in February 2020.

9. Population Matters

A working group was set up to consider whether to uphold or rescind an earlier GPRC decision to ban the charity Population Matters from holding a stall at Conference. The working group reached out to liberation groups in the party as well as the equality and diversity coordinator on GPEx, to enable them to articulate their views on the organisation and provide evidence in support of their position. Material currently included on the Population Matters website was carefully considered, and the working group corresponded with the current CEO, who expressed his views on the reasons for the ban and changes that have since been made to bring the organisation into line with progressive Green Party values. The working group presented their findings to GPRC together with a recommendation that the ban be lifted, but that GPEx should be the final arbiter on allocation of stalls to organisations, based on the party's ever evolving campaigns and communications priorities. GPRC endorsed the report and its recommendations by a narrow majority vote.

10 Unite to Remain

In the run up to the Unite To Remain arrangements, constituencies identified as potentially taking part in a UTR 'stand aside' situation were required to decide democratically

to stand aside any selected candidate. This was to comply with Green Party values and following the advice of GPRC. Members in some constituencies had initially voted at a local party meeting, but staff and GPEx members asked for a ballot to follow on from that to get the fullest mandate for a stand aside decision. In some cases, these ballots were run in parallel to selection ballots to stand a candidate in case the UTR agreement did not actually come together between the three parties at the England and Wales level.

Decisions made by members to stand aside were conditional on a UTR agreement taking place at the England and Wales level, i.e. they would continue to stand a candidate in the case of no agreement by the Green Party's UTR negotiation team, GPEx elections officers and GPRC, with the Liberal Democrats and Plaid Cymru.

Members in 45 English and Welsh constituencies voted to stand aside candidates. The process used balloted all members in the constituency. Where a constituency crossed local party boundaries, the ballot crossed those boundaries as per Green Party rules. Members in 5 constituencies voted against standing aside. In 7 constituencies, members decided not to stand a candidate in the General Election whether a UTR agreement was reached or not.

11 Training

GPRC has continued to regularly make requests of GPEx that they include a budget for training in the annual budget and that they arrange training for members of GPRC, GPEx, DC and DRC and staff on relevant topics, including but not limited to safeguarding, unconscious bias, sexual harassment, finance and governance. GPRC cochairs have requested that this become part of the induction for members of governance bodies. Some training has taken place already, but we will continue to monitor this and request that appropriate training is provided to all who need it.

12 Motions from Autumn Conference 2019

At Autumn Conference in 2019, seven policy motions were referred to GPRC by conference which were discussed at a GPRC meeting and the following decisions were made:

- E06 Reform the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime – proposal to update LP408 – referred back
- E07 The Oxford–Cambridge Expressway – approved
- E08 Improve calculations to set Living Wage levels – proposal to update WR686 – approved
- E10 Support fair transitional pension arrangements for 1950's women – approved, including the amendment proposed in the conference agenda
- E11 Access to nature and health – approved
- E13 Legalisation of secular humanist marriage – approved
- E15 One Yorkshire – referred back

Confidential Matters

a. Members suspended in 2019–20 by GPRC pending investigation of complaints or for posing a risk to the party.

Over the last 12 months we have temporarily suspended

13 members on a no–fault basis pending investigation of complaints by DC and of these:

- 1 has left the party
- 4 were formally suspended by DC
- 1 was expelled from the party
- 3 were dropped either by GPRC or following DC
- 4 are outstanding

Please note that the temporary suspension by Co–chairs or GPRC is intended to protect the party where there is a risk continuing which suspension would mitigate. It is not a disciplinary sanction. It must be stressed here that GPRC is not a pro–active body in suspending members. It can only react to properly submitted and appropriately evidenced cases of reputational damage and serious risk to the party or to individuals within party activities.

It must also be underlined that it is the Disciplinary Committee that deals with matters relating to internal party discipline. Suspension by GPRC is not a quick solution to a disciplinary problem. The two processes are separate. Ideally complaints should be resolved by the local party, or at Regional level, with unresolved problems escalated to the Disciplinary Committee.

GPRC will be taking steps to better communicate how the suspension process should and can be used where there is a real danger of the party being brought into disrepute in the public eye.

We are increasingly concerned about the use of social media and how vulnerable individuals and the party can become if it is used with poor judgment.

b. Members refused renewed membership (2019–20)

There are currently 4 members who are refused re–joining the party.

1. the respondent brought the party into disrepute and was expelled at DC hearing.
2. GPRC on calls refused membership, after being informed that the member had an unspent criminal conviction for threatening an MP.
3. membership cancelled following staff request accusing anti–Semitism.
4. the respondent brought the party into disrepute and was expelled at DC hearing.

c. Appeals (2019–20)

We have made decisions on seven appeal cases during the period.

One appeal was upheld, one was partially upheld in relation to the sanction applied, and in five cases the appeals were not upheld.

Note: conference agreed that now complainants may also appeal.

A5 **DISPUTE RESOLUTION COMMITTEE REPORT**

Wendy Armour, DRC Co-ordinator

1. About the Dispute Resolution Committee (DRC)

The committee exists to offer and develop mediation as an approach to conflict resolution for party members, as both an alternative to, and where this has not been resolved via, existing dispute/complaints channels.

Mediation is part of what is known as nonviolent, peace–based conflict resolution where people are supported to listen, hear, appreciate and understand each other’s viewpoints as to how the disputes have arisen. Mediators support this process, working to ensure everyone feels safe and supported. Mediation aims for relationships to be mended wherever possible and goodwill restored.

Mediation is an entirely voluntary process, and it does not preclude pursuing other options if members are not satisfied with its outcome. Any agreement that may arise will have to be fully acceptable to both parties, and both parties will have to commit to abiding by it. The process is completely confidential, and nothing that is said, shared or agreed can be disclosed to any other person – no records are stored.

Mediation services can be requested by any member, officer or green groups of the GPEW and we welcome inquiries from outside of the formal disciplinary process.

Values

The values of the GPEW underpin our approach to mediation with the following particularly relevant to this work:

- A healthy society is based on voluntary co–operation between empowered individuals in a democratic society, free from discrimination whether based on race, colour, gender, sexual orientation, religion, social origin or any other prejudice.
- We emphasise democratic participation and accountability by ensuring that decisions are taken at the closest practical level to those affected by them.
- We look for non–violent solutions to conflict situations, which take into account the interests of minorities and future generations in order to achieve lasting settlements.
- We encourage members to take responsibility for their actions and recognise that unforeseen undesirable consequences might flow from them.

2. Membership update since report to Spring Conference 2020 (21.2.2020)

Current members:

Marisa Johnson (re–elected Autumn conference 2019)

Wendy Armour (elected Autumn conference 2019)

Peter Hamilton (co–opted mid–April 2020)

Jan King (co–opted mid–April 2020)

Adam Clarke (elected Autumn conference 2019)

and inactive since late March 2020)

Resignations:

Nick Barnett (elected Autumn conference 2019) resigned early March 2020.

3. Co-Option to Vacancies

In our report to Spring Conference 21.2.20 we reported an advert was put on the members website for a co-opted member for the one vacancy unfilled at Autumn Conference 2019 and there had not been any response from members. This vacancy would have been up for election at Spring Conference 2020; however, conference did not go ahead due to the Covid19 pandemic. After discussion with the ERO we recruited two members for co-option to the committee from within the new group of regional volunteer mediators.

Additional support

In addition, as we have had an inactive member since March 2020, we have recently invited Ron Meldrum, one of the volunteer mediators, to support the committee and he kindly agreed (August 2020).

4. Roles

Coordinator – Wendy Armour

Deputy Co-ordinator – Peter Hamilton

Treasurer – there was no budget allocated to DRC from April 2020, so this role is currently inactive.

Mediation leads – Marisa Johnson has taken the lead on arranging mediations. Jan King and Marisa Johnson have worked together to develop a Framework for Mediation guidance document which sets out how mediation is approached and undertaken in the GPEW and assures quality standards.

5. Meetings

DRC meetings:

Since our report to Spring Conference 2020, DRC has met three times, one was a closed meeting (members only). It is planned to meet once again before Autumn Conference 2020, at the end of September. So that will be a total of eight meetings throughout the year.

All active members have attended all the DRC meetings and there is regular communication between the active members via email, skype/zoom and phone calls.

Mediators group meetings:

In addition there have been two meetings with DRC members and the new regional volunteer mediators and it is planned to meet once again before Autumn Conference 2020, at end of September. The first induction meeting was also attended by the relevant Regional Coordinators and these officers are included in routine communications to the mediators.

6. Budget

The 2019/20 budget of £600 was not spent as training booked for March 2020 was cancelled due to the Covid19 pandemic. There has been no budget allocated to DRC this financial year.

The Committee would like funds to purchase its own zoom account dedicated for DRC work/mediations.

7. Green Party Regional Council (GPRC) Friend

The committee would like to extend a big thank-you to Ann Forsaith, our GPRC friend, for all her support. Ann has attended every DRC meeting as the GPRC Friend (apart from one closed meeting) and been helpful and supportive in her liaison role. She left the meetings prior to the confidential part of the meeting agenda when current cases are reviewed in confidence only by the committee members. Ann also attended the first meeting of the new volunteer mediators in April 2020.

Ann has recently given up her friending roles and the committee has welcomed Steve Leyland in August 2020 as the new GPRC friend, and looks forward to working with him.

Marisa Johnson, Jan King and Wendy Armour gave a presentation to a recent GPRC meeting suggesting a new approach to a complaints process, involving a first informal tier of dispute resolution.

8. Mediation Cases/Activity

Since our report to Spring Conference, 21.2.2020, we can report the following activity in formal mediation cases – as at the time of this report:

Cases currently 'Open' : 3

Cases currently 'Paused' : 1

Cases now 'Closed': 6

Total: 10*

*There was a noticeable decrease in demand for mediation and/or advice during the lockdown period of the Covid19 pandemic. However, since the lockdown has eased there has been an increase in referrals, so most of the above activity is related to recent activity as lockdown eased. Further referrals are anticipated over the next few weeks given the rise in formal complaints submitted recently.

We also meet with individuals referred to or advised towards DRC but after discussion do not proceed to mediation, and the figures above do not include this activity.

Additional activity:

There has also been other activity including offering advice to green groups or officers to discuss improving their dispute resolution, which Wendy Armour and Jan King have undertaken. Wendy Armour and Peter Hamilton, DRC Coordinator and Deputy, have also met with individual members to discuss issues they may have, which may have prevented or ameliorated formal complaints. This individual meeting and discussion does appear to be useful for members, and the committee would like it to be encouraged prior to members submitting formal complaints.

Maggie Hunter, a volunteer mediator, has undertaken Nonviolent Communication TM training with a green group and has recently offered her services to other groups.

Ron Meldrum, has undertaken mentoring referred by Disciplinary Committee.

The committee would like to thank and acknowledge Bernard Ekbery, former DRC Coordinator for continuing to offer mediation to his on-going cases started during his previous term – all now completed.

9. Complaints Referral Group (CRG)

The Co-ordinator and Deputy Coordinator, ensure one of them attends the CRG meetings which meets to assess if the new complaints received by the Party, at national level, have been properly brought. We have been responsive to requests to meet and taken on our share of the minute taking.

10. Training Undertaken by Members

As reported in our report to Spring Conference Wendy Armour, Co-ordinator, was due to undertake a 3-day training in mediation & negotiation at political grassroots level arranged by OxPeace in mid-March 2020, however this was cancelled due to Covid19 pandemic. A day-long online workshop was offered instead in June 2020, free of charge, which Wendy attended.

During the lockdown period three of the volunteer mediators and three of the DRC members attended online seminars/conferences offered freely by Oxpeace.

11. Strengthening the Party's Mediation Capacity – Regional Volunteer Mediators appointed

The Committee are very pleased to report that by March 2020 we had successfully recruited eight new mediators with relevant experiences and/or qualifications – two of whom were also co-opted to DRC in April 2020 to fill vacancies. Since then a further two new volunteers have joined us. One volunteer has recently resigned (August 2020) as they left the party.

So at the time of this report we have a total mediation capacity of 11 mediators, including the active DRC members. Plus there is another member (West Midlands) who has indicated they may apply to join us as a volunteer in a few months' time.

We have recruited across all the regions apart from the North East, South West and Wales – and we plan to try to recruit from these areas again soon. Relationships between the volunteer mediators and Regional Coordinators have been encouraged and facilitated, so the mediators are a regional as well as a national resource.

The mediators group has met twice since April 2020 and another meeting is planned before Autumn conference, at the end of September 2020.

Of the current new mediators, five have either completed their first mediation with us, or are currently mediating on their first or second case. We anticipate that all of the volunteers will have completed their first mediation within the next two-three months.

Framework for Mediation GPEW: To further support this expansion of mediation capacity a Framework for Mediation guidance document has been developed which sets out how mediation is approached and undertaken in the GPEW and assures quality standards. This can be shared with regional and local officers who may be undertaking mediation to ensure

best practice.

12. Advisory Group development for Communication Challenges

As it has been identified that occasionally Green Party groups may come across participants who have difficulty in communicating, Wendy Armour, Co-ordinator and Ron Meldrum, Volunteer Mediator, are at an early stage of developing an Advisory Group for communications, that can advise local parties and all green groups.

Causes could be variety of reasons, from anxiety issues, depressions issues, autism, behavioural issues, relationship break down or simply difficulty between two people. This can cause conflict and possibly even complaints that get escalated to the disciplinary committee. Sometimes this way of resolving such positions is not appropriate.

We have recently accepted a mentoring case referred from Disciplinary Committee, and this experience will inform the development of the advisory group.

13. Current issues for consideration

The committee members have noted that DRC is becoming more of a service offered to members and green groups rather than a committee, and this necessitates a different approach to volunteer work and involvement. An increase in the capacity for mediation has involved more work for the committee members and, as we are all volunteers, we have had to prioritise our efforts to the service element, liaising with members and groups wanting mediation and also requests for advice and information. Also liaising and inducting new mediators.

We have also questioned whether the annual election of the committee at conference is the best way to deal with this shift towards a service approach and that continuity of members who are known and provide a steer to the mediation work by new volunteers is perhaps more important than previously.

We have also discussed whether there may be more value in the dispute resolution function and mediation being situated entirely separately from the current disciplinary process to ensure its impartiality is signalled and understood by party members requesting our services.

Priority issue – we are sharply aware of the lack of diversity on our committee and panel of mediators, especially with regard to ethnicity/cultural backgrounds. We have approached Greens of Colour for their help and advice on this, and this is a matter we would want to highlight as requiring priority for action.

14. Thanks and acknowledgements

In particular the committee would like to extend a huge thanks to:

- Matt Browne, former Governance Manager, whose efforts in supporting the recruitment of the new regional volunteer mediators has ensured a skilled group of mediators is now established.
- All the new volunteer mediators for joining us and engaging & responding so warmly and professionally with the committee and for working alongside the Regional

- Co-ordinators – who we also warmly thank for their engagement with our development work
- Wendy Armour, DRC Co-ordinator would like to give particular thanks to:
 - Marisa Johnson for her unwavering support and availability to take on and advise on mediations for members, the supporting and induction of new volunteer mediators and her input on developing the much-needed operational framework for mediation in the party.
 - Jan King for her collegueship, advice and lead/input on developing the much-needed operational framework for mediation in the party.
 - Peter Hamilton, for his generous support, wise advice and time to DRC and CRG.
 - Dave Newman for his generous and friendly technical advice and support
 - Leo Littman, former Chair of Disciplinary Committee and CRG, for his time, professionalism and good-humour in helping her settle in and understand the processes.
 - Ron Meldrum for his expertise and time in starting to develop a small advisory group for challenging communications and providing the basis for our new mediation agreement.
 - Maggie Hunter, volunteer mediator, for her extra work in providing Nonviolent Communication TM training.
 - Gerhard Lohmann-Bond and Martin Hemingway, Regional Co-ordinators, for their generous time in giving wise advice and kindly support.
 - Nick Barnett for his support, input and time as the Deputy Co-ordinator during his period as a committee member.

15. For further information about the work of DRC please contact: coordinator@drc.greenparty.org.uk

The below was reported to Spring Conference 2020 but that conference did not happen, so appears here as well.

1. About the Dispute Resolution Committee (DRC)

The committee exists to offer and develop mediation as an approach to conflict resolution for party members, as both an alternative to, and where this has not been resolved via, existing dispute/complaints channels.

Mediation is part of what is known as nonviolent, peace-based conflict resolution where people are supported to listen, hear, appreciate and understand each other's viewpoints as to how the disputes have arisen. Mediators support this process, working to ensure everyone feels safe and supported. Mediation aims for relationships to be mended wherever possible and goodwill restored.

Mediation is an entirely voluntary process, and it does not preclude pursuing other options if members are not satisfied with its outcome. Any agreement that may arise will have to be fully acceptable to both parties, and both parties will have to commit to abiding by it. The process is completely confidential, and nothing that is said, shared or agreed can be disclosed to any other person – no records are stored.

2. Members Elected at Autumn Conference 2019

- Wendy Armour (newly elected)

- Nick Barnett (re-elected)
- Adam Clarke (newly elected)
- Marisa Johnson (re-elected)

Four members above were elected, leaving one vacancy. Bernard Ekbery, the previous DRC Co-ordinator, had served a total of five years on the committee and was not eligible to re-stand. Bernard has remained as a mediator (see 7. Mediation Cases below).

3. Roles

The following roles were approved/agreed by committee members at its first meeting after autumn conference:

- Wendy Armour – Coordinator
- Nick Barnett – Deputy Coordinator
- Adam Clarke – Treasurer

4. Co-Option to Vacancy

An advert was put on the members website for a co-opted member however there was no response. This vacancy will be up for election at Spring Conference 2020.

5. Meetings

The Committee has met four times since the Autumn conference, at the time of this report.

The previous Committee Coordinator, Bernard Ekbery, attended the first three of these meeting as part of continuity/hand-over arrangements and this involved joining the confidential part of the agenda when current cases are reviewed in confidence, usually only by the elected members.

6. Green Party Regional Council (GPRC) Friend

Ann Forsaith attends every DRC meeting as the GPRC Friend and is helpful and supportive in her liaison role. She leaves the meeting prior to the confidential part of the meeting agenda when current cases are reviewed in confidence only by the elected members.

7. Mediation Cases

Since the new committee formed after Autumn Conference 2019, there have been three new mediation cases referred to the committee via the Complaints Referral Group (CRG) which were taken on by Marisa Johnson and Wendy Armour. All three cases are now closed with one being resolved successfully. There is one new case referred via CRG however it is awaiting agreement to start.

There were a further five on-going cases from the previous committee. Bernard Ekbery, the former Co-ordinator, kindly and helpfully agreed to continue with his work with some of these cases when the Committee decided to ask him to remain as a mediator – this was with disputants' knowledge and approval and working closely with DRC members.

One of these cases is now closed and one nearing the end of the process, with a mediation session planned. Nick Barnett has the lead for another.

Of the remaining two (both longstanding processes), one is paused to allow the disputant to re-consider their options to proceed or terminate the process, and the other mid-process.

Cases currently 'Open' : 3
Cases currently 'Paused' : 1
Cases now 'Closed': 4
Cases potentially likely to be considered : 3
Total: 11

8. Complaints Referral Group

Wendy Armour, Coordinator, and Nick Barnett, Deputy Coordinator, ensure one of them attends the CRG meetings which meets to assess if the new complaint(s) received by the Party, at national level, have been properly brought.

9. Training Undertaken by Members

Wendy Armour, Co-ordinator, is due to undertake a 3-day training in successful mediation & negotiation at political grassroots level arranged by OxPeace in mid-March 2020.

Wendy also commences 'Inspiring Non Violence' a six week online course with Woodbrooke Quaker College & Turning the Tide on 24.2.20.

10. Strengthening the Party's Mediation Capacity – Regional Volunteer Mediators

The Committee has a role to develop the party's capacity for mediation, and with this in mind an email was sent out on 18.2.20 to 5,000 of the party's officers asking for experienced mediators to form part of a new volunteer resource at Regional Party level to help promote a culture of respect and tolerance through non-violent communication & mediation. At the time of writing this report (21.2.20) we have had nine responses.

It's envisaged that regional volunteer mediators will undertake resolution face-to-face and remotely (via Skype/Zoom) and the national Disputes Resolution Committee will offer support and oversight.

11. Mediation Workshop – Spring Conference 2020

Marisa Johnson and Wendy Armour will run a taster-style workshop on mediation for members at Spring Conference

12 For further information about the DRC please contact

coordinator@drc.greenparty.org.uk

A6 POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

[[SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.

Section 13 part i of the constitution states:

The PDC shall submit a written report to each Conference.

Section 13 part ix of the constitution states:

All decisions to alter, archive and/or delete RoPS entries will be reported to Conference through the Policy Development Committee report.

This report was received late]]

Mick Greg

Committee Membership and Changes

The Committee currently has only two elected members with voting rights. This follows an elected member needing to drop out due to matters unconnected with PDC, and the elected Co-ordinator leaving the party and wandering off in early June 2020. Following a skills audit in November and December of last year, several names were proposed for co-option on the Committee and a number of people joined us for several meetings. However, after an initial flurry of interest, we remained with the two voting members, ably assisted by one co-opted and very active participant who we are pleased to say is standing for election to the committee.

After the Coordinator left the Green Party, the committee members discussed co-opting more members to help with the work. However, we believed at the time that GPex would co-opt an interim Coordinator and that we should wait until this happened so that a new skills audit could be conducted. Unfortunately, GPex never did co-opt anyone and so our small and reduced committee has worked hard to ensure that all necessary tasks have been attempted. Although the Co-ordinator post was publicised for co-option no one came forward, and this role has remained empty. Although I had expressed interest in this, I decided against taking up the Coordinator role, even on an interim as this would mean I had to resign membership of another committee.

The Committee has continued to meet on average once a month, with an extra meeting in July to address further applications for accreditation of proposed motions to this Autumn Conference.

The year started with a very successful Policy Fest

PolicyFest 2020

Policyfest was again organised by the Policy Development Committee (PDC) this time hosted through the East Midlands Region in Nottingham on the 18th January.

The event faced several challenges not least caused by the General Election. A number of the logistic and organisational matters were not addressed until after the General Election and indeed as many volunteers were somewhat fatigued from the work over this period the arrangements were not addressed in earnest until the Christmas break. At this time, we discovered that our booked venue had cancelled our booking without notice to us and urgent work was undertaken to find another venue in the City at very short notice.

With special thanks to Gerhard Lohmann-Bond, East Midlands Regional Coordinator and Conference staff members Louisa Greenbaum and Ruby Tucker a location was found with close to one hundred attendees. The costs of the venue were just about covered using a little of the excess generated by the 2019 event in Newport.

The format of the day was a little different from the previous event following feedback from delegates with sessions covering Climate Change and the 2019 General Election Manifesto, the Future of Policy Development, Training in Policy Process, Land Use and Zero Carbon, 40 years of neo-

liberalism economics and meetings of the Security, Peace and Defence Policy Working Group and Transport Policy Working Group. Minutes of these meetings are being collated to be shared on the members website or available through the respective Policy Working Groups. Our thanks to all our facilitators.

At the same time a specific training event was organised over two days around non-violent communication and the Rights and Responsibilities chapter of Policies for a Sustainable Society. This followed some contracted work to engage with communication and engagement and work continues to progress this area of policy.

It was recognised that some aspects of the day were less well organised than the standards expected and our apologies were extended on the day and again here for the inconvenience caused. There are lessons being learned from this and improvements being addressed for future events. Due to the time needed to organise this event only one a year will be organised with the next one being in Winter 2021 the location and date will be confirmed following the Autumn conference.

Policy Decisions and Process of Accreditation

Although much was planned to be considered, due to the cancellation of the Brighton Conference in Spring, no changes have been made to Policies for a Sustainable Society (PSS) or Records of Policy Statement (RoPS) since the Autumn conference in Newport in 2019. However, this report contains recommendations for conference to vote on.

There were four requests for accreditation for the Brighton Conference 2020 of which one was approved. Given Standing Orders regarding how we deal with matters that remain undealt from any given conference, the PDC accreditation decisions taken ahead of the cancelled Brighton Conference could not be carried over to this Autumn conference.

Accreditation decisions remain the most divisive element of PDC's work. Both ahead of Brighton and in the run up to this Autumn Conference, in deciding to accredit a proposed motion, or not, our decisions have made some members happy, and some very much the opposite.

To continue to engage members, it is relevant we feel to demonstrate in this report what is the function of accreditation, as it has evolved since 2017.

If accreditation is a success Conference will see less motions 'referred back', less elongated lists of amendments, and counter amendments. As PDC we have provided an introduction session to new Conference attendees, but I have yet to feel confident in how I can explain the process of 'what is actually going on??' as amendments battle it out to either fundamentally change an original motion or seek to bolster it from these changes. It personally disappoints me as I see less and less hands in the air as each amendment, or bundle of amendments, is debated as the room appears to get too confused about what they are actually putting the cards in the air for, or frankly just losing interest.

If accreditation works as it should, those motions we have agreed to accredit should have no need to generate these 'endless' amendments. An accredited motion will be understandable and have gone through a process of consultation, have no direct conflict with other parts of our Policy base and therefore not need to have clarification or unexpected hostile amendments. If accreditation works then your Plenary experience should be far less 'gruelling' for those who are taking part as neutral participants.

Which leads to a crucial 'understanding' of accreditation: PDC are not '*endorsing*' an accredited motion. It could be the most 'upside down idea' but if it has met our criteria then it will receive accreditation (with the expectation that you, as sensible members, would subsequently vote it down.)

We have received accreditation requests for 12 motions ahead of this conference. We were in discussion with proposers of three other possible accreditations, who did not then submit requests. I do not intend to go over those accredited or enter into discussion at conference about why or how. The motions we accredited are in Section C. To begin to debate accreditation at the point of presenting this report, will easily become a debate about the motion itself, and this is inappropriate until it comes up on the agenda. I reassure you that there is separate correspondence regarding views of members who feel that accreditation was wrongly awarded.

There is a similar argument to not entering into discussion about those motions we declined accreditation for, as they also now appear on your conference agenda in Section E to be debated later. By not accrediting we are similarly not saying we *do not* endorse these motions. However, our mission in PDC is to develop policy (the clue is in the title) I therefore propose to highlight the motions who did not receive accreditation and give a summary of why this was withheld, in the hope that this will be of use to future accreditation requesters.

The motion "Environmental Education Learning" was not accredited as no evidence was provided of consultation.

The motion regarding "Recognise trans parents" was not accredited as it had ambiguous interpretations.

The motion "Changes to local planning and built environment and housing policies" was initially accredited but when presented to SOC as a document contained some 27 pages, was ruled out of order by SOC. A decision that PDC agreed with.

We received no other requests for accreditation.

Evolution of Accreditation Processes

Accreditation has evolved with 8-point criteria to be applied, and a standard form in which requests are made. The form, from our perspective, works to achieve standardisation of the information and hence the determination of the outcome for each motion can be measured against each other. Both these documents can be supplied by contact with the *Policy@* email address. It is acknowledged that accreditation will continue to evolve between Conferences. By this we mean that although consistency will be applied to each motion application ahead of

each conference the ground rules of what is a good standard will, and should, undoubtedly change over time.

The main contentiousness in determining accreditation remains primarily around the issue of 'consultation'; specifically, how much is enough and who should be consulted? As PDC we know are not experts in the fields of each policy area. We shall not identify where consultation should be sought, just that it has been. In future my personal desire would be to see movement towards consultation with bodies who are not the natural 'bed-fellows' of the objectives of the motion proposed. Ahead of this conference it is acknowledged that none of the accreditation requests had applied this criterion hence it was not 'enforced'. Although it appeared a desirable element of a motion's journey, the new Committee shall need to consider the relevance of this before it may be properly implemented.

Dissatisfaction with an accreditation decision? For this conference, we have adopted a much later than usual deadline for accreditation decisions. The deadline for accreditation was extended as we became aware of the potential for some early communications about accreditation to have been lost, as the Co-ordinator resigned with little notice. It is out of fairness to motion proposers that we gave an extra two weeks and arranged an extra meeting to consider late requests.

We are very grateful to SOC for bearing with us in this decision.

For future conferences, we suggest that a dead line should be agreed for accreditation requests to be made, and this will be well publicised on the pre-agenda forum. In setting this deadline, we would build in time for members to question accreditation decisions.

Policy Working Groups (PWGs)

There are two specific function for PDC regarding Policy Working Groups: to check they are active and to provide guidance of the structure around the operation of each group, for example to ensure that each group is inclusive and open of all members.

It is an annual routine for PDC to check on the status of the party's Policy Working Groups by seeking contact with those named as convenors.

The following groups appear to not have replied to requests:

1. Culture, Media and Sport
2. International
3. Marine and coastal
4. Natural resources and waste
5. Pollution
6. Tourism
7. Workers' rights and employment

The purpose of listing these in this report is twofold:

1st to hope to prompt contact with members who are operating as convenors for these groups

2nd to prompt other members who may wish to breathe new life into these groups

However, if there is no evidence forthcoming of an active

group operating then we recognise the confusion to members who may wish to join a group and be disappointed to find no contact is returned.

If no contact by the 8th of November, PDC will need to make the request to have these PWG's removed from the members website.

House of Lords (HoLs)

We were very pleased to have introduced a new function this year as part of the PWG audit and invited PWGs to offer recommendations of existing policy to our HoLs representatives to use for Private Members Bills. Two groups took up this offer: Climate Emergency PWG proposed a PMB and Animal Rights PWG suggestions were offered as amendments to the Agriculture Bill going through Parliament, some of which were included in the debate in HoLs . We hope that other PWGs will take this opportunity to have Green Policies discussed in HoLs next year.

Policy Fest 2021

Although some initial enquires have been made regarding venue, the uncertainty over Covid 19 and social distancing has meant that work to organise this event was put on hold

Records of Policy Statements and minor changes to PfSS (PDC special powers)

One of the functions of PDC is to archive RoPS that may have become outdated. We have attempted this year to design a sheet that can be used by subsequent committees and while this is still a work in progress it is ready to hand over to the new committee for further decisions to be made.

We are recommending to conference that the following be archived as outdated:

- *Press Statement for Welsh Referendum 2018*
- *Letter to Penny Mordant re women's suffrage centenary action group 2018*
- *Solidarity with Leeds UCU 2017*
- *Defending Democracy 2017*
- *Plane Stupid Activists 2015*
- *Liverpool Activists 2015*
- *Green EU campaign 2015*
- *Afghanistan 2009*

And these changes be made to PSS:

PP121 Take out 'rest of EU' So it reads 'UK and other countries'

PP127 Take out 'and the EU' So it reads aging population in the UK.

Take out 'compulsory retirement age' so it reads 'measures would include more flexible working arrangements.'

NY501 Take out 'within the European Union' So it reads 'we will promote and support the principle of equal rights for residents.'

AR404: delete "and we will press for it to be adopted across the EU."

AR408: delete "through the EU" and insert "nationally"

AR403: delete “chronic” as there are many other health implications such as epidemics

AR406: insert “genetically-induced increases in yield” (sense)

AR409: change 2nd sentence to: “Mandatory CCTV is required in all slaughterhouses (from May 2018)”

AR412: please delete link to HE322

AR414: add the words “and skin” (to cover ostrich skin handbags etc)

Future Work

A full compliment of crew for the PDC is 5 elected, voting members; 5 co-opted members and an elected Co-Ordinator who also sits on GPEX. Given the severely reduced numbers on the Committee this year, and especially given the significant increase in accreditation requests ahead of Autumn Conference, we wholly acknowledge that some tasks are ongoing and are being handed over to the new committee to complete.

These outstanding tasks are broadly defined as being:

- Support to establish a Basic Income PWG
- Support to establish a Land Use PWG
- Development and support to Policy Working Groups to establish separate Constitutions. (We suggest that a question regarding whether PWGs require help with a constitution is included in next year’s audit.)
- Needs related to Policy Fest 2021
- Further work on conducting minor textual changes to PfSS and updating of ROPS (much of this preparatory work has been done and with this and with the PWG audit we have attempted to design spreadsheets for use over several years so that the next committee does not have to reinvent these every year.
- Further support to our House of Lords representatives in taking forwards Members Bills by linking them with relevant PWGs

Summary

Most of all, we are very pleased to see the significant increase in accreditation requests, alongside a significant movement towards the criteria defined to make good policy motions; hence more accreditations. Whilst we see that there could always be wider discussion about accreditation and its primary function, this is a positive step in our Party’s movement to a stronger policy base.

The interest expressed in joining PDC at the internal elections is extremely pleasing to us who have been ‘holding the fort’ for a while now.

On a personal note I offer my sincere and heartfelt gratitude to Liz Carlton, who steps down from PDC at this conference after offering most excellent support to me, and hard work to PDC since we met in 2017.

Also to Bob Beggs who has displayed similar levels of excellence, hard work, patience and humour to our small group. Although we end as a three is has been most enjoyable to be part of PDC for further year. It remains to be seen if Bob

and myself are returned for a term next year!

As always, any interest in PDC can be expressed through contact with policy@greenparty.org.uk which is still in Mick’s hands for the time being.

A7

COMPLAINT MANAGERS REPORT

[[SOC Note: Standing Orders for Party Discipline includes the following requirements for this report.

6.19 The Complaints Manager shall report all decisions of censure, suspension and expulsion to the next meeting of GPRC and to the next National Conference.

This report was received late.]]

The Standing Orders for Party Discipline require the Complaints Manager to report all decisions of censure, suspension and expulsion, taken by the Disciplinary Committee, to Conference.

The Disciplinary Committee have met seven times since Autumn Conference 2019:

21 September 2019
26 September 2019
23 November 2019
25 January 2020
28 March 2020
25 May 2020
20 June 2020
26 September 2020

Of the 32 cases heard by the Disciplinary Committee and reported back to the Complaints Manager, 12 led to complaints dismissals, 5 to upheld complaints resulting in censures, 8 to suspensions, 2 to suspended suspensions, 2 to upheld complaints resulting in expulsions. 1 complaint was upheld, but no

sanction issued. 1 complaint was upheld but discharged. 1 complaint should not have progressed to Disciplinary Committee as respondent was not a member.

In September 2018 to September 2019, of the 21 cases heard by the Disciplinary Committee and reported back to the Complaints Manager, 5 led to complaints dismissals, 6 to upheld complaints resulting in censures, 6 to suspensions, 2 to upheld complaints resulting in expulsions. 2 complaints were upheld, but no sanction issued.

The Complaints Manager is also required to report all Appeal decisions to Conference.

The Green Party Regional Council Appeals Sub Committee has considered one appeal since Autumn Conference 2019, with a further 4 appeals to be heard at time of writing:

22 April 2020: Appeal against a Disciplinary Committee suspension and ban from holding office imposed in March 2020. Appeal dismissed.

The Complaints Manager wishes to put on record their thanks to the Disciplinary Committee and the Green Party Regional

Council for their necessary and at times difficult work for the Party. The volume of complaints received by the Green Party over the past year has increased considerably, and the volunteers on both the Disciplinary Committee and the Green Party Regional Council have worked diligently to process these complaints fairly, in line with Standing Orders.

The Complaints Manager would also like to thank the Chair and Deputy Chair of Disputes Resolution Committee for taking on, with members of Disciplinary Committee and the Green Party Regional Council, the labour and responsibility of serving on the Complaints Referral Group, which assesses all new complaints received against Standing Orders.

A8 CAMPAIGNS COMMITTEE REPORT

[[SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.

Section 14 part iii of the constitution states:

The Campaigns Committee shall submit a written report to each Annual Conference.]]

No Report Receive by deadline.

A9 CONFERENCES COMMITTEE REPORT

[[SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.

Section 10, part xv of the constitution states:

The Conferences Committee shall provide a report to each Annual Conference.]]

No Report Receive by deadline.

A10 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

[[SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.

Section 19 part iv of the constitution states:

The Equalities & Diversity Committee shall provide a report to each Annual Conference.

SOC Note – the constitution includes the following requirements for this report.]]

No Report Receive by deadline.

A11 GREEN WORLD EDITORIAL BOARD REPORT

No Report Receive by deadline.

A12 FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT GROUP REPORT

Bernard Ekbery (convenor), Jenny Rust, Bill Walton, John Coyne

contact: bernard.ekbery@googlemail.com

The Framework Development Group (FDG) is an ongoing working group set up by Conferences in 2018 & 2019. Members have been drawn from a wide range of perspectives and Green Party bodies, communicating with each other mainly via a Loomio group and email.

It's initial purpose was to consult widely and bring forward proposals for development of a Framework for Ethics & Conduct within the Green Party (that work is now discharged), with an ongoing remit to assist in the creation and launch of the Framework, working closely with the body created by Conference to do that – the Framework Oversight Body (FOB). The FDG was unable to begin that ongoing work until the FOB was convened, which it now has been. As convenor I've worked since Newport Conference to encourage getting the FOB up & running, communicating several times with staff during the summer and the changeover of CEOs, before the general election. I held a meeting with the CEO in January before the Covid crisis and attended the first FOB meeting this August.

There will need to be an initial phase of locating & collating existing organisational guidance and procedures on ethics & conduct into one easily accessible place, in line with what Conference approved. The FDG's immediate tasks now are to produce 2 reports for the FOB, based on anonymised responses to the membership-wide survey carried out earlier. The first report will list possible 'chapter' headings for the Framework – main areas for it to cover. The second will cover areas that members need guidance on.

The FDG's work will be complete after the Framework has been created, signed off on & launched (as provided for in previous Conference motions). The Framework Oversight Body, however, has a continuing remit to oversee the Framework's ongoing functioning and maintenance.

A13 CLIMATE EMERGENCY POLICY WORKING GROUP REPORT

Climate Emergency Policy Working Group (CEPWG)

(*** shows work needed in 2020/21.)

Summary

A. The climate emergency policies in the 2019 General Election (GE) manifesto, whilst more ambitious than those in previous manifestos, fall short of the High Ambition interpretation of the Policy for Sustainable Society (PSS&HA), and of what is needed to address the climate emergency, by large margins. This is despite a previous conference decision that manifestos should be based on "a high ambition interpretation of the full set of current

policies (PSS&HA) plus those that are adopted to close the policy gap”. It is regrettable that the production of this GE manifesto did not comply with this decision.

- B. We are therefore presenting a motion to amend the manifesto.
- C. We are also presenting motions on deforestation, zero-carbon cars and vans and banning advertising of high-carbon goods and services. They are all in section C.
- D. We note that even after 2030 we will need to generate some electricity from natural gas using CCS, or synthetic gas created from surplus electricity and biomass.
- E. The policies required to close the gap between PSS&HA and our Zero Carbon by 2030 (ZC2030) target will mainly concern energy, buildings, transport, industry and agriculture but will have implications for health, forestry, economics, public administration, tourism and other areas.
- F. Since Spring 2019 conference only the Climate Emergency, Food and Agriculture and Peace and Defence Policy Working Groups (PWG) have proposed policies to close the policy gaps. Some important policy areas are not covered by any PWG.
- G. By the likely date of the next General Election the current ZC2030 target will have become unachievable. The team would welcome feedback on possible changes to the targets and their timing.

We recommend that by adopting this report conference resolves that GPEX (or its successor body) should:

[[SOC Note – the word “shall” was ruled out of order in this sentence and replaced with “should” on the basis of section D clause 8 part “g) substantially changing policy areas or having complex implications for other areas, without having passed through the agreed process of consultation” motions which instruct GPEX to take actions should be made through the first agenda process and open themselves to the scrutiny and opportunity for discussion and amendment which that entails.]]

1. Take active steps to improve understanding and communications about policy between PWG conveners, political leaders, spokespeople and staff and shall establish formal liaison arrangements.
2. Arrange the production of a successor document to the climate policies in the manifesto that is based on PSS with High ambition.
3. Ensure that the climate emergency policies in future national and regional manifestos are based on a high ambition interpretation of the full set of current policies plus those that are adopted to close the policy gap.

[SOC Note – The Climate Emergency Policy Working Group submitted a 14 page report which has been included as a supporting document.]

SECTION B

B1

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE VOTING PAPER

Food and Agriculture Policy Working Group, David Davies, Barbara Mead-Mason, Bill Rigby, Clare Walters, Colette Stein, Emily O'Brien, Ken Huggins, Les Levidow, Liz O'Neill, Maggie Hunter, Martin Farley, Mary Franklin, Mary Scott Morgan, Meg Day, Oliver Dowding, Reiner Tegtmeier, Susan Chapman.*

Synopsis

No synopsis supplied.

Motion

Delete the current Food and Agriculture Policy (FA100 – FA742) and replace with the text below.

FA100 AIMS and PRINCIPLES

FA101 AIMS OF the Green Party Food and Agriculture Policy – to enable the development of a Food and Agriculture system that is effective and sustainable in all senses. We will work with farmers and other stakeholders to transform the system and create an industry that:

- Produces healthy, nutritious food and other useful outputs to meet the needs of the population at fair prices for producers, consumers and all workers in the food sector;
- Overall, in order to address the climate crisis this will mean producing less meat and dairy and more fruit and vegetables;
- Ensures food sovereignty and a secure supply of food; ensuring that there is sufficient food for everyone.
- Adheres to high standards of animal welfare and husbandry;
- Ensures sustainable practices across the whole food production system including farming in an agro-ecological way.
- Conserves and improves the health of the soil;
- Enhances the wider environment, including water quality, within and beyond the purely agricultural context;
- Will reduce emissions of greenhouse gases to meet the Green Party target of zero emissions by 2030 for the whole economy;
- Promotes and maintains a wide diversity of wildlife;
- Offers sustainable employment, decent livelihoods, career opportunities, good working conditions and ongoing training throughout the workforce;
- Acknowledges that agriculture has a responsibility to manage land for a range of purposes beyond food production – flood prevention and alleviation, carbon capture, public access, maintenance of wildlife habitats, promoting biodiversity;
- Supports smaller, local, and fair-trade enterprises and

limits the concentration of power and wealth within the agriculture, food processing and trading industries.

- Educates the population about food and health and builds links between farms, schools and the wider community.

AMENDMENT 2A

[[SOC Note – this is a single amendment across multiple pages, it is going to be taken after Amendment 1 to this paper because part 1a and 2b have complex interactions which are most easily solved by ordering them in this way.]]

Greg Dring, Bob Beggs, Steve Betteridge, Steve Day, Lin Patterson, Harry Dring, Jessica Johannesson.*

Delete “– to enable the development of a Food and Agriculture system that is effective and sustainable in all senses.”

And replace with:

“Agriculture, especially the rearing of animals for meat and dairy production, is a major driver of climate change. It will not be possible to prevent catastrophic climate change unless consumption of these foods is drastically reduced, relative to the current level of consumption in the UK and the world.

Market forces and government policies have favoured increasing industrialisation of agriculture, mass-produced food and dependence on fossil fuels. Soil erosion, depletion of water resources, pollution, loss of biodiversity and animal suffering are commonplace.

In addition, agriculture accounts for a significant proportion of greenhouse gas emissions and pressure on land resources is linked with deforestation in many parts of the world.

The Green Party will therefore use rationing to reduce the amounts of meat and dairy food consumed in the UK.”

So that the opening section of FA101 reads:

“AIMS OF the Green Party Food and Agriculture Policy – Agriculture, especially the rearing of animals for meat and dairy production, is a major driver of climate change. It will not be possible to prevent catastrophic climate change unless consumption of these foods is drastically reduced, relative to the current level of consumption in the UK and the world.

Market forces and government policies have favoured increasing industrialisation of agriculture, mass-produced food and dependence on fossil fuels. Soil erosion, depletion of water resources, pollution, loss of biodiversity and animal suffering are commonplace.

In addition, agriculture accounts for a significant proportion of greenhouse gas emissions and pressure on land resources is linked with deforestation in many parts of the world.

The Green Party will therefore use rationing to reduce the amounts of meat and dairy food consumed in the UK.

We will work with farmers and other stakeholders to transform the system and create an industry that:”

Move bullet point 7 so that it becomes bullet point 1 and all the others are moved accordingly.

FA102 Principles that Underpin and Apply across the whole policy –

- Precautionary Principle –If a product or process may have a dangerous effect (on people, animals or the environment) it should be banned unless and until its safety is assessed and confirmed.
- Polluter Pays – those who produce pollution (including greenhouse gases) should pay the costs of managing it to prevent damage to human health or the environment.
- Fair Trade – both domestically and internationally to ensure that producers receive a fair price for their product and that workers at all stages of any process receive a fair wage and have safe working conditions.
- Transparency – it is important that people can know what is in all of their food and its packaging so information about production methods and the content of food should be openly available at every stage of the food production, distribution and preparation process.
- Climate Change – All our policies will be informed by the need to mitigate its impact and respond appropriately to the climate emergency.

AMENDMENT 1A

Richard McCarthy, Georgia Taylor, Pamela Harling, Tony Firkins.*

In FA102 Swap the present climate Change bullet point for:

“Climate Emergency – All our policies will be informed by the need to mitigate its impact and respond appropriately to the climate emergency. In particular, we will act to restore the UK’s extensive peatlands to their natural state, when they act as a net GHG sink rather than as a GHG emitter.”

AMENDMENT 2B

Greg Dring, Bob Beggs, Steve Betteridge, Steve Day, Lin Patterson, Harry Dring, Jessica Johannesson.*

In FA102 move bullet point 5 and make it the first bullet point.

and add the words “and does so in a way that ensures fair access to sustainable food for everybody”.

[[SOC Note – this amendment initially included an example of how it would read if passed. In order to avoid unintended interactions with amendment 1a, this has been removed so that both amendments can be considered on their own merits and both can pass without any interaction.]]

FA 200 FOOD PRODUCTION

FA201 Agricultural Production – We will:

- Work to maximise food sovereignty using methods that are ecologically sustainable (agro–ecology), reduce greenhouse gas emissions, support best practice animal welfare, support a healthy wildlife population and provide necessary ecosystem services. This will operate on a landscape scale as well as individual farms.
- Rebalance agricultural production to produce more fruit and vegetables and to anticipate reduced demand for meat, milk and eggs.
- Support measures which promote local, regional and national food self–reliance. We support the maintenance and extension of the Products of Designated Origin system for relevant products.
- While it will continue to be necessary to import foodstuffs especially those that cannot be grown in the UK; we will control the import of animal feed especially that which is grown in unsustainable or environmentally destructive ways.

AMENDMENT 1B

Richard McCarthy, Georgia Taylor, Pamela Harling, Tony Firkins*

In FA201 Last bullet point

Delete

“While it will continue to be necessary to import foodstuffs especially those that cannot be grown in the UK; we will control the import of animal feed especially that which is grown in unsustainable or environmentally destructive ways.”

Replace with

“While it will continue to be necessary to import foodstuffs; we will control the import of any agricultural product – including, but not limited to: timber, cotton, palm oil, soya, and any human or animal foodstuff – which is grown in unsustainable or environmentally destructive ways.”

FA 202 Structure of Agriculture – We will:

- Introduce policies to reverse the economic pressure toward unsustainable intensive farming methods and to support smaller mixed farms and those using sustainable methods. Farms should be able to make productive and environmentally safe use of all the ‘waste’ materials that they produce (eg manure).
- Support mixed farms and improve access to land for new entrants to the industry particularly in labour–intensive enterprises such as horticulture. We will amend the planning guidance to Local Authorities for rural areas to enable the associated infrastructure and housing to be constructed.
- Support community supported agriculture, community growing schemes, access to allotment gardens, urban gardening schemes and other local sustainable food initiatives.
- Establish an independent agricultural and horticultural advisory service to provide advice to farmers and growers

based on sustainable principles.

FA203 Financial Support for Food and Farming – access to nutritious food is a right which should be upheld and so we will use public funds to support the production of wholesome food in environmentally and socially sustainable ways.

- We will change the basis of agriculture support toward supporting a combination of sustained, fairly rewarded employment, producing nutritious food, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, high standards of animal welfare, enhancing wildlife habitats, providing ecosystem services and promoting a transition to non-chemical methods of farming.
- We will develop a mechanism to intervene, when necessary to ensure that prices and incomes are fair and sustainable throughout the food system.
- As a condition of public support farmers and growers should declare the production methods and inputs that they use and this information will be made publicly available.
- We will encourage new entrants to agriculture and horticulture and enable access to land and the provision of the necessary finance and training.

FA204 Intermediary Bodies – in order to achieve the required transformation of the Food and Agriculture Systems we will need to establish an organisational infrastructure to support and sustain the changes. We will:

- Establish a Food and Agriculture Commission to develop and implement the structural and financial changes including changes to agriculture support, regulation and taxation that we propose to introduce.
- Re-structure and adequately fund the Environment Agency and Natural England to enable them to manage natural assets effectively.
- Establish an independent agriculture and horticulture advisory service.
- Strengthen the Food Standards Agency with a brief to promote and secure wholesome food for a healthy population.
- Establish a Food and Agriculture research council with the aim of supporting research into sustainable and health and promoting sustainable methods of food production and distribution; part of its role will be to shift the balance away from chemical-based approaches toward understanding whole systems and promoting ecological balance. The imperative to combat global heating will drive research into best practice in carbon sequestration and improvement of carbon retention in soils. Given the importance of food supply and the impact of the climate crisis on agriculture we will ensure that there is sufficient research capacity to monitor the situation and provide expert advice on mitigation.

AMENDMENT 1C

Richard McCarthy, Georgia Taylor, Pamela Harling, Tony Firkins*

In FA 204 add addition bullet point at the end

“Establish a Peatland Restoration Commission, to restore any peatland that is not in its natural state, to be returned to that state as quickly as possible, but with particular focus on any peatland that is presently being used either as cropland, or as intensive grassland: These to be returned to natural state by 2030.”

FA205 Animal Rights – the Green Party promotes the best standards of animal welfare on farms, during transit and at abattoirs. The Green Party policy on animal rights, including that set out in AR4321, will apply to agriculture. We will end the live export of animals for slaughter or fattening.

FA206 Prohibitions and Controls – We will:

- Establish a rigorous system for licensing new agricultural and horticultural chemicals and reviewing the licencing of existing ones including fertilisers, herbicides, pesticides and fungicides based on the precautionary principle.
- Restrict the use of fertilisers and the spreading of animal manures in a way that can lead to the pollution of soil, air or water; this may include imposing a tax or levy on the sale of artificial fertilisers; using animal manures in a positive way will be encouraged.
- Strengthen regulations to protect farm workers, rural communities, consumers, wildlife and other animals from harmful substances used in agriculture and horticulture.
- Require transparency in the use of chemicals on fields and crops and ensure that the public and local residents are informed when spraying or fertiliser application is to take place.
- Allocate sufficient resources to enable the new Environment Agency (see FA204) to monitor water quality and farm spraying activity to ensure effective enforcement of regulations.
- Establish and enforce robust regulation of GMOs (including gene edited organisms) in food and agriculture to protect people, animals and the environment. This includes effective protection from GM contamination; clear labelling of all uses of GMOs in the food chain (including animal feedstuffs); and measures to prevent the cultivation or import of GMOs unless they are independently proven, on a case by case basis to be safe and produced responsibly, fairly and sustainably. We oppose the development of GM animals.
- Restrict the use of antibiotics, growth hormones and other animal medicines to occasions when they are prescribed by a registered veterinary practitioner for animal health reasons.
- End the use of peat in horticultural compost;

AMENDMENT 1D

Richard McCarthy, Georgia Taylor, Pamela Harling, Tony Firkins*

FA 206 add another point

“End the use of peat in horticultural activities or for any other use.”

FA302, replace the final point with

Peatland soils both store enormous quantities of carbon, and are particularly vulnerable to erosion and emitting carbon from farming processes. We will therefore end cropland usage and intensive grass production on peatland – by far the greatest cause of CO2 emissions from peatlands – as soon as possible; and attempt to return these areas of peatland to natural habitat by 2030. Other areas of peatland will also be returned to their natural state over a longer time period”

AGRICULTURE AND THE ENVIRONMENT

FA301 Food, Agriculture and Climate Change – climate change is the most profound challenge facing the planet. Agriculture and food production account for some 10% of UK greenhouse gas emissions. Soil is the most important carbon store in the UK.

- All farmers will be supported through advice and guidance to manage their farms to reduce GHG emissions to net zero by 2030. Carbon sequestration will be one of the outcomes to attract payment under the revised farming support scheme.
- We will set rigorous targets for GHG reductions, to reduce emissions to zero by 2030 across the Food and Agriculture System to cover farms and the whole supply, manufacturing and distribution system including imports.
- We will promote a move to a diet with significantly less meat consumption that will require fewer farm animals reducing emissions from ruminant digestion and releasing areas of grassland for crops, forestry or wildlife.
- We will introduce a carbon tax and this will apply both to agricultural inputs and to agricultural products based on the net greenhouse gases released during their production.
- We support the development of appropriate renewable energy systems on farms; we will monitor the growing of crops specifically for fuel.
- Lowland peat soils are vulnerable to erosion and carbon loss; we will support applied research to ensure that they are managed in a manner that reduces GHG emissions and returns them to being net sequesters of carbon.

FA302 Agriculture and Forestry – we are committed to planting more trees; this will help to combat climate change and to enhance opportunities for wildlife. The Food and Agriculture Policy is compatible with the Forestry Policy which will require extensive areas of farmland to be planted with trees. We will increase overall UK tree cover to the EU average (FR600).

FA303 We will promote Agro–forestry and other approaches to integrating trees, hedges and wildlife habitats into farming and animal husbandry systems.

FA304 Agriculture and the Management of Natural Resources – Some 70% of UK land is farmland and farmers have a responsibility for the impact of how they manage the land on the whole ecosystem. Farmers will be supported through both advice and the use of public subsidy to manage their land to use natural resources responsibly.

- Farms should be managed to hold water in times of excess and to prevent rapid run–off and potential flood risks.

- We will reduce the use of artificial fertilisers and sprays and ensure that slurry and other waste material is managed effectively so that water courses are not polluted with nitrates or other harmful chemicals and greenhouse gas emissions are minimised.
- Water is a scarce resource, particularly in some parts of the country, and should be used sparingly; we will support research into the use of drought resistant crop varieties and promote systems (such as rainwater harvesting) that make best use of available water.

FA 400 FOOD PROCESSING

FA401 Food Processing and Manufacturing – UK citizens eat more ultra–processed food than any other European country, which contributes to high levels of obesity and ill health. Food processing and manufacturing employ more people than farming and growing; we will work to deliver fair practices at all stages of the food supply chain.

- We will actively promote healthy food and work to reduce the proportion of highly processed food in UK diets.
- We will work to reduce the dominance of processors, manufacturers and supermarkets in the food supply chain to secure fair pricing at all stages of production.
- All processed food should include a full list of ingredients; comprehensive information about the methods of manufacture and all substances used during production should be posted on the producers' websites.

FA500 FOOD DISTRIBUTION

FA501 Food from Overseas and Trade Deals – the UK imports a 50% (including 85% of vegetables) of its food. It also imports substantial quantities of animal food. Many foods are imported because it is not possible to grow them in the UK.

- We will ensure that all international trade deals are based on fair trade principles.
- We will ensure that UK market demands are not to the detriment of the exporting countries' economy, society or the environment in which it is produced. We will work to eliminate modern slavery and indentured labour wherever it is found; we will require all importers to demonstrate due diligence.
- Trade Deals should ensure that imported food is produced in accordance with UK environmental, animal welfare and conditions of work standards.
- We will regulate the import and distribution of plants, animals and insects to prevent the spread of disease and of invasive species.

FA502 Food Distribution –

- We will support the development of shorter supply chains and direct links between producers and consumers.
- We will support not–for–profit community–based schemes that tackle food poverty while ensuring that the causes of food poverty are also addressed.
- We will limit the dominance and/or negative impact of large food processors and retailers to reduce unnecessary

transportation of food and to ensure that farmers receive fair prices and fair contracts.

- We will regulate to ensure packaging and advertising of food products do not misrepresent how or by whom it was produced.

FA503 Public Sector Procurement – public organisations will provide a wide range of healthy catering services for staff, service users and the general public.

- Public bodies will be required to use their procurement process to specify local, sustainably sourced produce where possible.
- Menus will focus on providing healthy nutritious food including offering vegetarian, vegan, religious and other medically required dietary options.

FA600 FOOD CONSUMPTION

FA601 Restaurants, pubs, cafes, take away and home delivery establishments –

- Restaurants and other food outlets will be encouraged and supported to use and identify local, seasonal produce. They will be discouraged from serving highly processed and unhealthy food.
- We will use the planning system to reduce the numbers of takeaways that are serving unhealthy food and replace them with greengrocers and other healthy food outlets.
- We will work to address alcohol related harm by discouraging binge drinking and other harmful activities while supporting community owned pubs and other pubs that play a positive role in community life.
- We oppose the 'beer tie' and other means by which large brewers and pub companies restrict the range of beers and cider, particularly from smaller producers that pubs are able to sell.

FA602 Healthy and Sustainable Food Standards

- We will support a progressive transition from a diet dominated by meat and animal products to one with a higher proportion of plant-based foods by public education and the operation of the carbon tax.
- We will establish a well-funded, strong, independent body to research and to act on all issues related to food distribution and consumption; it will work across all government departments to promote safe and healthy food.
- We recognise that many people are currently not able to access healthy food at affordable prices. The ultimate aim is to secure food justice and a right to food by tackling firstly unfair food systems as outlined in this policy, and secondly via the Basic Income and Living Wage policy ensuring that everyone has sufficient income via fair wages and benefits to make healthy sustainable food choices. Whilst in transition we will give extra support to schemes which address food poverty and help with access to healthy food whilst recognising these do not address the underlying causes of food poverty and food inequality.
- We support Sustainable Food Cities and other initiatives to secure the availability of healthy, sustainable food at reasonable prices.

- We will support programmes to promote healthy eating and monitor their effectiveness.

AMENDMENT 2C

Greg Dring, Bob Beggs, Steve Betteridge, Steve Day, Lin Patterson, Harry Dring, Jessica Johannesson.*

In FA602, in the first bullet point delete the word “support” and replace with “ensure”.

Replace the final full stop with a comma, and add the words “by rationing the consumption of meat and dairy foods” so that the bullet point now reads:

“We will ensure a progressive transition from a diet dominated by meat and animal products to one with a higher proportion of plant-based foods by rationing the consumption of meat and dairy foods.”

FA 603 Food Waste – much food in the UK is wasted by distributors, supermarkets, restaurants and in the home. We will work to eliminate waste at all stages of the food chain in line with the food waste hierarchy (reduce, re-use, recycle).

- We will support systems to distribute surplus food to those in need but this should not be relied on as the means to address food poverty;
- We will work to ensure that all food that is produced has a timely route to market and is not rejected on spurious grounds;
- We will support public awareness campaigns to reduce household food waste and enable unavoidable food waste to be composted or fed to animals;
- We will change legislation so that post-consumer food waste can be safely fed to animals.

FA 604 Packaging – Packaging, particularly food packaging, forms a big proportion of domestic waste. We will work to radically reduce the amount of food packaging material that enters the waste stream.

- We will reduce the amount of packaging material that is used by the food industry through shortening supply chains so that there is a closer link between producers and consumers. We will seek to eliminate all unnecessary packaging.
- We will promote the use of re-fillable containers wherever possible.
- We will promote the use of re-useable packaging through deposit schemes and other means.
- We will ensure that essential packaging that cannot be re-used is made of materials obtained from sustainable resources that can be easily recycled. Government will work with food producers, waste disposal enterprises and local government to determine how this can best be done.

SECTION C

C1

DEFORESTATION (FAST TRACKED)

9124 Points

Climate Emergency Policy Working Group, Tony Firkins, Craig Hutton, David Dwyer, Georgia Taylor, Gerald Weston, Jacqueline Walkden, James Firkins, John Baker, Maggie Thorburn, Melanie Smith, Noah Sorensen, Pamela Harling, Richard McCarthy, Sharon Galliford.*

Synopsis

The UK needs to reduce greenhouse gases released in producing the goods and services that it uses. Since deforestation contributes strongly to GHG emissions a ban on the import of products produced on deforested land (eg wood, beef, soya and palm oil) would help.

Motion

In Policies for a Sustainable Society

Insert IP249: The UK should ban the import of all products grown on recently deforested land.

C2

CAR AND VANS TO GO ZERO CARBON BY 2030

9007 Points

Climate Emergency Policy Working Group, Tony Firkins, Basil Clarke, Carla Denyer, Chit Chong, Georgia Taylor, Iva Flint, James Firkins, Jonathan Essex, Mark Meatcher, Melanie Smith, Pamela Harling, Richard McCarthy, Robert Page, Sarah O'Connell, Shahrar Ali, Susie O'Connor.*

Synopsis

This motion would amend the party's policy on road transport so that it supports the target for the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in the Climate Emergency chapter (CC015). It would end the sale of new fossil-fuelled cars and vans from 2025 and their use by 2030.

Motion

Insert new paras into transport policy as follows then renumber following paras:

TR049: The Green Party's Climate Emergency policy recognises the urgency of the threat and the need to eliminate greenhouse gas emissions (CC015 refers). The Green Party would therefore end the use of fossil fuel-burning cars and vans on our roads from 2030.

TR050: To achieve this the Green Party would prioritise reducing the need to travel and increasing public transport, walking and cycling. It would ensure that by 2025 all new motorbikes, scooters, cars and vans would produce zero tailpipe greenhouse gas emissions. To support the remaining vehicles we would ensure the availability of sufficient charging points for electric vehicles, regulated to avoid footway and bike lane obstruction, and of hydrogen refuelling facilities.

TR051 Implement a vehicle scrappage scheme that compensates people for the surrender of their old fossil-fuelled vehicles, or the reduction of their tailpipe emissions to zero with a mixture of grants towards new zero emissions vehicles including bicycles, and rail and bus passes. Priority will be given to vehicles for people with disabilities.

TR052 This rapid transition away from fossil-fuelled vehicles requires a revolution in the funding of railways, mass rapid transit, zero emission bus and coach services, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, waterborne freight and other changes. Funding must be sufficient to enable the majority of current car and van miles to be made by these alternative methods or to no longer be necessary within a decade.

C3

BAN ON ADVERTISING OF HIGH-CARBON GOODS AND SERVICES

7732 Points

David Flint, Abigail Perrin, Alexandra Geddis, Basil Clarke, Brig Oubridge, Carla Denyer, Caroline New, Chit Chong, Craig Hutton, Iva Flint, Jacqueline Walkden, Jerome Thomas, Jonathan Essex, Karen Varga, Luke Balnave, Mark Meatcher, Melanie Smith, Natalie Bennett, Oliver Lax, Peter Sims, Phil Horton, Richard McCarthy, Robert Page, Sarah O'Connell.*

Synopsis

To address the climate emergency needs decisive action from government, business and citizens. At present citizens are encouraged to do ecologically damaging things, like fly and buy SUVs, by a plethora of adverts. We should stop this by banning such ads.

Motion

Add new para to the Culture, Media and Sports chapter of the PfSS:

CM687: The current climate emergency makes the promotion of high carbon products and services such as air flights

and SUVs increasingly unsustainable. The Green Party will therefore seek to progressively reduce and ultimately eliminate all advertising for and promotion of such goods and services.

C4 THE 2019 GENERAL ELECTION MANIFESTO AND CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION

7059 Points

*Climate Emergency Policy Working Group,
Tony Firkins*, Britta Goodman, Chit Chong,
Daniel Goldsmith, David Flint, David Wild,
Ewan Jones, Georgia Taylor, James Firkins,
Jenny Vernon, John Baker, Jonathan Essex,
Liz Reason, Maggie Thorburn, Maria Smith,
Martin Farley, Oliver Lax, Pamela Harling,
Peter Sims, Phil Horton, Rebecca Warren,
Richard McCarthy, Sarah O'Connell,
Stephen Clark, Tom Beaton, Victoria George.*

Synopsis

The 2019 General Election manifesto included many climate emergency related policies and targets and is now a formal party policy statement. But it falls short of what conference decided last year. The following amendments will increase the level of ambition in addressing the climate emergency and remove anomalies.

Motion

The following are changes proposed to the Green Party General Election Manifesto 2019 (GEM2019) as posted at <https://campaigns.greenparty.org.uk/manifesto/>.

1. On page 3 of GEM2019 replace “reduce the UK’s carbon emissions to net zero by 2030” with “very substantially reduce the UK’s greenhouse gas emissions by 2030”.
2. On page 6 of GEM2019 replace “reducing climate emissions to net zero by 2030” with “very substantially reducing the UK’s greenhouse gas emissions by 2030”
3. On page 84 of GEM2019 replace “reducing our carbon emissions to zero by 2030” with “very substantially reducing the UK’s greenhouse gas emissions by 2030”
4. On page 20 of GEM2019 replace “Start deployment of Carbon Capture and Capture (CCC) system that can deal with CO2 emissions from manufacture of iron, steel and cement” with “Start deployment of Carbon Capture and Sequestration (CCS) systems that can deal with CO2 emissions from manufacture of iron, steel and cement and capture CO2 from the air.”
5. On page 22 of GEM2019 replace “Plant 700 million new trees and aim for 50% of all farms to be engaged in agroforestry by 2030.” with “We will increase woodland cover from 13% of the UK to 25% by 2030. We will aim for 50% of all farms to be engaged in agroforestry by 2030.”
6. On page 22 of GEM2019 replace “The new woodland

when fully grown, will store carbon, provide home-grown timber and create new wildlife-rich environments” with “The new woodland when fully grown, will store carbon, provide home-grown timber and sustainable biofuels and create new wildlife-rich environments”

7. On page 16/17 of GEM2019 replace “Apply a Carbon Tax on all fossil fuels, as outlined above in the ‘Green New Deal for energy’ section, which will increase the cost of petrol, diesel and shipping fuel as well as on aviation fuel for domestic flights. Domestic flights will also lose their VAT exemption” with “Apply a Carbon Tax on all fossil fuels, as outlined above in the ‘Green New Deal for energy’ section, which will increase the cost of petrol, diesel and shipping and aviation fuel. Flights will also lose their VAT exemption”
8. On page 86 of GEM2019 replace “Carbon Tax: £76.7 billion” with “Carbon Tax (and Frequent Flyer Levy): £76.7 billion”
9. On page 11 of GEM2019 replace “Prohibit the construction of nuclear power stations” with “Prohibit the construction of entirely new nuclear power stations”
10. On page 10 of GEM2019 replace “Introduce new support for solar, geothermal, tidal, hydro and other renewable energies” with “Introduce new support for solar, geothermal, tidal, hydro, other renewable energies and gas with Carbon Capture and Sequestration (CCS)”.
11. On page 10 of GEM2019 replace “We will raise the Carbon Tax rate progressively over a decade, rendering coal, oil and gas financially unviable” with “We will raise the Carbon Tax rate progressively over a decade, rendering coal, oil and unmitigated gas financially unviable”
12. On page 11 of GEM2019 after “and smart control of vehicle battery charging.” add new sentence “When this is insufficient, electricity will be generated by gas-fired power stations”.
13. On page 21 of GEM2019 after “away from intensive livestock farming.” add new sentence “We would encourage farmers to adopt management practices that would reduce methane emissions per animal.”
14. On page 23 of GEM2019 replace “Support the transition to plant-based diets by phasing in a tax on meat and dairy products over the next ten years, to reduce the 5% of UK’s carbon emissions that come from methane produced by livestock.” With “Support the transition to plant-based diets by phasing in a tax on meat and dairy products over the next ten years. The reduction in animal husbandry will release pastureland to be used for arable, forests, energy and rewilding.”
15. On page 14 of GEM2019 delete the paragraph starting “Ensure that all 8 million rented homes are A rated for energy efficiency....”
16. On page 17 of GEM2019 replace “Make 40 miles per hour the default speed limit in non-residential areas except on major roads” with “Make 40 miles per hour the default speed limit in non-residential areas except on major roads where the default speed limit will be 55 miles per hour”

17. On page 17 replace “End the sale of new petrol and diesel fuelled vehicles by 2030” with “End the sale of new fossil fuelled vehicles by 2030”

18. On page 27 of GEM2019 replace “You can find out more environmental and financial detail about how we would deliver our Green New Deal in the appendix to this Manifesto” with “You can find out more financial detail about how we would deliver our Green New Deal in the appendix to this Manifesto”

19. On page 86 of GEM2019 bottom of first column replace “Total extra revenue generated by savings: £29.4” with “Total extra revenue generated by savings: £29.4 billion”

AMENDMENT 1

Tony Firkins, Bob Beggs, Phil Horton,
Richard McCarthy, David Flint, Pamela Harling.*

Delete Clause 8 of the motion.

Insert the following new clause at end and renumber accordingly.

“On page 17 of GEM2019 replace the paragraph which reads:

“Ban advertising for flights, and introduce a Frequent Flyer Levy to reduce the impact of the 15% of people who take 70% of flights. This Frequent Flyer Levy only applies to people who take more than one (return) flight a year, discouraging excessive flying.” With “Ban advertising for flights”

AMENDMENT 2

Mariette Labelle, David Webb, Emma Bateman, Georgia Taylor,
Daniel Wimberley,
Richard McCarthy.*

Delete clause 9 to keep “Prohibit the construction of nuclear power stations” as it currently is on page 11 of the 2019 General Election Manifesto.

C5

ADOPT THE PRINCIPLE OF RATIONING TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS ARISING FROM TRAVEL, AMENDING THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY AND THE TRANSPORT CHAPTERS OF PSS

6957 Points

Bath and North East Somerset Green Party

Greg Dring, Chit Chong, David Beasley, Jay Ginn,
Sarah OConnell, Steve Day.*

Synopsis

Amend policy to adopt the principle of rationing of carbon heavy travel, and apply this change to the Climate Emergency and the Transport Chapters of Policies for a Sustainable Society (PSS), and remove Frequent Flyer Levy from Records of Policy Statements.

Motion

The following changes to PSS are proposed:

In the chapter on the Climate Emergency in the section under the heading Demand Reduction

Insert a new CC120:

CC120 It is now necessary to drastically reduce the consumption of those high carbon products that are not necessary for survival, especially in sectors where change can be made rapidly. These are travel, especially flying for leisure. To this end we will introduce a system of rationing of flights and road fuel. The principle to be followed is fairness, and some adjustments will have to be made to meet the special needs of different people.

Re-number the existing CC120 so that it becomes CC121.

Renumber and amend the existing CC121:

CC121 To drive change throughout society the UK should combine a carbon tax and dividend with publicity campaigns and possible carbon rationing. For instance, it should require all adverts for high carbon products, including food, to carry an ‘environmental health warning’. The carbon tax would reflect all emissions of greenhouse gases, not just CO2. It should have a progressive element to deter high individual emitters.”

By inserting “the use of rationing with” between “combine” and “a carbon tax”

By inserting “, and” between “dividend” and “with”

By deleting “and possible carbon rationing”

So that it now reads

CC122 To drive change throughout society the UK should combine the use of rationing with a carbon tax and dividend, and with publicity campaigns. For instance, it should require all adverts for high carbon products, including food, to carry an ‘environmental health warning’. The carbon tax would reflect all emissions of greenhouse gases, not just CO2. It should have a progressive element to deter high individual emitters.

In the chapter on Transport:

Amend TR041: The burning of all fossil fuel and derivatives (e.g. petrol, diesel, natural gas) to provide power for transport is unsustainable. One of the most serious effects is the contribution to the climate emergency by producing carbon dioxide. The Green Party seeks to dramatically reduce the production of carbon dioxide from all methods of transport. The principle means of doing this are by demand reduction and modal shift. (see TR011)

By replacing “principle” with “principal”

By inserting “including the rationing of fuels for private road transport use,” between “reduction” and “and modal”

So that it now reads

TR041 The burning of all fossil fuel and derivatives (e.g. petrol, diesel, natural gas) to provide power for transport is unsustainable. One of the most serious effects is the

contribution to the climate emergency by producing carbon dioxide. The Green Party seeks to dramatically reduce the production of carbon dioxide from all methods of transport. The principal means of doing this are by demand reduction, including the rationing of fuels for private road transport use, and modal shift. (see TR011)”

Replace the existing

TR063 Road fuel tax is an important factor in encouraging users to be more mileage conscious and to opt for smaller, more fuel efficient cars. The Green Party would increase road fuel tax incrementally until the revenue of fuel tax covers a high proportion of road traffic's external costs, with adjustments for transport use and the nature of the fuel.

With new

TR063 The Green Party will use rationing to reduce access to road fuels incrementally to drive a move away from reliance on private cars in favour of other modes of transport and a shift towards reducing travel overall.

Replace the existing

TR064. The Green Party supports the introduction of fuel tax on aviation fuel and emission charges and increased landing charges on aircraft.

With new

TR064 The Green Party will use regulation and rationing to eliminate flying for leisure purposes, and reduce flying for other purposes. If genuinely sustainable aviation fuel becomes a possibility in future the Green Party will use rationing to ensure equitable access to the use of this resource.

Under the heading Car Culture

Amend the existing

TR300 Cars are currently seen as the primary means of transport by many people. The Green Party would work at all levels to alter this perception, by providing information on the problems and real costs of their use, and by improving the perception of all more sustainable methods of transport.

By inserting “by rationing the availability of road fuels for private use, and” between “their use,” and “and by improving”

So that it now reads

TR300 Cars are currently seen as the primary means of transport by many people. The Green Party would work at all levels to alter this perception, by providing information on the problems and real costs of their use, by rationing the availability of road fuels for private use, and by improving the availability of, and the perception of, all more sustainable methods of transport.

Under the heading Air Transport

Replace the existing

TR550 There is insufficient public awareness of the resources wasted and damage done by excessive use of air transport. The Green Party considers that governments should run public

awareness campaigns about the impact of air travel on the global climate, the local environment and human health.”

With new

TR550 As a part of its approach to rationing high carbon products, the Green Party will prohibit the use of civil aviation for carrying passengers, except in a limited range of circumstances. Hence, for most people there will be no ration of air miles. Government will have to decide, taking account of the circumstances of the time, the extent to which this might be relaxed for certain groups, such as those who have family members who are settled in distant countries.

Record of Policy Statements.

The new policy on aviation renders the ‘Frequent Flyer Levy’ (18 Oct 2016) redundant.

Delete reference to the ‘Frequent Flyer Levy’ (18 Oct 2016)

C6

UPDATING THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS TO REFLECT DOUGHNUT ECONOMICS

6944 Points

Tax and Fiscal Policy Working Group, Rachel Collinson, Adrian Spurrell, Chris Evans, David Wild, Hannah Clayton, Jenny Vernon, Lee Irving, Martin Farley, Martin Osborne, Nick Hartley, Nicole Haydock, Sabrina Poole, Sam Riches, Sharon Galliford, Siroi Hugh-Jones, Tim Davies.*

[SOC Note – this requires a 2/3rd Majority]

Synopsis

Our Philosophical Basis promotes the idea that we must aim to reduce GDP. But we also say we think GDP should not matter. Which is it?

By making these changes to policy we can affirm that not all growth is bad, to make our economic policy more credible.

Motion

In PB104, delete

“in material affluence for the people of the world, and has therefore relentlessly pursued the goal of economic growth”

and replace with:

“in material goods for the people of the world. It has therefore relentlessly pursued the goal of economic growth even if it means harming the well-being of all living things.”

so that PB104 reads:

“Since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, society has expected continual increases in material goods for the people of the world. It has therefore relentlessly pursued the goal of economic growth even if it means harming the well-being of all living things. Some nations, such as our own, have indeed become very rich and yet within them there is still abject poverty. Meanwhile, the poor nations of the world are

becoming poorer as wealth continues to be transferred to the rich nations from the poor ones.”

In PB420, delete

“Under the present system, economic growth is supported by unlimited consumption of both renewable and non-renewable resources. However, in a finite world there is not an infinite supply of natural resources. The Green Party recognises limits to growth.”

and replace with:

“Under the present system, the pursuit of economic growth drives over-consumption of the earth’s natural resources. However, in a finite world there is not an infinite supply of those resources. The Green Party recognises the dangers of the pursuit of economic growth above all else.”

so that it reads:

“Under the present system, the pursuit of economic growth drives over-consumption of the earth’s natural resources. However, in a finite world there is not an infinite supply of natural resources. The Green Party recognises the dangers of the pursuit of economic growth above all else. Limits to growth are likely to be imposed primarily by resource depletion and the ever-increasing costs of pollution. Furthermore, land also is in limited supply. An expanding world population demands expanding food supplies. Irresponsible land use planning, degradation of land through human activity and changes in land quality and availability due to the climate emergency, mean that land must be managed in such a way as to ensure sustainable human development and safeguard biodiversity”

In LP402, amend

“While the Green Party aims to reduce the need for growth in the economy and the population, there will inevitably be requirements for new infrastructure, housing stock, industrial and commercial land, and social facilities in many local communities. Good planning and design are essential to resolve potential conflicts between social, economic and environmental concerns.”

So that it reads:

“While the Green Party aims to create an economy that doesn’t depend on growth in GDP, there will inevitably be requirements for new infrastructure, housing stock, industrial and commercial land, and social facilities in many local communities. Good planning and design are essential to resolve potential conflicts between social, economic and environmental concerns.”

This will help these policies accord with IN204 which agrees with the idea that some growth is helpful:

“This should drive managed reductions in some areas as well as helpful growth in other areas of production”

AMENDMENT 1

Tony Firkins*, Rachel Collinson, David Flint, David Wild, Phil Horton, Pamela Harling, Annette Pearson.

Insert these three clauses into the motion:

1. In Local Planning and the built environment in Policies for a Sustainable Society insert new:

LP411 Some areas of construction will need to expand to create the zero carbon infrastructure such as housing retrofit and electricity system, required to achieve net zero emissions. Other areas of construction, such as new build offices, shops, entertainment and warehouses, must be drastically reduced.

2. In Housing in Policies for a Sustainable Society insert new:

HO410 Although we expect to build no more new-build homes in 2020–2029 than were built in the decade 2010–2019 we will create more new homes in total:

by bringing empty homes into use (HO401),

by retrofitting, converting and extending existing buildings (HO405) and

by reducing demolition rates (HO406).

2. In Housing in Policies for a Sustainable Society insert new:

HO411 We will make a large net increase in social housing by

targeting over 50% share of new build and housing produced by HO410 policies to be social housing

ending the sell-off of social housing (HO503).

C7

SELF DECLARATION OF GENDER

6284 Points

Kathryn Bristow, Alastair Binnie-Lubbock, Alexandra Phillips, Alexandra Burton, Alice Hubbard, Alice Kiff, Amanda C Baker, Amy Heley, Anita Workman, Anne Hamdache, Anne-Marie Organ, Aprilia Kemp, Ashley Knox, Ashley Routh, Caitlin Baker, Carla Denyer, Caroline Russell, Catriona Sibert, Cerine Yudin, Chandler Wilson, Charlene Concepcion, Charlotte Ruddick, Elaine Francis, Elisabeth Whitebread, Emma Edwards, Giorgia Finney, Hannah Graham, Helen James, Imogen Loucas, JJ Wilkinson, Joe Lever, Julie Evans, Kat Macann, Kate Benson, Kate Kenzie, Katharine A Gilchrist, Katherine McAlpine, Kelsey Trevett, Laura Power, Lee-Anne Lawrance, Lily Roff, Louise Young, Luanne Thornton, Lucy Madeley, Melanie Horrocks, Miles Row, Monika Sobiecki, Morgaen Warner, Nannette Youssef, Nick Hartley, Quinn Daley, Rachel Collinson, Ria Patel, Rosie Rawle, Sally Outen, Samantha Alexander-Eames, Seren Parri, Simon Hales, Susie O’Connor, Tabi Joy, Teresa Ravenshaw, Thom Madden, TJ Milburn, Tom Pashby, Zoë Garbett.*

Synopsis

The 2004 Gender Recognition Act doesn’t meet the needs of trans people. The Women and Equalities Select Committee

concluded that “Its medicalised approach pathologises trans identities and runs contrary to the dignity and personal autonomy of applicants. The Government must update the Act, in line with the principle of gender [Excessive length, cut by SOC].

Motion

Insert new RR531 and renumber PSS accordingly:

RR531 The Green Party believes that trans, non–binary, genderqueer, third gender, and intersex people should have their gender legally recognised and be empowered to update their birth certificate and any other official documents, without medical or state encumbrance. We support the right for individuals to update their legally recognised gender by self declaration, to how they would describe their gender, without requiring approval from a doctor or a judge.

C8

ANIMAL RIGHTS: FIREWORKS; LIMIT USE AND QUIET

5840 Points

Animal Rights Policy Working Group, Emma Randall, Angela Faulds, Ben Harvey, Charlotte Godber, Chris Evans, Dave Plummer, David Finney, David Hale, David Rey, Diana J Newson, Rebecca Stanton, Ed Saul, Edward Thompson, Eleanor Matthews, Emily McIvor, Jane Tredgett, Joyce Barnett, Juliette Rey, Karen Varga, Kerstin Mackay, Liz Carlton, Louise Davies, Mandy Rossi, Nick Newson, Noah Sorensen, Noel Lynch, Oscar Gillespie, Samantha Alexander-Eames, Simon Hill, Steve Betteridge.*

Synopsis

Gunpowder explosions terrify wildlife, horses, livestock and companion animals who can become highly stressed and injure themselves or get lost trying to escape. This motion seeks to stop the private purchase and uncontrolled use of fireworks, limiting displays to 10 previously–agreed, public–licensed shows per year, using Quiet Fireworks only, and [excessive length, cut by SOC].

Motion

AR433: Wild, domesticated and companion animals suffer greatly from the fear of loud fireworks, and danger from other fire–bearing items such as paper lanterns which are released outside. These can be a danger, cause noise pollution, and generate air pollution and litter nuisance for all. Greens in government would ban the outside release of lit paper lanterns and restrict firework sales to public–licensed displays using quiet fireworks only – to ensure public safety and to allow animal owners to predict (and therefore mitigate) effects on their animals. District councils will allow 10 days a year for displays, the dates to be agreed after local public consultation. A quiet firework must equate to a maximum peak noise intensity of 70 decibels (70dBC).

C9

ACCESS TO FERTILITY TREATMENT

4653 Points

Kathryn Bristow, Alexandra Phillips, Alexandra Burton, Andrew Gray, Anita Workman, Anne Hamdache, Anne-Marie Organ, Aprilia Kemp, Caitlin Baker, Catriona Sibert, Cerine Yudin, Charles Gillott, Charlotte Ruddick, Ed Saul, Eleanor Matthews, Elisabeth Whitebread, Emma Edwards, Giorgia Finney, Helen James, Imogen Loucas, James Braun, Jeffrey Scott Spragg, Joe Lever, Julie Evans, Kat Macann, Kate Benson, Kate Kenzie, Kelsey Trevett, Lily Roff, Luanne Thornton, Lucy Madeley, Matthew Hull, Morgaen Warner, Niall Murphy, Quinn Daley, Rakesh Prashara, Raphael Hill, Ria Patel, Robin Brabham, Sally Outen, Samantha Alexander-Eames, Sean Mulcahy, Seren Parri, Stephen Lloyd, Susie O’Connor, Teresa Ravenshaw, Thom Madden, Timothy Priest.*

Synopsis

Currently it is difficult or virtually impossible for certain groups of people to receive fertility treatment through the NHS, for example older people, same sex couples, single people and people who are sex averse or repulsed. Also funding for cryopreservation of sperm, oocyte and embryos is inconsistent throughout the country.[Excessive length, cut by SOC.]

Motion

Insert new HE800 to HE803 and renumber PSS accordingly:

Heading: Fertility

HE800 The Green Party acknowledges the wellbeing that child rearing can bring into the lives of all types families and recognises the choice to conceive children is a fundamental human right, which should be free of government interference.

HE801 The Green Party believes people have an individual right to make choices for their own fertility and when traditional methods have failed or are not desired, access to treatment is an essential part of healthcare.

HE802 Treatments such as IVF, should be funded and accessible through the NHS to all, without barriers or restriction apart from those which are medically necessary. This is regardless of other factors such as if a surrogate will be carrying the child or if donated sperm, oocyte or embryos are used.

HE803 When loss of fertility is likely to occur whether through age, gender affirming treatment or any other reason, cryopreservation of sperm, oocyte and embryos should be offered free of charge through the NHS. These should be held as long as the patient wishes, until normal fertility resumes, up to six months after their death or until the collected material is no longer deemed viable.

SECTION D

D1 WINNING OVER WORKERS IS CRUCIAL TO FIGHTING CLIMATE CHANGE.

4073 Points

Peter Murry, Alan Wheatley, Danny McNamara, Jay Ginn, Jim McGinley, Les Levidow, Lois Davis, Malcolm Bailey, Martin Childs, Martin Francis, Noel Lynch, Paul Philo, Richard Wyatt, Roy Sandison, Simon Hales, Steve Williams, Susan Tibbles.*

Synopsis

To win the fight against climate change the GPEW needs to link up with workers and trade unions to promote a Just Transition to a sustainable green economy. The GPEW needs to send the message that it supports workers.

Motion

The Green Party of England & Wales (GPEW) believes that winning over workers and Trade Unions is crucial if we are to have any chance to fight climate change and save the planet.

In the UK, 6.35 million people (23.4% of employees) are members of the trade unions as well as millions who want to be in trade unions but are pressured not to. The GPEW need to win as many of these people to the idea of a Just Transition to a green economy. To not take this seriously would be a serious mistake in the struggle to save the planet.

The position of Trade Union Liaison Officer was agreed by Conference a number of years ago and GPEW does have a good record of active support of workers struggles and supports the repeal of anti–Trade Union Laws. The development of Green New Deals and Just Transition in the trade union movement reflects this progress. So, it would be very concerning if the party is now seen to relegate workers.

Removing the TULO position and/or not including the Green Party Trade Union group would suggest that workers are seen as not being important in our work.

Action

- That the GPEW builds on the position of the Trade Union Liaison Officer (TULO) and the Green Party Trade Union group in any reorganisation mandated by its own democratic procedures
- That the GPEW ensures that workers and a Just Transition are centre stage in policy formation in respect to our number one remit to save the planet and building the green economy.

D2 DIVERSITY IN TARGET SEATS

3825 Points

Benali Hamdache, Alexander Nettle, Alexander Sallons, Alice Kiff, Amanda C Baker, Amy Heley, Arran Rang, Benjamin, Blake Roberts, Carmen Legarda, Charlene Concepcion, Charlie Button, Cleo Lake, Daniel Duffy, Daniel Key, Hannah Graham, Ian Hunt, Katherine McAlpine, Kefentse Dennis, Laura power, Lewis Williams, Louise Young, Lucy Pegg, Melanie Horrocks, Miles Row, Monika Sobiecki, Nick Humberstone, Paddy Moran, Phil Vabulas, Satnam Deuchhakar, Simon Stafford-Townsend, Tabi Joy, Tom Pashby, Zoë Garbett.*

Synopsis

Since at least 2010 every single declared target Westminster seat for the Green Party has had a white candidate. Not a single person of colour has been selected for a winnable Westminster election. For our party to break out of our white middle class stereotype we must select candidates from [excessive length, cut by SOC].

Motion

Insert into Record of Organisational Statements:

Conference instructs Green Party Regional Council to:

Convene a working group (made up of representatives from leadership, Greens of Colour, AGC, GPEx, SOC and other necessary groups) to discuss and debate possible options to address a lack of diversity in our target candidates including quotas and training schemes. This working group will also look at the issue of collecting accurate demographic data from all candidates – including making it a prerequisite to be a candidate for the Green Party.

Thereafter this group will run a workshop at Spring conference 2021 to debate options.

Present a voting paper at the following conference to be voted upon.

D3 LEADERSHIP GENDER BALANCE COMPOSITE

Composite of two motions proposed by different groups of people – both identified next to the relevant parts in the text, and with the original motions in the appendix.

SOC Note: This motion will require a two–thirds majority.

Synopsis

See synopsis of each individual motion.

Motion

Current text in the constitution

Subsection i) of Article 8, Green Party of England and Wales Constitution:

“There shall be a leader and two deputy leaders of the party. The leader shall be a voting member of the Executive and the deputy leaders be treated as a job–share.”

Subsection iv) of Article 8, Green Party of England and Wales Constitution:

“The post of deputy leader will be held as a job share with two individuals of a different gender, noting that gender is self–determined.

“Two members of a different gender may together stand for the office of Leader in order to hold the post as a job share in which case they shall be known as ‘Co–Leaders’. In this case a single Deputy, the individual who polls the highest vote, regardless of gender, will be elected. Members standing to be Co–Leaders may not simultaneously be candidates as individuals for either Leader or Deputy Leader.”

Subsection v) of Article 8, Green Party of England and Wales Constitution:

“The Leader and Deputy Leader(s) or Co–Leaders shall be elected every two years. The election shall be by a postal ballot of all members of the Party.”

Proposed new text for the constitution.

(SOC note, this version was proposed by Jessica Goldfinch*, Caitlin Collins, Glyn Goodwin, Janine Pyke, Jo Campbell, Maire Smith, Marcus Grant, Margaret Adams, Martha James, Mike Shone, Niamh Mac Mahon , Paula Hermes, Stephen Green, Susan Jones.)

In article 8:

Replace current subsection i) with “There shall be a leader and deputy leader of the party. Both the leader and the deputy leader shall have a voting role on the Executive”.

Delete subsection iv) entirely and renumber subsequent subsections accordingly.

Amendment 1

Tom Pashby*, Alice Bennett, Alice Hubbard, Amelia Womack, Amy Heley, Ben Knowles, Chris A Williams, Cleo Lake, Jake Welsh, Kahina Bouhassane, Kelsey Trevett, Lawrence McNally, Liam Blakey, Matthew Townsend, Meg Day, Nick Hartley, Raphael Hill, Richard Wyatt, Rosemary Sexton, Sabrina Poole.

Delete proposed “new text for the constitution” and replace with:

Change Subsection iv) of Article 8 to:

“The post of deputy leader will be held as a job share with two individuals, at least one of whom must be a woman or a gender non–conforming/non–binary person, noting that

gender is self–determined.

“Two members, of whom at least one must be a woman or a gender non–conforming/non–binary person, may together stand for the office of Leader in order to hold the post as a job share in which case they shall be known as ‘Co–Leaders’. In this case a single Deputy, the individual who polls the highest vote, regardless of gender, will be elected. Members standing to be Co–Leaders may not simultaneously be candidates as individuals for either Leader or Deputy Leader.”

D4

REQUEST THAT THE CODE OF CONDUCT OVERSIGHT GROUP APPEND “ANTISEMITISM: A GUIDANCE” TO THE CODE OF CONDUCT

[[SOC note – there is a potential interaction between this motion and “D16 IHRA, Palestine, and Free Speech”, particularly if both amendments are passed. SOC has ruled that it will not impede the passage of both motions through conference, but that the Code of Conduct Oversight Body will have to take both motions (if passed) into account in any decision making that is required as an outcome.]]

3404 Points

Vivien Lichtenstein, Alexandra Phillips, Alice Bennett, Andree Frieze, Barbara Holloway, Chandler Wilson, David Farbey, Elise Benjamin, Joshua Alston, Katharine A Gilchrist, Kathryn Bristow, Larry Sanders, Lee-Anne Lawrance, Lesley Grahame, Lucy Pegg, Matt Browne, Robert Nixon, Rosemary Sexton, Rosie Rawle, Ruth Brandt, Sam Alston, Sian Berry, Tom Pashby, Zack Polanski.*

Synopsis

This is a request to the oversight body to consider proposing “Antisemitism: A Guidance” and its covering notes to the Code of Conduct. This will enable party bodies to refer to the various definitions included in that document.

Motion

Conference instructs the oversight body once established to consider proposing the following as a revision or attaching this as an appendix to the Code of Conduct in accordance with Clause 4.2 or 4.3 of the Code of Conduct.

In referring to that document, party bodies should note:

- The party’s policy on Freedom of Speech
- The party’s support of Boycott Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaigns.

And with regard to the IHRA’s definition and examples:

- This working definition should be regarded as a helpful set of guidelines to help identify different examples of possible antisemitism, rather than a strict legal definition
- The paragraph preceding the list of examples includes “contemporary examples of antisemitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere could [include], taking into account the overall context”. That is, there are contexts in which an example

is antisemitic and contexts in which it is not. It is therefore understood that the IHRA is also a defence against false accusations of antisemitism.

- The IHRA definition confirms that ‘criticism of Israel similar to that levelled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic’.
- The definition and its examples are for the party’s internal use. It is completely irrelevant how other organisations interpret and use it.

Sections affected by the appended “Antisemitism: A Guidance”

9 Safe Space and Civility: 9.1 and 9.2

10 Inclusion: 10.1 and 10.2

11 Diversity: 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3

“Antisemitism: A Guidance” appears as a supporting paper to this agenda and it is distributed alongside it. If it does not appear with it, please contact Standing Orders Committee for a copy.

AMENDMENT 1

*Joshua Alston, Elise Benjamin, Sam Alston,
Zack Polanski, Raphael Hill, Jack Lenox.*

Delete:

‘In referring to that document, party bodies should note:

- The party’s policy on Freedom of Speech
- The party’s support of Boycott Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaigns.’

And replace with:

In referring to that document, party bodies should note:

- The IHRA definition represents the gold standard definition of antisemitism. Other information provided is intended to contextualise and explain the IHRA definition.
- Existing Green Party antisemitism policy, adopted in Autumn 2008, is:
- Members should at all times, including when proposing and implementing policy, be sensitive to the fact that the Green Party does not and will not endorse or tolerate antisemitism, or discrimination of any form.
- This motion also takes note of our existing, comprehensive racism policy
- This motion is to adopt a definition and examples that will act as an aid to the work of the party through the Code of Conduct.
- This motion does not in any way conflict with other policies on, for example, BDS, and will not prevent legitimate criticism of the actions of any nation state.
- The CST [Community Security Trust] notes that this working definition should be regarded as a helpful set of guidelines to help identify different examples of possible antisemitism, rather than a strict legal definition.
- There is a need to provide greater information and guidance to help members of the party identify and understand genuine antisemitism.

- Some types of antisemitism, for example the use of tropes, are not always obvious to non–Jews, and can cause unintentional harm and offence.
- This motion is also intended to act as an aid to members in understanding when legitimate criticism of the actions of a nation state or individuals cross over into genuine antisemitism.
- The importance of a wider understanding of what constitutes antisemitism is highlighted in a letter co–signed by Rabbis from across the political and communal spectrum recognising the value of the definition in helping to understand and educate about genuine antisemitism.

So that it reads:

- Conference instructs the oversight body once established to consider proposing the following as a revision or attaching this as an appendix to the Code of Conduct in accordance with Clause 4.2 or 4.3 of the Code of Conduct.
 - In referring to that document, party bodies should note:
 - The IHRA definition represents the gold standard definition of antisemitism. Other information provided is intended to contextualise and explain the IHRA definition.
 - Existing Green Party antisemitism policy, adopted in Autumn 2008, is:
 - Members should at all times, including when proposing and implementing policy, be sensitive to the fact that the Green Party does not and will not endorse or tolerate antisemitism, or discrimination of any form.
 - This motion also takes note of our existing, comprehensive racism policy
 - This motion is to adopt a definition and examples that will act as an aid to the work of the party through the Code of Conduct.
 - This motion does not in any way conflict with other policies on, for example, BDS, and will not prevent legitimate criticism of the actions of any nation state.
 - The CST [Community Security Trust] notes that this working definition should be regarded as a helpful set of guidelines to help identify different examples of possible antisemitism, rather than a strict legal definition.
 - There is a need to provide greater information and guidance to help members of the party identify and understand genuine antisemitism.
 - Some types of antisemitism, for example the use of tropes, are not always obvious to non–Jews, and can cause unintentional harm and offence.
 - This motion is also intended to act as an aid to members in understanding when legitimate criticism of the actions of a nation state or individuals cross over into genuine antisemitism.
 - The importance of a wider understanding of what constitutes antisemitism is highlighted in a letter co–signed by Rabbis from across the political and communal spectrum recognising the value of the definition in helping to understand and educate about genuine antisemitism.
- And with regard to the IHRA’s definition and examples:
- The paragraph preceding the list of examples includes

“contemporary examples of antisemitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere could [include], taking into account the overall context”. That is, there are contexts in which an example is antisemitic and contexts in which it is not. It is therefore understood that the IHRA is also a defence against false accusations of antisemitism.

- The IHRA definition confirms that ‘criticism of Israel similar to that levelled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic’.
- The definition and its examples are for the party’s internal use. It is completely irrelevant how other organisations interpret and use it.

Sections affected by the appended ‘Antisemitism: A Guidance’

9 Safe Space and Civility: 9.1 and 9.2

10 Inclusion: 10.1 and 10.2

11 Diversity: 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3

AMENDMENT 2

Joshua Alston, Elise Benjamin, Sam Alston, Zack Polanski, Raphael Hill, Jack Lenox.

Remove:

Appended document – Antisemitism: A Guidance

Replace with:

The IHRA Definition

Antisemitism: A Guidance (Version 2)

D5 INDEPENDENCE OF THE COMPLAINTS PROCESS

[[SOC note – the next 4 motions (D5 – D8) has been promoted from their positions in the agenda based on the prioritisation ballot outcomes and the provisions of Section E, clause 3, part e, subsection ii of the Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference:

“The SOC shall have discretion to vary the order of the Final Agenda from that indicated by the prioritisation ballot. SOC may exercise this discretion:

ii) because of the need to debate motions which affect other motions in an appropriate order, or the desirability of placing motions on the same subject together.”]]

3171 Points

Disciplinary Committee, Alan Butterworth, Andy Denis, John Coyne, Karen Marie Andersen, Yasmin Aytüre.

SOC Note: This motion will require a two-thirds majority

Synopsis

To clarify the reach of the authority of the Party Executive and the separation of the powers of other Party bodies mentioned

in the Constitution.

Motion

Conference asserts the value of having an independent internal complaints process, separate from the authority of the Party Executive (GPEX).

Conference resolves to clarify the Constitution to put that independence beyond doubt, as follows.

At the end of paragraph 7.1 insert the words.

“Certain duties and responsibilities are reserved to other Party bodies specified in this Constitution, in particular GPRC, GPRC Appeals Committee, Disciplinary Committee, Standing Orders Committee and Conference. The authority of the Executive does not extend over those reserved duties and responsibilities.”

AMENDMENT 1

John Coyne, Andrew Denis, Pippy Shepherd, Cate Mohr, Stephanie Pitchers, David Morgan, Kevin Robinson Hale, Sarah Jennings, Tom Crone, Ted Grant, Alan Butterworth, Sally Newey.*

Add the following to the end:

Although Conference withholds any power for the Executive to overrule Disciplinary Committee or Appeals Committee, Conference resolves that the Appeals Committee in particular should have the power to reconsider one of its own decisions if that committee considers there is a compelling reason to do so.

Conference therefore amends paragraph 7.10 of Standing Orders for Party Discipline (SOPD), as follows.

Current text of 7.10

7.10 The Appeals Committee appeal decision shall be final and binding and not subject to further appeal. The Appeals Committee should give reasons for its decision. They shall remind the Respondent and Complainant of their rights of Whistleblowing under the GPEW Policy on Harassment, Bullying and Discrimination.

Replace the first sentence of paragraph 7.10 so that it says

“The Appeals Committee appeal decision shall not be subject to further appeal, however the Appeals Committee may review its decision if it considers there is a compelling reason to do so.”

AMENDMENT 2

John Coyne, Andrew Denis, Pippy Shepherd, Cate Mohr, Stephanie Pitchers, David Morgan, Kevin Robinson Hale, Sarah Jennings, Tom Crone, Ted Grant, Alan Butterworth, Sally Newey.*

Add the following to the end of the motion.

Conference recognises that there may be circumstances in

which Disciplinary Committee should review and/or re–hear a flawed disciplinary decision. And in particular this might be appropriate where new evidence had been presented or where a procedural flaw had been found. To increase the likelihood that a fresh panel of Committee members could be assembled, Conference resolves to reduce the quorum for a disciplinary hearing from four to three.

Amend SOPD paragraph 7.9 to allow Appeals Committee to refer a complaint back to Disciplinary Committee, as follows.

In SOPD 7.9 add the words.

The Appeals Committee also has discretion to refer a complaint back to the Committee for reconsideration if it considers that is fair and proportionate.

Amend paragraph 6.1 of SOPD, replacing “four” by “three”.

D6 DISREPUTE IN THE DISCIPLINARY PROCESS

2645 Points

Disciplinary Committee, Alan Butterworth, Andy Denis, John Coyne, Karen Marie Andersen, Yasmin Aytüre.

SOC note: This motion will require a two–thirds majority

Synopsis

Clarifying “Disrepute” as one of the three grounds for a disciplinary complaint specified in the Constitution. Behaviour which risks bringing the Party into disrepute can be grounds for a complaint, even if the disrepute has not been realised. Redundant references to “disrepute” elsewhere are removed.

Motion

Conference resolves to clarify the criteria for deciding on Disrepute as a disciplinary matter. Conference notes that “disrepute” is mentioned inconsistently in the following places in the Constitution, in the Code of Conduct (CoC), in Standing Orders for Party Discipline (SOPD), which in turn refers to the GPRC Handbook

To avoid ambiguity, Conference amends the Constitution, the Code of Conduct and SOPD as follows.

In paragraph 4 xi) in the Constitution, at the end of

“c) that a member has brought the Party into disrepute”

insert the words

“or that through their actions they have been reckless about the risk of disrepute to the Party”

Instruct the Code of Conduct Oversight Body to amend the Code of Conduct as follows:

In the Code of Conduct delete paragraph 7.3 and renumber the subsequent paragraph.

“7.3 Members should take care to not bring the Green Party into disrepute by engaging in unethical conduct.”

In the CoC paragraph 8.2 delete the words

“and to not bring the Party into disrepute while doing so”

In the CoC paragraph 8.5 delete the words

“must take care to not bring the party into disrepute”

and replace with

“should consider how the effect of their expressed opinions might reflect on the reputation of the Party”.

In the CoC paragraph 15.2 delete the final clause.

“, nor used to bring the Party into disrepute”.

In SOPD paragraph 1.2 delete all after and including the words

“one of the following grounds:”

and replace by

“one or more of the grounds specified in the Constitution of GPEW.”

In SPOD paragraph 3.9 delete all after and including the words

“of the following grounds:”

and replace by

“of the grounds specified in the Constitution of GPEW.”

D7 INCONSISTENCY IN THE COMPLAINTS REFERRAL GROUP MEMBERSHIP BETWEEN THE CONSTITUTION AND STANDING ORDERS FOR PARTY DISCIPLINE

2419 Points

Disciplinary Committee, Alan Butterworth, Andy Denis, John Coyne, Karen Marie Andersen, Yasmin Aytüre.

[SOC Note: This motion will require a two–thirds majority]

Synopsis

To correct some drafting errors in the Constitution and in Standing Orders for Party Discipline.

Motion

(1) Conference notes the inconsistency between the Constitution paragraph 4 xii) and the Standing Orders for Party Discipline (SOPD) paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6. Conference resolves to delete paragraph 4 xii) of the Constitution and renumber paragraphs as necessary.

Conference resolves to make the following drafting corrections to Standing Orders for Party Discipline.

(2) In SOPD paragraph 2.4 replace “3.8” with “3.10”.

(3) In SOPD paragraph 3.12 replace “3.8” with “3.10”.

(4) In SOPD paragraph 4.5 replace “3.7” with “3.8”.

(5) In SOPD paragraph 6.17 replace “7.5” with “7.3”.

(6) The last paragraph in Footnote 8 in SOPD currently says: When the Committee decides on a sanction it should start with the least punitive sanction and if they decide it is not sufficient

to achieve the aim of the decision being made, to record why and then to move on to the next most serious sanction, i.e. to approach the sanctions in ascending order of seriousness.

In the final sentence of Footnote 8 in SOPD delete all after “to record why”.

D8

BREACH OF CONTRACT LITIGATION AND THE DISCIPLINARY PROCESS

2352 Points

Disciplinary Committee, Alan Butterworth, Andy Denis, John Coyne, Karen Marie Andersen, Yasmin Aytüre.

Synopsis

Instructing GPEX to aim to reduce the risk of the Party being taken to court by a member who disagrees with a decision of the Appeals Committee.

Motion

Conference notes that the contract between GPEW and a member of GPEW is governed by the Constitution and the subsidiary documents mentioned in the Constitution, in particular Standing Orders for Party Discipline (SOPD).

Conference notes that SOPD paragraph 7.10 states that

“The Appeals Committee appeal decision shall be final and binding and not subject to further appeal.”

Conference instructs GPEX to take steps to ensure that the final and binding decision of Appeals Committee is not vulnerable to litigation under breach of contract. In particular Conference requests GPEX to consider a requirement for members to agree that the extent of any liability under their contract of membership is limited to the value of the aggrieved member’s membership subscription.

Conference notes that any legal challenge to GPEW under the Equality Act 2010 would not be and should not be affected by this limitation of contractual liability.

D9

AN EXTRAORDINARY PARTY CONFERENCE TO DEBATE A CONSTITUTION THAT DELIVERS THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND INTENT OF THE HOLISTIC REVIEW COMMISSION AND INCORPORATION OF THE PARTY

3119 Points

Adrian Spurrell, Maciejowska Judy, Andrew Bradbury, Barbara Light, Emma Bullard, Jackie Turvey Tait, Jon Nott, Kathryn Driscoll, Kieran Turner, Liz O’Neill, Liz Reason, Martina Weitsch, Peter Underwood, Rachel Collinson, Sam Riches, Sian Berry.*

Synopsis

This motion proposes an Extraordinary Party Conference to

debate a constitution that delivers the recommendations and intent of the Holistic Review Commission and Incorporation of the Party. Drafted by a governance specialist, it will draw on work done to date and be checked by the Party’s solicitors prior to coming [excessive length, cut by SOC].

Motion

This conference convenes an Extraordinary Party Conference under the provision in the constitution under section 10, part viii.

This conference delegates the power only to consider and vote on changes to our constitution and organisational ways of working within the party. No further powers of this conference are delegated to it.

The agenda for the extraordinary conference will not feature reports from party bodies aside from SOC to report on the agenda setting process, and will only feature motions and amendments in section D which seek to make changes to the constitution, associated standing orders and ways of working within the party.

The conference will take place online using the same standing orders as the virtual extraordinary conference of Autumn 2020, and the deadlines for the conference will ensure that the pre–agenda deadline will fall on or after January the 4th 2021.

AMENDMENT 1

Danny McNamara, Peter Murry, Roy Sandison, Martin Francis, Mike Shaughnessy, Tom Killick, Lois Davis, Martin Hemingway, Martin Childs, Sue Tibbles,*

In paragraph no. 2, first sentence: delete

“to our constitution and organisational ways of working within the party” and insert “designed to ensure that the personal assets of officers, employees and members are legally protected from liability for GPEW costs through the introduction of Limited Liability status or other mechanism”.

In paragraph no. 3: delete

“, associated standing orders and ways of working within the party” and insert “and associated standing orders required for the introduction of Limited Liability status or other mechanism for protecting the personal assets of officers, employees and members from legal liability for GPEW costs”.

So that it reads:

This conference convenes an Extraordinary Party Conference under the provision in the constitution under section 10, part viii.

This conference delegates the power only to consider and vote on changes designed to ensure that the personal assets of officers, employees and members are legally protected from liability for GPEW costs through the introduction of Limited Liability status or other mechanism. No further powers of this conference are delegated to it.

The agenda for the extraordinary conference will not feature reports from party bodies aside from SOC to report on the agenda setting process, and will only feature motions and amendments in section D which seek to make changes to the constitution and associated standing orders required for the introduction of Limited Liability status or other mechanism for protecting the personal assets of officers, employees and members from legal liability for GPEW costs.

The conference will take place online using the same standing orders as the virtual extraordinary conference of Autumn 2020, and the deadlines for the conference will ensure that the pre-agenda deadline will fall on or after January the 4th 2021.

AMENDMENT 2

Martin Hemingway, Roy Sandison, Lopy Oubridge, John Street, Simon Hales, Sam Riches, Daniel Wimberley, Beccy Swarbridge, Martin Childs, Nicole Heydock.*

After the final paragraph, add new paragraph:

Any text agreed by the conference will go to a full ballot of the party membership before adoption as a replacement for the existing constitutional arrangements.

D10 ACCESSIBILITY AND CHANGE PROCESS FOR PARTY BRANDING

2821 Points

Emma Carter, Adam McGregor, Benedict Allbrooke, Elaine Francis, Evie Rouxel, Hannah Clare, Harry Rouxel, Kathryn Driscoll, Laurie Needham, Louis Williams, Mae Rouxel, Mat Wise, Matt Edwards, Robert Nixon, Rustam Majainah, Samir Jeraj, Steve Caudwell, TJ Milburn.*

Synopsis

The consistency of the party brand is an important part of running effective elections campaigns and improving the quality of local party election literature. All parts of the party should adhere to our brand to ensure that it's clear to everyone what the brand is.

Motion

Insert into Record of Organisational Statements:

Conference instructs the Green Party Executive to ensure that our external visual identity remains consistent with the party brand guidelines, in particular, central party communications via email and social media. With support available to assist local parties to adhere to the guidelines.

Whenever there are changes and deviations to the guidelines these will be clearly communicated via the local party bulletin, and the relevant assets for the visual identity will be distributed to everyone prior to being used by any part of the party – central or otherwise.

Any changes to the brand identity will only take place

outside of the main election cycle and will not under any circumstances take place between January the 1st and the first Thursday in May, or the 5 months prior to a general or other major election held outside of May.

GPEX will initiate a review of our brand guidelines to ensure that they adhere to best practice for accessibility in design. This will include and report on at least a consideration of the colours used, the level of contrast between text and backgrounds and the recommended arrangements of text on the page. This will ensure that the guidelines will assist activists and the central party in creating content which is accessible to the widest possible group of people.

The review process will involve consultation with the wider membership, and in particular the designers that work hard in local and regional and Wales parties across England and Wales to create the vast majority of the party's content.

The review will report back at the latest to Autumn conference 2021, and will be implemented in line with the timelines outlined in this motion.

D11 CONSULTATION AND RIGHT OF REPLY FOR LIBERATION GROUPS ON PROPOSED POLICY

2770 Points

Phil Vabulas, Alexandra Burton, Andrew Gray, Anita Workman, Anne-Marie Organ, Ashley Routh, Bartley Shaw, Caitlin Baker, Caroline Wild, Catriona Sibert, Cerine Yudin, Charles Gillott, Charlotte Ruddick, Ed Saul, Eleanor Margolies, Eleanor Matthews, Georgia Berini, Giorgia Finney, Helen James, Imogen Loucas, Jeffrey Scott Spragg, Kat Macann, Kate Kenzie, Lily Roff, Morgaen Warner, Noah Sorensen, Sally Outen, Sean Mulcahy, Seren Parri, Stephen Lloyd, Tabi Joy, Thom Madden, Timothy Priest, Tracey Beresford.*

Synopsis

Too frequently there are motions submitted which clearly affect members of liberation groups, but have not consulted those groups. This motion seeks to find options to ensure proper consultation and rights of reply where appropriate.

Motion

Insert into Record of Organisational Statements:

Conference instructs Policy Development Committee to convene a working group (membership to be determined by the Policy Development Coordinator and must include at least one member of Standing Orders Committee) to discuss and debate possible options for ensuring that Members Working Groups which are recognised by the Equality and Diversity Committee are adequately consulted and have a right of reply to any proposed policy which is targeted at members of such a group. Thereafter this group will run a workshop at either Spring Conference 2021, or any EGM held in the first 6 months of 2021, to debate options and will present a voting paper at the following conference to be voted upon.

D12 LIBERATION MANIFESTO APPROVAL

2732 Points

Benali Hamdache, Alexander Nettle, Alice Kiff, Amanda C Baker, Amy Heley, Andy Hunter-Rossall, Arran Rangi, Benjamin, Blake Roberts, Carmen Legarda, Charlene Concepcion, Charlie Button, Cleo Lake, Daniel Duffy, Daniel Key, Hannah Graham, Ian Hunt, Joshua Alston, Katherine McAlpine, Kefentse Dennis, Laura power, Lewis Williams, Louise Young, Lucy Pegg, Melanie Horrocks, Miles Row, Monika Sobiecki, Niall Murphy, Nick Humberstone, Paddy Moran, Raphael Hill, Sam Murray, Satnam Deuchhakar, Simon Stafford-Townsend, TJ Milburn, Wesley Walton.*

SOC Note: This motion will require a two-thirds majority

Synopsis

Every election the party currently publishes manifestos from our liberation groups. However the process at the last General Election was been vague – with shifting timelines and goalposts. This led to nearly all of these documents not given proper public launches. We'd like to constitutionally mandate GPRC to provide a [Excessive length, cut by SOC].

Motion

Insert a new 13 vii into the Green Party Constitution and renumber

vii. The party shall also publish smaller community specific manifestos called "liberation manifestos" at a General Election. These will include:

A LGBTIQ+ Greens manifesto (produced by LGBTIQ+ Greens)

A Greens of Colour manifesto (produced by Greens of Colour)

A Green Women manifesto (produced by Green Party Women)

A Young Greens manifesto (produced by Young Greens)

A Jewish Greens manifesto (produced by Jewish Greens)

A Disability manifesto (produced by GP Disability Group)

At the start of the election GPRC will be mandated to provide a clear timeline for approval and publication.

D13 TO REQUIRE GPEW MEMBERS TO HAVE BEEN MEMBERS FOR TWO YEARS BEFORE STANDING FOR SOC

2577 Points

Standing Orders Committee, Claire Nash*, Alan Borgars, Doug Rouxel, Jay Ginn.

SOC Note: This motion will require a two-thirds majority

Synopsis

To require GPEW members to have been members for two years before standing for SOC

Motion

Amend Constitution Section 10 iii) to add:

"Candidates for election to the Standing Orders Committee must have been a member of the Party for a minimum of two years prior to standing for election to the Standing Orders Committee."

D14 ALLOW CRITICISM OF OTHER CANDIDATES IN INTERNAL ELECTIONS

2497 Points

Rob Bryher, Adam McGregor, Alexander Sallons, Alexandra Burton, Andrew Gray, Anita Workman, Anne Hamdache, Anne-Marie Organ, Ashley Knox, Caitlin Baker, Cameron Palin, Carol Thornton, Catriona Sibert, Cerine Yudin, Charles Gillott, Charlotte Ruddick, Conor Ritchie, Dan Thomas, Daniel James, Daniel Johnston, Eleanor Matthews, George Morris, Georgia Berini, Giorgia Finney, Helen James, Imogen Loucas, James Braun, Jeffrey Scott Spragg, Jennifer Bartle, Joe Levy, Karl Wardlaw, Kat Macann, Kate Kenzie, Lily Roff, Mark Rutherford, Morgaen Warner, Noah Sorensen, Robin Brabham, Ruth Brandt, Sabrina Poole, Sally Outen, Sean Mulcahy, Sebastian Cousins, Seren Parri, Simeon Jackson, Stephen Lloyd, Steve Miller, Tabi Joy, Thom Madden, Timothy Priest, Tristan Gray.*

Synopsis

It is detrimental to the party's internal democracy and complaints system to not allow valid criticism of other members. There are many instances where it is right to criticise other members and members should not fear complaints being submitted against them on these grounds.

Motion

Instruct the Code of Conduct oversight body to make the following changes to the Code of Conduct.

In Green Party Members Code Of Conduct, remove 13.3 which reads:

13.3 Members should refrain from criticising other Party members publicly, including any situations where non-members may be present. If criticism is felt to be necessary, it should be done sensitively and constructively by those given that responsibility. Criticism should be of actions and behaviour or statements etc., not of the person. Avoid labels, name calling and stigmatising a person.

Insert new 13.3 and 13.4 which reads:

13.3 If criticism of another member is felt to be necessary, it should be done sensitively and constructively. Members should seek out the most appropriate and proportionate way to raise issues or inform other members of concerns in the first instance, such as internal forums, and should always bear in mind paragraphs 7.3, 8.2, 8.5, 15.2 and 17.2 in this code of conduct on bringing the party into disrepute.

13.4 It is however acknowledged that it is sometimes in the democratic interests of the party for members to know

information about other members that would involve criticism of their actions and behaviour (e.g. candidates standing in internal elections). The avoidance of labels, name calling and stigmatising a person are guiding principles for members' behaviour.

D15 PROACTIVE STANCE FOR STANDING IN ELECTIONS

2436 Points

Emma Carter, Andy Hunter-Rossall, Benedict Allbrooke, Elaine Francis, Evie Rouxel, Hannah Clare, Harry Rouxel, Kathryn Driscoll, Laurie Needham, Louis Williams, Mae Rouxel, Mat Wise, Robert Nixon, Rustam Majainah.*

Synopsis

Change constitution to always run in elections.

Motion

In section 3 part b of the constitution: b) to that end to win seats at all levels of government;

Add: Between “to” and “win” insert “run in all possible elections and”

So it reads:

b) to that end to run in all possible elections and win seats at all levels of government wherever financially and organisationally feasible.

Insert into the Record of Organisational Statements, as follows.

“Conference requests GPEX to consider the provision of financial support for subregional election deposits (mayoral and PCC) wherever it considers there is a reasonable prospect of retaining deposits.”

D16 IHRA, PALESTINE, AND FREE SPEECH

[[SOC note – there is a potential interaction between this motion and “D4 Request that the Code of Conduct oversight group append “Antisemitism: A Guidance” to the Code of Conduct”, particularly if both amendments to that motion are passed. SOC has ruled that it will not impede the passage of both motions through conference, but that the Code of Conduct Oversight Body will have to take both motions (if passed) into account in any decision making that is required as an outcome.]]

2289 Points

Shahrar Ali, Alan Wheatley, Anne Gray, James Dickins, Jay Ginn, Jim McGinley, Les Levidow, Lois Davis, Malcolm Bailey, Martin Francis, Meg Day, Mehmood Naqshbandi, Paul Philo, Roy Sandison, Simon Hales, Tom Killick.*

Synopsis

Conference is asked to reaffirm its support for free speech on Israel and Palestine and for The Green Party to campaign

against adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition and in support of Boycott Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaigns.

Motion

Insert into Record of Organisational Statements:

Conference notes the relentless pressure upon public and educational institutions to adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism and the associated contentious examples referring to Israel and calls upon all Greens to stand firm against its adoption.

Greens are at the heart of building a movement against racism and fascism, and there is no place for antisemitism, Islamophobia or any other kind of racism in our Party. At a time when the far-right is growing in confidence it is more important than ever to stand against Holocaust denial, anti-Jewish conspiracy theories and any other forms of antisemitic prejudice and hatred.

However, the examples which accompany the IHRA definition systematically conflate opposition to Israeli policies with antisemitism, threatening to undermine many years of practical solidarity with the Palestinian people, including Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS), in the face of decades of dispossession and occupation. Adopting IHRA would mean that BDS would be treated as antisemitic.

Unjustified allegations of antisemitism also set back the fight against antisemitism itself. We believe it is vitally important that Greens continue to speak out to challenge Israel's history of racism towards the Palestinians without being labelled as antisemitic.

The IHRA definition and its examples have already posed a serious threat to academic freedom, wider freedom of expression and the unjustified attacks upon Green candidates and spokespersons.

Conference instructs GPEX, the Green Party campaigns team and elected Green Party representatives to oppose adoption of the IHRA definition with examples and campaign to protect free speech across our public institutions and universities.

D17 MAKE CAMPAIGNING AND ADVOCATING VOTING FOR OTHER PARTIES SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION.

2104 Points

Rob Bryher, Alexander Sallons, Anna Bryher, Ashley Knox, Carol Thornton, Chris Evans, Dominic Tristram, Emma Carter, Evie Rouxel, Harry Rouxel, Jennifer Bartle, Karl Wardlaw, Lynn Haanen, Mae Rouxel, Mark Rutherford, Matt Edwards, Molly Scott Cato, Sabrina Poole, Sebastian Cousins, Steve Miller, Tim Davies, Tristan Gray.*

Action

SOC Note: This motion will require a two-thirds majority.

Synopsis

It is detrimental to the party if members – whether prominent or otherwise – publicly call for people to vote for other political parties. This motion provides for a disciplinary process to deal with members who choose to do this.

Motion

In the constitution section 4, part vii (7), insert in the final sentence between “campaign” and “for”:

“for, or advocate voting”

So that it reads:

“No member may campaign for, or advocate voting for any candidate standing against a properly selected Green Party candidate.”

At the end insert:

“Members who are alleged to have acted contrary to the requirements of this clause may be subject to disciplinary action. If their actions are such as to damage the Green Party they may be suspended or expelled.”

D18 MAKE MEMBERSHIP OF THE YOUNG GREENS AN AUTOMATIC OPT-IN RIGHT FOR YOUNG MEMBERS 16-29 INCLUSIVE.

2025 Points

Jessica Goldfinch, Bernadette O'Malley, Caitlin Collins, Clare Palmer, Conor Ritchie, Diane Wood, Eleanor Crawley, Emma Bateman, Janet Wright, Janine Pyke, Jo Campbell, Maire Smith, Marcus Grant, Margaret Adams, Mariette Labelle, Martha James, Mike Shone, Paula Hermes, Robbie Spence, Stephen Green, Susan Jones, Taymar Pitman.*

[SOC Note: This motion will require a two-thirds majority.]

Synopsis

In line with common practice safeguarding protocols to make Young Greens membership opt-in and within common practice age-bracketing.

Motion

Delete all of the current bye-law 5xii) subsection 2) and replace with:

5xii) 2): ‘Members who are between the ages of 16 years and 29 years inclusive have an automatic right to join, and participate in all activities of, the Young Greens if they so wish.’

Conference instructs Young Greens to amend their constitution accordingly.

D19 AFFILIATED GROUPS

1870 Points

Adrian Spurrell, Judy Maciejowska, Barbara Light, Emma Bullard, Jackie Turvey Tait, Jon Nott, Kathryn Driscoll, Kieran Turner, Liz O'Neill, Martina Weitsch, Peter Underwood, Rachel Collinson,*

Sam Riches, Sian Berry, Steve Leyland.

[SOC Note: This motion will require a two-thirds majority]

Synopsis

The definition of “affiliated groups” passed at Conference but assumed a new constitution would exist. This motion: inserts the definition into the current constitution; vests power to recognise affiliated groups in GPRC; removes references to “subsidiary documents”; deletes references to “the Council”.

Motion

In the Constitution:

1. Insert the following text to create a new paragraph at the end of section 5 (“Organisation”), to become 5.xxv:

Groups may be formed by members who are, in a stated context (including, but not exclusively, socially, politically, economically, culturally and historically) at risk of inequality or lacking in access to rights, resources or opportunities. This can include, but is not limited to, gender, gender identity, sex, sexual orientation, age, ethnicity, religion or belief, health status, disability, education and income. Such a group may be recognised by Green Party Regional Council (GPRC) as an Affiliated Group if it meets the criteria for structure and governance as defined in the by-law relevant to this section of the constitution. A group may not call itself an Affiliated Group unless recognised by Green Party Regional Council. Recognition may be granted, and withdrawn by Green Party Regional Council if the criteria are no longer met, using a process set out in Green Party Regional Council Standing Orders.

2. Insert the following text as the By-law relevant to section 5.xxv:

- i. Affiliated Groups must have in place and record:
 - a. the name of the Group
 - b. the need for the Group
 - c. the scope of the Group and its chosen membership criteria (e.g. characteristics of members or subject)
 - d. the desired outcomes of aims, and how they were agreed
 - e. the name of an accountable contact or coordinator with whom correspondence can be conducted; and, if applicable:
 - f. a record of the Group's committee members
 - g. whether there is a membership fee, how much and when it will be reviewed
 - h. a list of members, which is to be held within the provisions of the relevant Data Protection legislation
 - i. frequency, location and method of meetings
 - j. the quorum for decisions
 - k. any legal or fiscal powers the Group holds, e.g., to raise money
 - l. a review mechanism for the Constitution or dissolution of the Group

- m. information on how the Group reaches out to the general membership to inform about membership of the Group
 - n. a simple complaints procedure
 - o. how it may be deemed someone is no longer to be a member
 - p. information on how to call an Extraordinary General Meeting and what matters may warrant such a meeting
 - q. the Group constitution
- ii. Green Party Philosophical Basis and Policies apply to these Groups.
 - iii. Groups must comprise 25 or more members.
 - iv. Groups must have a page in the members' website that as a minimum gives a brief outline of the purpose of the Group and in what capacity members might be eligible to join it, and how to join. Notes of decisions made should be published on the members' website. Any training offered should be notified to GPRC. Groups may hold a fund; if they do, they should have a bank account, keep simple accounts and have an agreement in place about what funds may be used for. They should hold an AGM, or method of reporting annually, to review positions held in the group. After the AGM, groups should send a copy of their AGM report and minutes to GPRC and a staff contact (to ensure that the members' website is kept up to date).

LATE MOTION 1

ACCESSIBILITY IN GPEW INTERNAL PROCESSES

Danny McNamara, Mark Douglas, Sandra McLeod, Brian Orr, Soody Kim, Shahrar Ali, Andrea Carey Fuller, Evie Rouxel, Emma Carter, Noel Lynch, Derek Hardman, Robbie Spence, Alan Wheatley, Haroon Saad, Tony Matthews, Tom Killick, Les Levidow, Kathy Nalson, Mike Shaughnessy, Kenneth Burgess, William Linegar, Roy Sandison, Jay Ginn, Kieran Turner, David Wild, Jennifer Linsdell, David Taylor, Mike Shipley, Rob White, Clive Lord, Mike Richardson, Walter Houston, Jan Clark, Karen Wood, Jenny Rust, Mike Shone, Myriam Salama-Carr, Shahrar Ali, Alan Story, Linda Oubridge, Mark Hollinrake, Beccy Sawbridge, Janet Russell, Ian Sadler, Nicole Haydock, Malcolm Bailey, Isobel Hoskins, Susan Tibbles, Josh Williams, Nick Barnett, Phillip James, Duncan Brindley, Alison Marshall, Peter Murry, Alison McNamara.*

Synopsis

News has emerged that a GPEW web refresh project has started. Some members have been excluded from the agenda preparations for this conference because the relevant processes were exclusively web-based and difficult to follow. This must be addressed urgently before the web refresh project goes any further.

Motion

Conference notes recent news that a project to refresh the GPEW members' website(s) is being set in hand.

Conference further notes reports from members that some found it impossible successfully to engage with the processes involved in preparing the agenda for this conference. In some cases, the difficulties arose because the methods for engaging with these processes were exclusively web-based. In others, the problems arose because the Party's sprawling web estate is difficult to use.

Conference recognises that members with particular disabilities and/or very low levels of internet experience and/or difficulties in accessing the internet are effectively excluded in circumstances like these from key democratic processes.

Conference therefore instructs the Green Party Executive Committee with assistance from the Digital team to carry out the following and report back to the Spring 2021 Conference on progress made:

1. Ensure that from the earliest stages the project to re-design and re-build the GPEW member web site(s) consults widely across the party with users, groups and constitutional bodies (including SOC) to ensure that a range of perspectives are involved and that all accessibility and usability issues are taken into account
2. Ensure that, in future, all processes that are key to the working of party democracy are made accessible to all. This may require the provision of alternative, non-IT based methods of engagement with the relevant processes or – in cases where web- or email-based solutions are employed – the use of reasonable adjustments.

SECTION E

E1

WILDLIFE & HABITATS POLICY ENABLING MOTION (FAST TRACKED)

8728 Points

Wildlife and Habitats Policy Working Group, Mike Shipley, Adam Harper, Anne Gayfer, Bernadette O'Malley, Carolyn Weston, Craig Hutton, Libby Hudson, Linda MacCallum Stewart, Sharon Galliford, Sue Shipley, Susan Tibbles, Tom Franklin, Vix Lowthion*

Synopsis

To renew the enabling motion passed at Spring 2016 to allow the Wildlife & Habitats Policy Working Group to complete its work to develop new policy in response to the national and global biodiversity crisis.

Motion

Conference is reminded that for the first time Environmental issues occupied the top 5 places in the World Economic Forum Global Risks register, 2020, with ecosystem destruction recognised as both a major short term and long term risk to global security and wellbeing.

Conference recognises that reversing biodiversity loss is an essential part of climate mitigation.

It notes that 2021 will be the UN Decade of Nature Recovery and is reminded that the UK has been described in a report to the Government as 'one of the most nature depleted countries in the world'.

Further, it is noted that the UK government will produce a new national strategy in 2021 to deliver its 25 year Plan for the Environment.

Conference recognises that the Green Party needs new policy to reflect these issues and cutting edge thinking in the science of conservation to place it at the forefront of positive change.

Therefore Conference instructs Policy Development Committee and the Wildlife & Habitats policy working group to complete its work on a new policy chapter for the PfSS and to bring a voting paper to Conference within two years.

E2

TEACH BRITISH SIGN LANGUAGE IN SCHOOLS (FAST TRACKED)

[[SOC note – this motion has been promoted from its position in the agenda based on the prioritisation ballot on the basis of Section E, clause 3, part e, subsection iv of the Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference:

“The SOC shall have discretion to vary the order of the Final Agenda from that indicated by the prioritisation ballot. SOC may exercise this discretion:

iv) having regard to the previous Conference history of motions and papers, including whether they have been submitted for debate previously. “]]

5824 Points

Charlie Keller, Alastair Binnie–Lubbock, Ashley Routh, Bernadette O'Malley, Georgia Berini, Gina Dowding, Julyan Levy, Karen Varga, Lee Irving, Lee–Anne Lawrance, Peter Sims, Ria Patel, Samir Jeraj*

Synopsis

No synopsis supplied.

Motion

In policy ED041, where it says;

“g. Learning at least one language from the age of 7 in addition to English (and Welsh within schools in Wales). Children should have a wide range of language available for instruction, and school children who are not native speakers, or are multilingual, should have the chance to develop and share their languages at school.”

Amend it to read;

“g. Learning a wide–range of languages from the age of 7:

1. These must include English until the age of 16, and British Sign Language (BSL) as a second language until the age of 13.
2. For students in Wales, these must include Welsh until the age of 16.
3. Students who are not speakers in a native language of England and Wales, or are multilingual, should have the chance to develop and share their own languages at school.”

And insert point h. below, relettering accordingly;

h. Students should have the opportunity to continue study in British Sign Language (BSL) as a second language after the age of 13 in order to gain a formal qualification.

E3

ATONEMENT AND REPARATIVE JUSTICE FOR THE TRANSATLANTIC TRAFFIC IN ENSLAVED AFRICANS

7643 Points

Greens of Colour and Young Greens: Cleo Lake, Alexandra Phillips, Alexander Nettle, Andrew Gray, Andy Hunter-Rossall, Arran Rangi, Benali Hamdache, Benjamin, Blake Roberts, Carmen*

Legarda, Charles Gillott, Charlie Button, Daniel Duffy, Daniel Johnston, Daniel Key, Ellie Chowns, Emma Edwards, George Morris, Gina Dowding, Ian Hunt, James Braun, Jay Ginn, Jean Lambert, Jeffrey Scott Spragg, Joe Lever, Joe Levy, Kate Benson, Kathryn Bristow, Kefentse Dennis, Lee-Anne Lawrance, Lewis Williams, Lucy Madeley, Lynn Haanen, Matthew Hull, Nannette Youssef, Natalie Bennett, Nick Humberstone, Nicola Frith, Paddy Moran, Rakesh Prashara, Robin Brabham, Sam Murray, Satnam Deuchhakar, Scott Ainslie, Sean Mulcahy, Simon Stafford-Townsend, Stephen Lloyd, Timothy Priest, Tyrone Scott, Wesley Walton.

Synopsis

This motion asks the Green Party of England and Wales (GPEW) to call on the UK government to establish an All-Party Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry for Truth & Reparatory Justice to address reparations needed to redress global inequalities caused by the Trans-Atlantic Trafficking of Enslaved Africans (TTEA); these include, but [Excessive length, cut by SOC].

Motion

To be added to the Record of Policy Statements:

Conference:

Calls for the UK government to establish an All-Party Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry for Truth and Reparatory Justice. (1)

Supports the calls from campaigners for the Government to commit to a holistic process of atonement and reparations, which adequately addresses Planet Repairs solutions to the ecocide arising from the climate and ecological crises, taking into consideration various proposals for reparation in accordance with the United Nations Framework on Reparations. (2)

Instructs the campaigns and external communications coordinators to prioritise advocacy in pursuit of these two calls.

E4

A PACKAGE OF TRANSPORT MEASURES TO RESPOND TO THE CORONAVIRUS CRISIS

7126 Points

Caroline Russell*, Abigail Perrin, Alan Francis, Carol Kambites, Catherine Rowett, Chris Radway, Emma Edwards, George Morris, Hannah Clayton, James Braun, Jay Ginn, Joe Levy, John Ackers, Jonathan Tyler, Kate Benson, Katie Dawson, Lucy Madeley, Matthew Hull, Natasha Cox, Nicola Baird, Robin Brabham, Simeon Jackson.

Synopsis

This is a Section E motion for RoPS providing a statement to support principles for road transport action in the light of the coronavirus pandemic and the climate crisis, with a package of three road transport measures to reduce traffic and to make future transport resilient, low carbon and liveable:[Excessive length, cut by SOC]

Motion

Insert into RoPS

Elected representatives and Green Party campaigners will support communities through the ongoing coronavirus pandemic and the climate crisis, with a package of three road transport measures to reduce traffic and to make future transport resilient, low carbon and liveable:

- Fifteen-minute neighbourhoods with inclusive people friendly streets: where people can access the goods and services needed for daily life within a fifteen-minute walk of home, supported by low traffic neighbourhoods, school streets, pop up bike lanes and widened pavements to provide physical distancing on high streets.
- Smart, fair, privacy-friendly road pricing: where people driving pay a fee related to their distance travelled and emissions produced. Business, think-tanks and councils all know this modern and sophisticated approach to traffic reduction needs to happen.
- A strict review of all infrastructure investment, with cancellation of any projects that don't reduce carbon emissions: as we emerge from the pandemic with council and city budgets broken, it's important that we review every planned investment, with cancellation of any projects that don't reduce carbon emissions – like the A303 past Stonehenge, the Silvertown Tunnel under the Thames, the A5036 through the Rimrose Valley in South Sefton and the 110 road building schemes either approved for funding under the Major Roads Network and Large Local Majors Programme or schemes considered eligible for funding as submitted by the various sub-national transport bodies.

E5

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION LEARNING ENTITLEMENTS

6546 Points

Wildlife and Habitats Policy Working Group, Mike Shipley, Linda MacCallum Stewart, Sue Shipley, Tom Beckett, Vix Lowthion.*

Synopsis

Amend the Education chapter of the Policies for a Sustainable Society so that policy on learning entitlements and environmental education makes specific reference to nature and experiential learning. These amendments now incorporate both 2019 Election Manifesto commitments and the recommendations from the New Deal for Nature Report.

Motion

In: "ED041 Therefore the National School Curriculum will be replaced with a set of learning entitlements (listed below), in the context of which learners and teachers together will develop curriculum content to suit their needs and interests.

Children and young people will be entitled to experience of:

ED 041 a [unchanged]

ED 041 b [unchanged]

ED 401 c [unchanged]

ED041 d. The environment, through academic work and on a practical level, including children and young people's understanding of their own physical environment and enabling them to be actively involved in improving their local environment."

Delete ED041d and replace with –

ED041 d The Environment, through both formal study and practical work to give young people direct contact with nature and the opportunity and ability to interact with their local environment. To this end, Primary schools will be enabled to give all pupils the equivalent of one hour per school day of quality outdoors time that involves some experience of nature. At least one free summer camp place to be available to all students between ages 11 and 16 offering outdoor experiences.

In addition 10,000 annual work–placements will be created for teenagers with national wildlife charities to open employment opportunities for young people of all backgrounds.

In: "Environmental Education

Policy

ED200 Schools will undertake an energy audit of the school and demonstrate, annually, how they are reducing their carbon footprint and contributing to sustainability locally.

They will provide environmental education through academic and practical work.

This will include encouraging children to attend their local community school so they are within walking distance in urban areas. Schools will be required to provide their own recycling and compost facilities. In this time of rising energy prices schools will be provided with grants to retro–fit their buildings with insulation and install solar panels, solar water heating, be well insulated and where appropriate have wind turbines. They will also have rainwater and grey–water flushing systems. This is particularly important in schools so that young people accept and expect these as part of normal daily life."

Delete ED200 and replace with

ED200: All educational establishments will be required to incorporate environmental education into their curriculum as part of a young person's learning entitlement. Home educators will be encouraged to incorporate knowledge and experience of the natural environment into the delivery of an education suitable for the current and future needs of the young person.

Education Authorities should provide a support structure to offer advice and guidance on content and delivery for both schools and home educators.

Insert new ED201 – 203 and renumber accordingly:

ED201 Policy will adopt an experiential approach to learning, encouraging enquiry, direct experiences of, and practical involvement in the living world. To this end School outdoor areas will be adapted where possible to safely attract wildlife.

ED202 Educational establishments should themselves aim to become sustainable institutions providing a practical demonstration of sustainability and adaptive actions for all establishment members. Students should become involved in the development and management of sustainability programmes and audits.

ED203 The new educational entitlements will include the opportunity for young people to learn about food and to gain direct experience of growing food plants.

Every primary school in Britain to be twinned with a farm, backed with finance for necessary adaptation and insurance.

AMENDMENT 1

Emma Randall, Diana Newson, Liz Carlton, Bob Beggs, Steve Betteridge.*

Clarification needs to be added to ED203 to prevent schools from twinning with farms that use methods that are abusive to animals or cause damage to the environment.

Delete "Every primary School" to the end of the sentence and replace with:

"Every primary school in Britain to be twinned with a farm that uses plant–based, environmentally friendly production methods, backed with finance for necessary adaptation and insurance."

Teachers

After ED214 add new clause:

ED215 Include Environmental education in the general Teachers' Standard supported by funding for teachers to gain outdoor learning qualifications. [NDNR4]

Assessment:

After ED056 add a new clause and renumber accordingly

ED057 The new National Council for Educational Excellence [NCEE] will monitor the development and delivery of the national policy on Environmental Education, offering practical guidance and advice on best practice.

After current ED057 insert the below and renumber accordingly

ED059 The NCEE in cooperation with Local Authorities will develop assessment procedures that capture equally knowledge about the environment, related skills, and social activism for the environment.

E6 STAYING CLOSE TO THE SINGLE MARKET

6541 Points

Molly Scott Cato, Alison Williams, Anthony Slaughter, Catherine Braun, Catherine Rowett, Chris McFarling, Eleanor Combley, Ellie Chowns, Gina Dowding, Jean Lambert, Kate Robinson, Lynn Haanen, Mary Franklin,*

Naraneer Ruthra-Rajan, Pau Jimenez Ingles, Rowan Munson, Sam Alston, Scott Ainslie, Steve Hynd, Vivien Lichtenstein

Synopsis

No synopsis supplied

Motion

Insert into the Record of Policy Statements:

The Green Party regrets that the UK is no longer a member of the European Union and that the decision to leave was based on deceit and a failure of democracy. We continue to believe that socially and economically our place as a country is at the heart of Europe.

While we are not immediately adopting a policy to rejoin, we believe that membership of the EU remains the best option for the UK and anticipate that, in the long run, we will be supporting a campaign to rejoin.

We deplore the government's decision not to extend the transition period and to rush through preparations for the massive changes to our economic and social structures in the middle of a global pandemic, putting businesses and citizens at risk. We maintain our position that the UK should retain membership of the single market and customs union and that UK citizens should continue to benefit from free movement across the EU.

While we continue to support the principle of subsidiarity, local supply chains, and strengthened local economics, we are clear that the best way to maintain high standards on workers' rights, health and safety and environmental protection is to stay within, or as close as possible to, the EU single market.

We deplore in particular the loss of rights and opportunities to our young people and will campaign to ensure that all young people regardless of background and socio-economic status continue to enjoy the opportunity to explore the continent they share with those from the 27 EU member states, especially through campaigning for continued participation in the Erasmus scheme.

We commit to maintaining close relationships with our European neighbours through pro-European organisations and through such groups as professional associations and twinning associations.

Conference instructs the external communications officer, the media team and the party's leaders to advocate for this policy in public communications.

E7 RECOGNISE TRANS PARENTS

5337 Points

Benali Hamdache, Adam McGregor, Alexander Nettle, Amanda C Baker, Ashley Routh, Benjamin, Blake Roberts, Caroline Wild, Chandler Wilson, Charlene Concepcion, Charlie Button, Daniel Duffy, Daniel Johnston, Daniel Key, Elaine Francis, Elisabeth Whitebread, Hannah Graham, Ian Hunt,*

Joe Lever, Katherine McAlpine, Kefentse Dennis, Kelsey Trevett, Laura power, Lewis Williams, Louise Young, Lucy Pegg, Matthew Hull, Melanie Horrocks, Miles Row, Monika Sobiecki, Niall Murphy, Nick Humberstone, Paddy Moran, Phil Vabulas, Quinn Daley, Raphael Hill, Ria Patel, Rosemary Sexton, Sam Alston, Sam Murray, Samantha Alexander-Eames, Simon Stafford-Townsend, Susie O'Connor, Teresa Ravenshaw, Zoë Garbett.

Synopsis

Currently trans parents face obstacles when they have children and want to have their gender affirmed on their child's birth certificate. Freddy McConnell had his legal case rejected where he was seeking to have his child's birth certificate recognise that he was his child's father. We believe new legislation is [Excessive length, cut by SOC].

Motion

Insert new RR537: The Green Party would remove the legal barriers to trans parents having their gender properly recognised on their child's birth certificate. We would ensure parents could choose the right option for them (mother/father/parent) on a birth certificate.

AMENDMENT 1

Robbie Spence, Jessica Goldfinch, Susan Jones, Susan Green, Lippy Oubridge.*

Insert at end

This parental right would be subject to the overriding principle set out in the Children Act 1989 that the wishes of the child are paramount and the child can only give valid consent to such a change to his or her birth certificate at the age of 18.

E8 A LOCAL AND PUBLIC STRATEGY FOR ZERO COVID BRITAIN

5288 Points

Vivien Lichtenstein Alison Williams, Anthony Slaughter, Chris McFarling, Chris Radway, Eleanor Combley, Kate Robinson, Larry Sanders, Molly Scott Cato, Naraneer Ruthra-Rajan, Nicole Haydock, Rowan Munson, Tim Davies*

Synopsis

The government's response to the global coronavirus pandemic has been slow, poorly organised and driven by an ideology of privatisation. This has resulted in thousands of avoidable deaths. The motion establishes the Green Party's critical stance towards the government's Covid19 response and empowers our media team to communicate this.

Motion

Insert the following into the Record of Policy Statements

The Green Party expresses sincere regret at the unnecessarily high death-toll from Covid-19.

We support the many public health academics and professionals who have criticised the government for numerous

errors and damaging policy failures and support calls for a judge-led inquiry into the government response to the pandemic.

The government's flirting with herd immunity, confusion over strategy, dismissal of WHO advice, and refusal to follow a strategy of elimination of the virus has led to thousands of avoidable deaths and left us unprepared as Covid19 collides with the annual winter health crisis in the NHS

We have argued throughout that the response to a public health crisis should have been led by public health teams in our local authorities, supported by adequate funding and staff.

We maintain our view that a decade of under-funding and ideologically motivated privatisation have left the NHS ill prepared for the coronavirus crisis.

We regret the absence of public health experts on the SAGE advisory committee.

The Green Party is clear that the awarding of contracts to private corporations without following the statutory procurement process has contributed to the failed response to the public health crisis, as well as wasting public money.

Conference instructs the media team and external communications coordinator to take note of these positions.

E9 ENABLING MOTION FOR THE REVISION OF GREEN PARTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE POLICY (FAST TRACKED)

5071 Points

Rupert George, Adam Harper, Alastair Binnie-Lubbock, Alexander J Armitage, Caroline Russell, Chris A Williams, Dave Plummer, David Wild, Joshua Alston, Julyan Levy, Liam McClelland, Paul Urwin, Samir Jeraj, Scott Ainslie, Steve Caudwell, Tom Franklin, Tyrone Scott, Vix Lowthion, Zoë Garbett.*

Synopsis

Green Party policy on criminal justice is out of date and needs a wholesale update to bring it in line with new evidence and developments that have taken place since it was last amended 12 years ago.

Motion

Conference instructs Policy Development Committee to facilitate policy development via the Criminal Justice Policy Working Group, with a view to bringing a Draft Voting Paper and Voting Paper to future conferences and to amending the Criminal Justice chapter of PSS.

E10 NUCLEAR POWER

4571 Points

Malcolm Bailey, Alan Wheatley, Andrea Carey Fuller, Danny McNamara, Jay Ginn, Jim McGinley, , Martin Francis, Michael Vince, Nicole Haydock, Noel Lynch, Paul Philo, Peter Murry, Richard Wyatt, Roy Sandison, Susan Tibbles.*

Synopsis

No synopsis supplied

Motion

Insert into RoPS

That given the confirmation by EDF Energy of escalating building costs for Hinkley Point C nuclear power plant of up to an additional £2.9 bn, in September 2019, with increasing risks of further delays and higher costs, whilst the costs of renewable energy continue to fall, the Green Party requests the government to abandon the Hinkley Point nuclear project and plans for the follow-up Sizewell C nuclear project, including the regulated asset-based model, and any further development of the hazardous and expensive nuclear power programme, and to implement the phased shut-down of all existing nuclear power.

AMENDMENT 1

Liz Carlton, Steve Betteridge, David Flint, Emma Randall, Diana Newsom, Daniel Wimberley, Richard McCarthy.

After "Sizewell C" insert: "and Bradwell B".

AMENDMENT 2

Sam Alston, David Wild, Peter Brommer, David Flint, Richard McCarthy.

Delete:

" , including the regulated asset-based model,"

So that it reads:

That given the confirmation by EDF Energy of escalating building costs for Hinkley Point C nuclear power plant of up to an additional £2.9 bn, in September 2019, with increasing risks of further delays and higher costs, whilst the costs of renewable energy continue to fall, the Green Party requests the government to abandon the Hinkley Point nuclear project and plans for the follow-up Sizewell C nuclear project and any further development of the hazardous and expensive nuclear power programme, and to implement the phased shut-down of all existing nuclear power.

E11 HIGH SPEED 2 (HS2)

4542 Points

Rob Bryher, Alexander Sallons, Andrew Wight, Anna Bryher, Dave Plummer, David O'Keefe, Jennifer Bartle, JJ Wilkinson, Mark Rutherford, Martin Farley, Matt Edwards, Paris Hayes, Tamara Evans Braun, Tristan Gray*

Synopsis

Our opposition to HS2 has been controversial within internal party debates. This motion simply aims to complete that debate by make a final decision on whether we will support or oppose HS2.

Motion

In Policies for a Sustainable Society

Delete TR244:

TR244 The Green Party believes that long–distance service provision should not concentrate on high speeds where this will affect local service provision or take up an excessive amount of limited resources. The Green Party supports the principle of a new north–south high speed line which would reduce the number of short–haul flights within the UK.

Insert new

TR244: The Green Party supports the principle of a new north–south high speed line, commonly known as High Speed 2 (HS2), which would reduce the number of short–haul flights within the UK.

E12

STRENGTHENING THE REGULATION OF ELECTION SPENDING

4293 Points

Brig Oubridge, Alan Francis, Alastair Binnie-Lubbock, Alex Raws, Britta Goodman, Caroline New, Ewan Jones, Linda Oubridge, Mary Franklin, Natalie Bennett, Oliver Dowding, Peter Matthews, Piers Mobsby, Richard Bolton, Ricky Knight, Steve Lambert, Steve Muggeridge, Sue Wright, Teresa Fallon*

Synopsis

Our current PSS policy section Public Administration & Government has a section on political party funding, although this makes no reference to donations from companies, but has no detailed policy in regard to limiting election spending in general, nor in regard to spending on targeted social media advertising. These are further large gaps in our policy which urgently need filling.

Motion

Re–number clause PA352 as PA360 and re–number subsequent clauses PA353 and PA354 as PA352 and PA353 respectively.

Insert new clause PA354 as follows:

PA354. Political party donations by companies are undemocratic, as they do not require specific approval by shareholders and provide no opportunity for individual shareholders to opt out. They also provide loopholes for the evasion of any limits on individual donations and for disguising the true source of donations. Limited companies will therefore not be permitted to make donations to political parties.

After clause PA354, insert new section heading “Election Spending” and insert re–numbered clause PA360 (previously

PA352).

PA360. Stricter limits on campaign spending for elections will be introduced. These will be calculated to reflect the amounts candidates need to get their message out to electors, without giving a large advantage to those with more funding.

Insert new clauses PA361 to PA369 as follows:

PA361. Current limits on spending on campaigns within individual constituencies, divisions and wards are sufficiently generous, and will be held at their present levels.

PA362. Current limits on what is termed “national” spending by political parties are unnecessarily high, and give an undue advantage to those who can spend the most. Moreover, the present system is regularly abused by the larger parties to classify as “national” spending money which should properly be considered as part of local campaigns, and thus to evade and exceed local spending limits. The Green Party would seek to impose a lower limit on so–called “national” spending, together with stricter controls on what may be considered “national” rather than “local” spending.

PA363. The use of billboard poster advertising should no longer be classified as “national” spending, but should be accounted as local spending in whichever constituency, division or ward each billboard is situated, whether or not the name of any individual candidate is shown.

PA364. Visits by party leaders or other high profile party figures, and the full costs of such visits, including the costs of ‘battle buses’ or other transport and of support staff, should also be considered as a local campaign expense in each area visited.

PA365. The largest growth area of so–called national spending in recent elections has been that of targeted advertising on facebook and other social media internet platforms. The Green Party agrees with the resolution of the European Parliament of 25th October 2018, that such targeted advertising should not be permitted during election periods, and the purchasing or obtaining of data for such purposes by political parties should likewise be prohibited.

PA366. If targeted internet advertising is allowed at all, target data for political advertisements should be limited to postcodes only, and since it is targeted at individual voters, it should be considered as a local campaign expense in the area of each such targeted voter and accounted accordingly. Legislation should require that such political ads (whether produced by political parties or by other non–party organisations or individuals) must include a digital imprint allowing the recipient to click the imprint and receive information about the source of the ad, and why they are seeing it. This information will include details about why the individual was targeted for this particular ad, what variants of the ad look like, and who paid for the ad’s production and publication.

PA367. Clauses PA365 and PA366 above apply only to paid advertising which is targeted at individual voters using algorithmic selection criteria, and would not apply to social

media posts or emails sent by national political parties to their members or supporters or to others who have registered with those parties to receive such posts, nor to the retransmission of such posts by individuals to other members of their own social networks.

PA368. The following will remain as allowable national expenditure: the costs of maintaining and staffing national and regional party offices (except in regard to any staff who are allocated or seconded to specific local campaigns); production of party political broadcasts; national newspaper advertising; producing and distributing national party manifestos; costs of national press conferences; producing and maintaining national party websites and those posts allowed under clause PA367 above; and transport costs associated with getting party leaders or other high profile party figures to studios for national TV or radio appearances, debates or interviews.

PA369. The Electoral Commission will have responsibility for enforcing these rules, and will be provided with additional staff and funding to enable it to do so. It will have a duty to audit national spending by political parties, and will be able to impose unlimited fines proportionate to the amount of any overspending which it uncovers.

E13 ENABLING MOTION FOR THE SECURITY PEACE AND DEFENCE CHAPTER (FAST TRACKED)

4220 Points

Rebecca Johnson, Adam Harper, Carl Benfield, Daniel Goldsmith, David Webb, David Wild, Gregory Lupton, Kemal Cufoglu, Mariette Labelle, Mike Longman, , Rebecca Warren, TJ Milburn, Tom Franklin, Vix Lowthion.*

Synopsis

Update and rewrite the entire chapter on Security, Peace and Defence in the Policies for a Sustainable Society (PSS).

Motion

The Security, Peace and Defence (SP&D) chapter has not been reviewed in full since 1990 and is out of date in many ways. This enabling motion is proposing that the SP&D policy working group will undertake a full review of current and future security challenges arising from the climate emergency, geostrategic shifts, military and peace-related developments, in order to equip Green Party of England and Wales (GPEW) with sustainable and effective principles and policies on international security, peace and defence for the future.

We will draw from Green New Deal principles and rethinking on security, peace and defence, as well as the more updated manifestos from 2015 onwards and recent motions passed by Conference such as de-carbonising the military (2019).

Research and information will be drawn from relevant international and local organisations and sources as well as Green thinking around the world.

Associated policy working groups within the GPEW will be

consulted as required. The aim is to bring a coherent, updated PSS Chapter for consideration and adoption by Conference.

E14 FUTURE REFERENDA

3651 Points

Brig Oubridge*, Alan Francis, Alex Raws, Britta Goodman, Jean Lambert, Peter Matthews, Piers Mobsby, Richard Bolton, Ricky Knight, Steve Lambert, Steve Muggerridge, Sue Wright, Teresa Fallon

Synopsis

The 2016 EU Referendum (the “Brexit Referendum”) was in many regards a flawed process, leading to an uncertain and highly disputed and divisive outcome. These proposals are intended to ensure that such flaws do not attend future referenda.

Motion

In the Public Administration & Government section of PSS, insert a new section headed “Regulation of Referenda”, renumbering subsequent clauses as necessary.

PA370. The Green Party would introduce legislation to ensure that any future referenda are fair and transparent in their conduct, and clear in their outcomes and effect.

PA371. Every referendum shall be clearly defined as either Confirmatory or Advisory. A Confirmatory Referendum is one in which the public is asked to confirm, or to reject, a pre-existing treaty or piece of legislation which has already been approved by Parliament with the proviso that it must be approved by a referendum, and which will directly and automatically come into effect once that approval has been secured. An Advisory Referendum shall be any referendum which does not involve such a pre-existing treaty or legislation.

PA372. A Confirmatory Referendum shall be immediate and binding in its consequences. An Advisory Referendum shall be for the guidance of Parliament, but its consequences, if any, shall be determined by Parliament: it cannot be binding, because Members of Parliament cannot be compelled to vote or not to vote in any particular way. However, an Advisory referendum will be influential among politicians, who are accountable to the electorate at subsequent elections. Where legislation is passed resulting from an Advisory Referendum it may, or may not, be appropriate for this to be subject to a Confirmatory Referendum, depending on the gravity of the matter under consideration, the extent of the majority in the original Advisory Referendum, and the judgement of legislators.

PA373. The powers of the Electoral Commission shall be increased, allowing it to impose a higher level of fines, and to rule any referendum to be invalid if the degree of malpractice was such that it may have had a decisive effect on the outcome. The use of paid social media in elections and referenda shall be regulated by law. It is difficult to legislate for truth in political campaigning, as much of it is opinion rather than fact, what is self-evidently true to one person can seem

to be an obvious lie to another, and any kind of prediction is inherently subject to inaccuracy. However, the deliberate publication of material which is demonstrably factually false or inaccurate in order to influence the result of a referendum or election should become an offence.

PA374. The Green Party will make it easier for anyone who feels that they have been deprived of their lawful right to vote in an election or referendum to complain to the Electoral Commission. The Electoral Commission shall rule on such complaints, and shall consider the volume of such complaints as a material factor in determining whether an election or referendum result is valid. They will also be empowered to impose proportionate fines on any person or authority found to be responsible for such occurrences. We oppose the introduction of regulations requiring voters to produce acceptable proof of identity when voting.

PA375. Although some countries require more than a simple majority for a referendum to pass, and there is also the precedent of the 1979 devolution referenda in Scotland and Wales requiring a simple majority also to comprise over 40% of the registered electorate, we believe that the clear differentiation between Confirmatory and Advisory Referenda, together with the other measures above, makes such requirements unnecessary.

E15 REMOVING A STATEMENT ON DENTAL HEALTH

3379 Points

Rosemary Sexton, Anna Bryher, Benedict Allbrooke, Carla Denyer, Hannah Clare, Jennifer Bartle, JJ Wilkinson, Jon Eccles, Lee Irving, Lou Goodger, Marie Robson, Martin Osborne, Matt Stratford, Nannette Youssef, Nick Hartley, Pau Jimenez Ingles, Robbie Mack, Ruth Brandt, Sam Alston, Sean Buchan, Steve Caudwell, Tamara Evans Braun, Tom Hathway.*

Synopsis

Our current policy opposing water fluoridation contains some outdated statements. This motion would remove that policy, on the basis that the desired outcome of the policy (ensuring ‘consumer choice’) is already covered by the wider-reaching health policy HE203 and by Core Value 7 (‘decisions taken at lowest practical level’).

Motion

Delete HE1103

HE1103 currently states –

HE1103 The Green Party is opposed to the artificial mass fluoridation of drinking water which is being promoted by the Government. There is conflicting evidence on the benefits to dental health of this practice and major concerns on the cumulative negative wider health effects of total ingestion levels of fluoride. There are further concerns on the links with the chemical industry that supplies artificial fluoride and the

compulsory nature of its addition to drinking water that denies consumers choice.

E16 REAFFIRM SUPPORT FOR BDS AND OPPOSE A KEY IHRA EXAMPLE

2998 Points

Les Levidow, Andrea Carey Fuller, Anne Gray, David Beasley, James Dickins, Jay Ginn, Jim McGinley, Joyce Barnett, Lois Davis, Martin Francis, Mehmood Naqshbandi, Nicole Haydock, Paul Philo, Robbie Spence, Simon Hales, Tom Killick.*

Synopsis

The Green Party reaffirms its long-standing support for the BDS campaign, which aims to end international support for Israel's regime of settler colonialism and apartheid. On those grounds, the phrase ‘apartheid Israel’ is anti-racist – not antisemitic, as falsely implied by an example in the IHRA Working Definition of Antisemitism.

Motion

Insert into RoPS:

1. The Green Party reaffirms its commitment to promote active participation in the Palestinian-led campaign for Boycott Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) against Israel and companies complicit in Israel's illegal occupation of Palestinian territories. We further endorse the BDS campaign's peaceful aim: ‘to pressure Israel to comply with international law and to end international support for Israel's regime of settler colonialism and apartheid’
2. For several years the UK government has attempted to prohibit public bodies from boycotting Israel and companies complicit in its violations of international law. It now plans new legislation for this purpose, as well as for a reverse boycott: to prohibit local authorities from contracting with companies that divest from Israel. We will work with other groups to oppose such government restrictions on organisations exercising their democratic right and ethical responsibility.
3. On the website of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), a Working Definition of Antisemitism includes several examples, e.g. ‘Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour’. This contentious example has been deployed for false accusations of antisemitism against the BDS campaign and its key phrase ‘apartheid Israel’, especially to deny venues for public events or to restrict speakers. The Green Party asserts that the BDS campaign's aims are anti-racist and rejects the above example of supposed antisemitism.

E17 ENSURING THAT SEX AND GENDER ARE NOT CONFLATED.

2913 Points

Emma Bateman, Alexandra Geddis, Alison Simmons, Alison Whalley, Alix Goldring, Andrea Carey Fuller, Andrea Paterson, Bernadette O'Malley, Brian Morris, Carina Moravec, Charlotte Godber, Christine Hickey, Clare Kerr, Clare Palmer, David Dwyer, Diane Green, Diane Wood, Rebecca Stanton, Eleanor Crawley, Janet Wright, Jo Pennington, Karen Kruzycza, Kate Driskell, Katherine Lysons, Kelly O'Brien, Kelly Richardson, Lina Numan, Louisa Gladwin, Marie Robson, Mariette Labelle, Niamh Mac Mahon, Nicola Builder, Nicola Watson, Peter Barnett, Peter Garbutt, Pippa Banham, Robbie Spence, Sonia Davies, Stewart Gibb, Taymar Pitman.*

Synopsis

Sex refers to biology which is immutable, gender is a social construction

Discrimination against women may be based on their perceived sex, however there are aspects of discrimination females face based on sex rather than gender.

To address discrimination it is imperative that accurate sex-segregated data is [Excessive length, cut by SOC].

Motion

Insert into RR540

Women's Rights

The Green Party calls for a review of the language used in law, in government bodies and NGOs to ensure that sex and gender are not conflated, and that accurate terminology is used where relevant which recognises that the category 'woman', which was formerly a sex based category, is now, by some parties, considered to be gender based.

When data is being collected and analysed to form policy in relation to women, regard should be paid as to whether the data is segregated by sex or by gender, and sex segregated data must be collected in order to monitor the effect of the alteration in the categorisation of women is having on women.

E18 RIGHTS OF TRANSGENDER, NON-BINARY AND AGENDER PEOPLE

2842 Points

Daniel James, Alison Whalley, Brian Morris, Caroline Wild, Christine Hickey, Clare Kerr, David Dwyer, Diane Wood, Rebecca Stanton, Ed Saul, Eleanor Crawley, Emma Bateman, Janet Wright, Janine Pyke, Jessica Goldfinch, Jo Pennington, Katherine Lysons, Kelly Richardson, Lina Numan, Linda Oubridge, Marie Robson, Mariette Labelle, Martha James, Nicola Builder, Peter Barnett, Peter Garbutt, Sonia Davies, Stewart Gibb, Susan Jones, Taymar Pitman.*

Synopsis

This revision emphasises the Green Party's support for transgender and non-binary rights, adds a mention of agender

rights, and removes divisive statements that distract us from these rights. It also removes some internal contradictions, and claims about existence and reality which are outside the scope of rights policy.

Motion

Delete current RR530:

The Green Party recognises that there are many gender identities that are within, and outside of, the traditional gender binary of man and woman. The Green Party recognises that trans men are men, trans women are women, and that non-binary identities exist and are valid. We shall respect transgender and non-binary people's identities as real. The Green Party shall include, and push for further acceptance of, transgender and non-binary people within all areas of society.

and replace with:

RR530 The Green Party recognises that there are many gender identities other than the binary of exclusively masculine or exclusively feminine. The Green Party recognises that transgender men, transgender women, non-binary and agender people have the same inherent rights as other people. We shall respect transgender and gender non-conforming identities. The Green Party shall include, and promote further acceptance of, transgender and gender non-conforming people within our society.

E19 DIRECTLY ELECTED INDIVIDUAL POSITIONS

2809 Points

Brig Oubridge, Alan Francis, Alex Raws, Britta Goodman, Caroline New, Ewan Jones, Jean Lambert, Linda Oubridge, Peter Matthews, Piers Mobsby, Richard Bolton, Ricky Knight, Steve Lambert, Steve Muggerridge, Sue Wright, Teresa Fallon.*

Synopsis

Our current PSS policy section Public Administration & Government has no policy in regard to directly elected mayors or Police and Crime Commissioners. This is a gap which urgently needs remedying, and the new clauses below are designed to fill that void. (This motion was previously submitted to the cancelled Brighton Conference, Spring 2020.)

Motion

In section headed "Local Government Structure", re-number existing clauses PA355–361 as PA370–376. Insert new clauses PA377 – PA381 as follows:

PA377. Directly elected individual positions.

Electing a single individual to a position of power, as with Metropolitan mayors and Police and Crime Commissioners, puts sole power in the hands of one person representing his or her own viewpoint or that of a single political party. This is at best democratically suspect, especially where that position is not subject to wider and representative accountability: the Green Party believes it is neither appropriate nor in keeping with other Green Party policy. However, while these posts

continue to exist, the Green Party will continue to stand candidates for them whilst also arguing and working for their abolition or reform. Furthermore, we believe that the present £5000 deposits required for these elections are an unnecessary and unreasonable barrier to democratic participation, and should be replaced by a requirement for an increased number of nominating signatures.

PA378. Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) were created by the 2010–15 coalition government without any democratic mandate and without consultation, and replaced the previous Police Committees composed of elected councillors from a representative range of parties. These posts have not gained public support and acceptance, as is evident from the extremely low turnout in PCC elections, and are not accountable to anyone between elections. The Green Party would incorporate local referendums in a future round of voting for these posts, allowing the electors of each Police Authority area to decide whether that post should continue, or be abolished with a reversion to the previous system.

PA379. The London mayor is accountable to the London Assembly, which is elected by a system of proportional representation. This is acceptable in principle, although the level of accountability could be improved.

PA380. Metropolitan mayors in other areas such as Greater Manchester, West Midlands etc. do not have equivalent regional assemblies to hold them to account. The Green Party would replace these by powerful regional assemblies elected by proportional representation on a similar model to that used for Scottish Parliamentary elections. (See PA410 below)

PA381. Directly elected local authority mayors exist in some authorities. Some of these were installed following local referendums, but the legislation was later changed to allow these to be imposed by a majority vote of local councillors. Most local authorities have not taken up this option, and the Green Party would legislate to remove it, and to require local referendums in those places which have adopted this system to determine whether or not it should continue.

In CJ315, after “Police forces supervised by and accountable to elected local government.” insert “Accordingly, the Green Party would incorporate in a future round of elections for the posts of Police & Crime Commissioners a referendum giving the population of each Police Authority area the option of abolishing this post and reverting to the previous system of Police Committees comprising a representative range of local councillors. (See PA363)”

Delete existing clause PA410

PA410 Any such region should be able to decide, via a referendum of the citizens living within it, to create a directly elected regional assembly as an additional tier of government.

Replace with new PA410 as follows:

PA410. As noted in PA365 above, the Green Party would replace directly elected Metropolitan mayors by Regional Assemblies which would be directly elected by proportional

representation. In some Regions, these Assemblies would include a larger area than present mayoralties (e.g. the North East, rather than Sunderland). These changes would be subject to a confirmatory referendum of the electors in each Region. Any other such region within England should also be able to decide, via a referendum of the citizens living within it, to create a directly elected regional assembly as an additional tier of government.

E20 PROTECTING TRANS CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

2558 Points

Robbie Spence, Alison Whalley, Alex Goldring, Andrea Paterson, Brian Morris, Caroline Wild, Christine Hickey, Clare Kerr, Clare Palmer, David Beasley, David Dwyer, Diane Wood, Rebecca Stanton, Eleanor Crawley, Emma Bateman, Georgia Berini, Janet Wright, Jo Campbell, Jo Pennington, Karen Kruzycka, Katherine Lysons, Kelly Richardson, Lina Numan, Louisa Gladwin, Marcus Grant, Margaret Adams, Marie Robson, Nicola Builder, Peter Barnett, Sonia Davies, Stewart Gibb, Taymar Pitman.*

Synopsis

Policy Motion to amend Green Party policy RR405 to protect the trans-identified child and to amend RR532 and RR533 to cross-reference them to the overriding amendment to RR405.

Enabling Motion to develop detailed policy to protect the trans-identified child from powerful medico-pharmaceutical corporations that seek to profit from them.

Motion

A. Amend PSS paragraphs in the following ways.

INSERT at the end of “RR405 The Green Party will seek the incorporation into law of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.”

“The Green Party will take measures to protect the trans-identified child from physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation. Such protective measures should, as appropriate, include effective procedures for the establishment of social programmes to provide necessary support for the trans-identified child and for those who have the care of the trans-identified child.”

INSERT a new phrase, “Subject to the overriding need to protect the trans-identified child, as set out at RR405,” at the beginning of RR532 and RR533 to cross-reference them to the overriding amendment to RR405, so that the new wording of RR532 and RR533 will read as follows:

“RR532 Subject to the overriding need to protect the trans-identified child, as set out at RR405, the process of transitioning through the NHS should empower rather than demean trans people. Gender Identity Clinics should consult service users on how to better recognise trans people’s own expertise and experience in service provision.”

“RR533 Subject to the overriding need to protect the trans-

identified child, as set out at RR405, the NHS should better recognise the increasing need for Gender Identity Clinics and increase service provision, across the country.”

[A section of this motion was ruled out of order and can be found in the “Out of Order” Section of the Agenda.]

[SOC has moved a significant amount of background information out of the motion to a background paper for this motion.]

AMENDMENT 1

Kathryn Bristow, Katherine Gilchrist, Stefan Liberadzki, Susie O’Connor, Carla Denyer, George Morris, Sean Mulcahy, Peter Price, Joe Lever, Valerie Remy, Jim Stuart.

Delete wherever it appears, “the trans–identified child” and replace with “trans people under the age of 18.”

Delete “effective procedures for the establishment of social programmes to provide necessary support” and replace with “sufficient resources to ensure that the Gender Identity Development Service can provide the necessary support”

Delete everything from: INSERT a new phrase, “Subject to the overriding need to protect the trans–identified child, as set out at RR405,” to the end.

So the motion reads as follows:

Amend PSS paragraphs in the following ways.

INSERT at the end of “RR405 The Green Party will seek the incorporation into law of the

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.”

“The Green Party will take measures to protect trans people under the age of 18 from physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation. Such protective measures should, as appropriate, include sufficient resources to ensure that the Gender Identity Development Service can provide the necessary support for trans people under the age of 18 and for those who have the care of trans people under the age of 18.”

E21

ABOLISH THE OFFICE FOR STUDENTS

2451 Points

Emma Carter, Amelia Womack, Anne Hamdache, Benedict Allbrooke, Evie Rouxel, George Morris, Hannah Clare, Harry Rouxel, Joe Levy, Joshua Alston, Laurie Needham, Mae Rouxel, Mat Wise, Nannette Youssef, Robert Nixon, Rosie Rawle, Rustam Majainah, Sam Murray, Sam Riches*

Synopsis

Since the creation of the Office for Students (OfS), it has been a regulator opposed to the best that students, universities, and Higher Education have to offer. The approach taken has been onerous on institutions, and designed to benefit older

elite universities at the expense of local institutions who deliver excellent education.

Motion

In the Education Chapter of Policies for a Sustainable Society.

Insert and renumber accordingly: ED259 A Green Government would repeal the 2017 Higher Education Act and abolish the Office for Students. This would be replaced by a collaborative, collegiate approach to regulation of the sector, independent of the government, which focuses on delivering quality education across the sector.

OUT OF ORDER MOTIONS

0001

THROUGH TRAFFIC IN URBAN CENTRES

Rob Bryher, Andy Hunter-Rossall, Anna Bryher, Ashley Knox, Carol Thornton, Conor Ritchie, Dan Thomas, Daniel Johnston, Dominic Tristram, JJ Wilkinson, Matt Edwards, Simeon Jackson, Steve Miller, Tristan Gray*

SOC ruled this motion out of order on the basis that it is vague (Section D paragraph 8, part d of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because disability and business access is not through traffic, and as such, the position taken by the motion is vague.

Synopsis

Too many of our towns and cities allow cars to drive directly through the centre of them. This motion updates our policy to include prohibition of through-traffic in urban centres.

Motion

Insert at the end of LP604:

i) Prohibit through-traffic (except disability and business access) in urban centres to encourage footfall and increase revenues for local businesses

0002

INTRODUCE WEALTH TAX TO FUND THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY FROM COVID19

Molly Scott Cato, Anthony Slaughter, Catherine Braun, Catherine Rowett, Chris Evans, Chris McFarling, Eleanor Combley, Ewan Jones, Jenny Vernon, Lynn Haanen, Natalie Bennett, Steve Hynd, Tim Davies*

SOC ruled this motion out of order on the basis that it seeks to significantly amend the principles passed in a policy motion or Voting Paper less than one year and nine months previously, (Section D paragraph 8, part h of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because the Economy chapter of PfSS was revised in June 2019, where the principle of a wealth tax was removed from PfSS.

Synopsis

synopsis supplied

Motion

The Green Party supports a wealth tax on households above a certain level of wealth. The nature of the tax would be determined based on consultation with relevant stakeholders to arrive at the rate of tax and the level of wealth that would incur taxation. To ensure that the tax is effective, as well as to

support other national financial goals, the party supports use capital controls in order to prevent capital flight.

Conference instructs GPEX to assemble the expertise necessary to further develop this proposal and ensure that the party is able to make a coherent case both for a wealth tax and capital controls.

0003

CHANGES TO LOCAL PLANNING AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND HOUSING POLICIES

Maria Smith, Adam Harper, Alexander J Armitage, Daniel Wimberley, David Flint, Georgia Taylor, James Firkins, Jenny Vernon, Jonathan Essex, Liz Reason, Pamela Harling, Pete Elliott, Peter Sims, Phil Horton, Sian Berry, Tom Chance, Tony Firkins, Tyrone Scott*

SOC ruled this motion out of order on the basis that it seeks to substantially change policy areas or having complex implications for other areas, without having passed through the agreed process of consultation (Section D paragraph 8, part h of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because the volume of proposed changes across two separate chapters of PfSS are enough to be considered a voting paper in and of themselves and there is a specific process for making wholesale changes to policy chapters of this nature, namely the voting paper process.

Synopsis

Policies to enable the dramatic reduction of carbon emissions associated with buildings and construction in order to meet our target of net zero carbon by 2030 (policy CC015). Proposals include a mechanism for meeting national carbon and energy budgets through national, bioregional and local planning, and improved building standards.

Motion

Changes to the Local Planning and Built Environment Chapter of PSS.

LP101 currently reads

“LP101 However, the half century following the introduction of the Town and Country Planning Act 1947 has seen three policy failures. First, unsustainable patterns of development have prevailed, though less than if there were no planning controls at all. Of particular concern has been the development of prime agricultural farmland and important natural habitats, low density suburban sprawl that makes sustainable lifestyles difficult, and energy-inefficient buildings. Second, in some parts of the country the permitted use of land for housing has

not kept up with the growing population, contributing to rising housing costs, and in turn to more overcrowding, a greater reliance on housing benefit, and fewer households being able to live near their place of work or their family. Third, and partly as a consequence of flawed national economic and industrial policies, in some parts of the country the permitted use of land for diverse and sustainable employment uses has been eroded by conversions to other uses.”

Delete “in some parts of the country the permitted use of land for housing has not kept up with the growing population, contributing to” and “and in turn to more” so that it reads:

“LP101 However, the half century following the introduction of the Town and Country Planning Act 1947 has seen three policy failures. First, unsustainable patterns of development have prevailed, though less than if there were no planning controls at all. Of particular concern has been the development of prime agricultural farmland and important natural habitats, low density suburban sprawl that makes sustainable lifestyles difficult, and energy–inefficient buildings. Second, rising housing costs, overcrowding, a greater reliance on housing benefit, and fewer households being able to live near their place of work or their family. Third, and partly as a consequence of flawed national economic and industrial policies, in some parts of the country the permitted use of land for diverse and sustainable employment uses has been eroded by conversions to other uses.”

Insert LP150 to LP159 with title “Principles”

“LP150 National, regional and local planning policy should articulate a vision that enables all people to realise their potential and improve their quality of life in ways which simultaneously protect and enhance the earth’s life support systems and other species’ habitats.

LP151 A revised National Policy Planning Framework, with social and environmental justice at its heart should be brought forward at the earliest opportunity. This NPPF will include (but not be limited to) energy plans, carbon budgets for buildings and construction, strategies for the equitable provision of housing for all, the retrofit of the majority of our existing built environment in order to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions associated with buildings, sustainable transport, and policies to seek to prevent the property and construction industries from driving inequality or unsustainable resource use. The national policy will set carbon and energy budgets for each bioregion.

LP152 Bioregional strategies will be reinstated to include regional energy plans and carbon budgets, regional infrastructure strategies, housing provision targets, and policies specific to each region. These strategies will be created with regards to achievable operational and embodied carbon and energy minimum standards as set out in National Building Standards (currently National Building Regulations). Bioregional strategies will be co–produced with the community to which they apply. The bioregional strategies will set carbon and energy budgets for each local authority.

LP153 Local Plans will be co–produced by local authorities

and local communities to give form to national and regional policies. Local Plans will be created with regards to achievable operational and embodied carbon and energy minimum standards as set out in National Building Standards. Local authorities will have an active role in identifying buildings and land for refurbishment and new build developments as well as different uses including material depots to enable a circular economy, providing infrastructure and drawing up the spatial plans for development.

LP154 The Green Party recognises that the built environment is a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions and that substantial changes are required to bring the sector in line with planetary limits.

LP155 The construction industry has the technical solutions necessary to realise a decarbonised built environment but requires an economic and legislative context to require it to do so.

LP156 Greenhouse gas emissions attributable to the built environment can be dramatically reduced with an extensive retrofit programme to upgrade cold, draughty, energy–wasteful buildings.

LP157 The demolition and replacement of new buildings should only occur as a last resort if the refurbishment, modification and/or retrofit of existing buildings is impossible.

LP158 The Green Party recognises that the construction industry must become circular in terms of use of resources if it is to be sustainable within planetary limits.

LP159 Local and regional authorities would be adequately resourced in order to produce, manage, and enforce robust budgets and strategies.”

LP201 currently reads:

“LP201 To provide housing that is suitable for and affordable by local people as well as the land, infrastructure and facilities for work, social and cultural activities as required by the community.”

Add “education, healthcare” so that it reads:

“LP201 To provide housing that is suitable for and affordable by local people as well as the land, infrastructure and facilities for work, education, healthcare, social and cultural activities as required by the community.”

LP203 currently reads:

“LP203 To minimise the impact of human development on other species, and to nurture a network of resilient habitats to reverse declining biodiversity.”

Replace “minimise the impact of” with “reverse the harm caused by”:

“LP203 To reverse the harm caused by human development on other species, and to nurture a network of resilient habitats to reverse declining biodiversity.”

Delete LP204.

LP301 currently reads:

“LP301 To improve the permitted use of land to meet local needs such as housing without prejudicing long-term aims.”

Add “and local manufacturing and production” so that it reads

“LP301 To improve the permitted use of land to meet local needs such as housing and local manufacturing and production, without prejudicing long-term aims.

Delete LP302 which reads:

LP302 To re-introduce conservation practices in the design and construction and use of buildings. This should result in buildings which are durable, energy efficient, and adaptable for more than one specific purpose.”

Replace with:

“LP302 To re-introduce conservation practices in the design and construction and use of buildings. This should result in buildings which make maximum use of existing built fabric and structure (including foundations, superstructure, buildings in situ and reclaimed built fabric), and are built from low embodied carbon materials, designed to circular economy principles, and at least zero carbon in use.”

Insert LP305 and LP306

“LP305 Short term actions to strengthen planning authorities’ ability to bring the built environment within planetary limits include:

- a) Creating Neighbourhood Plans with climate justice at their heart and having them approved through local referendums to give them the status of local plans and in order to access funding eg Community Infrastructure Levy
- b) Create Supplementary planning documents (SPDs) and/or Development plan documents (DPDs) to supplement existing local plans that recognise the climate emergency and empower the planning authority to consider planning applications in the context of a climate emergency.

LP306 To keep the environmental impact of construction activity and of the built environment within planetary boundaries.”

Delete LP400.

LP401 currently reads:

“LP401 In practice, given the current unequal distribution of land, property and power, achieving LP400 will inevitably mean that some with excessive wealth and power will lose out. Planning policy should seek to resolve these conflicts in the interests of greater equality.”

In LP401 replace “LP400” with “LP150 onwards” so that it reads:

“LP401 In practice, given the current unequal distribution of land, property and power, achieving LP150 onwards will inevitably mean that some with excessive wealth and power will lose out. Planning policy should seek to resolve these conflicts in the interests of greater equality.”

Delete LP402 to 403 which read:

“LP402 While the Green Party aims to reduce the need for growth in the economy and the population, there will inevitably be requirements for new infrastructure, housing stock, industrial and commercial land, and social facilities in many local communities. Good planning and design are essential to resolve potential conflicts between social, economic and environmental concerns.

LP403 Sustainable development will be achieved through planning by creating places that facilitate a sustainable low carbon, and eventually zero carbon, circular economy, with actions to mitigate and adapt to the climate emergency, to reduce our ecological footprint to a ‘one planet’ level, and to address more localised problems such as flooding. Local plans should integrate with energy plans.”

Replace with P402 to LP403:

“LP402 While the Green Party aims to escape the need for growth in the economy and the social and environmental damage this growth entails, there will inevitably be requirements for the substantial refurbishment of existing as well as some provision of new infrastructure, housing stock, industrial and commercial assets, and social facilities in many local communities. Good planning and design are essential to resolve potential conflicts between social, economic and environmental concerns.

LP403 A sustainable built environment will be achieved through planning by creating places that facilitate a net zero carbon, circular economy, with actions to mitigate and adapt to the climate emergency, to reduce our ecological footprint to a ‘one planet’ level, and to address more localised problems such as flooding and heat islands. Local plans should integrate with national and bioregional energy plans.

LP404 currently reads:

“LP404 Achieving this requires a recognition that policies addressing all aspects of planning, including construction, housing, energy, transport, food, waste, water, health, the economy and natural habitats, are interconnected. More detailed policies in these areas are set out in other chapters. Local plans and neighbourhood plans (see LP504) should seek to foster Lifetime Neighbourhoods, which offer everyone the best possible chance of health, well-being and social, economic and civic engagement regardless of age. Ensuring this means that communities are empowered, and that local shops, social and community facilities, streets, parks and open spaces, local services, decent homes and public transport are affordable and accessible to everyone now and for future generations.”

Add “and businesses” so that it reads:

“LP404 Achieving this requires a recognition that policies addressing all aspects of planning, including construction, housing, energy, transport, food, waste, water, health, the economy and natural habitats, are interconnected. More detailed policies in these areas are set out in other chapters.

Local plans and neighbourhood plans (see LP504) should seek to foster Lifetime Neighbourhoods, which offer everyone the best possible chance of health, well-being and social, economic and civic engagement regardless of age. Ensuring this means that communities are empowered, and that local shops and businesses, social and community facilities, streets, parks and open spaces, local services, decent homes and public transport are affordable and accessible to everyone now and for future generations.”

LP407 currently reads:

“LP407 The Green Party strongly supports the provision of green belts to contain urban sprawl, to maintain the separation of settlements, to protect prime agricultural land around settlements, to encourage urban regeneration and compact towns and cities, and to complement the ecological and cultural value of other designations listed in LP405. The Green Party would put a greater emphasis on the green belt’s use for wider sustainable development considerations such as flooding, biodiversity, agriculture, energy production and sustainable transport. The local authority role in reviewing and protecting their green belt is set out in LP510.”

Replace “development” with “built environment” with so that it reads:

“LP407 The Green Party strongly supports the provision of green belts to contain urban sprawl, to maintain the separation of settlements, to protect prime agricultural land around settlements, to encourage urban regeneration and compact towns and cities, and to complement the ecological and cultural value of other designations listed in LP405. The Green Party would put a greater emphasis on the green belt’s use for wider sustainable built environment considerations such as flooding, biodiversity, agriculture, energy production and sustainable transport. The local authority role in reviewing and protecting their green belt is set out in LP510.”

LP408 3rd bullet reads:

“• restrict the role of the National Planning Inspectorate to examining local plans for compliance with national policy, abolishing its appeals process;

Replace with:

“• restrict the role of the National Planning Inspectorate to examining local plans for compliance with national policy and alignment to national carbon budgets, abolishing its appeals process;”

Insert LP411 to LP416 as follows:

“LP411 Demolition will be discouraged. Very small scale demolition will be permitted through revisions to permitted development rights, however all other demolition will require a full planning application or inclusion in a Local Development Order. Planning submissions will be required to include a study covering the social, economic and environmental impacts of all demolition work (including partial and full demolition of a building or structure), with reference to the local energy plan and buildings standards, as well as demonstrating how the

demolished fabric will be reused, recycled or disposed of. The disposal of building materials will be subject to limitations as set out in the Green Party’s Natural Resources and Waste Policy (NR). In the case of social or co-operative housing, residents would be given the right to an indicative ballot to be included with a Statement of Community Involvement as part of the planning application.

LP412 Planning use classes should be used to ensure that the built environment meets the needs of the community. The index of classes will be set at national level and may include new use classes such as a use class for holiday homes as per HO401. Bioregional strategies will include quotas for each use class to be determined via citizens assemblies and reviewed every two years.

LP413 All planning applications will be required to submit whole life carbon and energy calculations. These are to include embodied carbon and energy in both the up-front construction and anticipated maintenance, as well as the operational carbon and energy of the building in use. Embodied and operational carbon to be reported separately in kgCO₂e/m² and kgCO₂e/m²/yr respectively. All planning permissions will be granted subject to a pre-commencement condition requiring updated whole life carbon and energy calculations based on construction information.

LP414 Developers who exceed their embodied or regulated (fixed building services and fittings including heating, cooling, hot water, ventilation and lighting) operational carbon budgets significantly without compelling reasons will face sanctions ranging from fines to permanent bans on applying for planning permission.

LP415 All design teams, contractors, suppliers, and others in the built environment supply chain subject to procurement standards (eg if tendering for a contract over a certain size) will be required to demonstrate environmental and social sustainability credentials. Such requirements are to be proportionate so as not to unfairly disadvantage sole traders and SMEs.

LP416 All approved planning applications will be subject to construction being carried out under a rigorous Quality Assurance process and subject to inspection to ensure the building’s energy performance matches design expectations. See section LP900 onwards for Building Standards.”

LP500 currently reads:

“LP500 Local authorities should bring forward Local Plans, setting out a clear spatial vision which gives form to the principles set out in LP401–406; which complies with national policy; which is aspirational but realistic; and which is based on an understanding of the significance of place – what the community values about it and how they would like it to change in the future. Plans should be accompanied by a delivery strategy, setting out the scale and location of anticipated change, the likely sequence of development, and wider changes required to meet the objectives.”

Replace “LP401–406” with “LP150 onwards and LP401–412”

so that it reads:

“LP500 Local authorities should bring forward Local Plans, setting out a clear spatial vision which gives form to the principles set out in LP150 onwards and LP401–412; which complies with national policy; which is aspirational but realistic; and which is based on an understanding of the significance of place – what the community values about it and how they would like it to change in the future. Plans should be accompanied by a delivery strategy, setting out the scale and location of anticipated change, the likely sequence of development, and wider changes required to meet the objectives.”

Delete LP501 which reads:

“LP501 Both the Local Plan and its delivery strategy should be underpinned by a rigorous evidence base. This would include assessment such as the availability of land, the requirements for housing (see HO401–409) and employment, the local ecology and ecosystems services, the historic environment, the landscape, and our changing climate.”

Replace with:

“LP501 Both the Local Plan and its delivery strategy should be underpinned by a rigorous evidence base. This would include assessment such as carbon budgets, the availability of land, the requirements for housing (see HO401–409) and employment, the local ecology and ecosystems services, the historic environment, the landscape, and our changing climate. The Local Plan must stay within the bioregional carbon budget.”

LP502 currently reads:

“LP502 Consultation on local Plans should begin early, and provide opportunities for local stakeholders to engage in a deliberative process to understand the evidence base and the challenges the local area faces; to identify the objectives and priorities for the plan; and to sketch the outline plans for each location. Without this genuine dialogue and co–production, plans are unlikely to arrive at the best solutions and are more likely to meet with opposition from those excluded from the process. The Green Party would ensure that planning departments are adequately resourced for this task. “

Delete sentence “Without this genuine dialogue and co–production, plans are unlikely to arrive at the best solutions and are more likely to meet with opposition from those excluded from the process.”

So that it reads:

“LP502 Consultation on local Plans should begin early, and provide opportunities for local stakeholders to engage in a deliberative process to understand the evidence base and the challenges the local area faces; to identify the objectives and priorities for the plan; and to sketch the outline plans for each location. The Green Party would ensure that planning departments are adequately resourced for this task.”

Delete LP504 which reads:

“LP504 The Green Party supports Neighbourhood Planning. Each local community should be able to express their own vision of a ‘lifetime neighbourhood’, defined as one where the social and physical conditions support a strong and vibrant community. Local planning authorities should seek to empower and support communities to develop their plans, ensuring they align with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area, national policy and legal requirements. Neighbourhood plans, therefore, must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, and local authorities should therefore have a duty to assist communities in engaging in a deliberative process similar to that used in consulting on the Local Plan. Neighbourhood plans and local plans should seek to identify deficiencies in the components of a lifetime neighbourhood, for example areas with little access to open space and nature, and develop plans to address these.”

Replace with:

“LP504 Neighbourhood plans should enable each local community to express their own vision of a ‘lifetime neighbourhood’, defined as one where the social and physical conditions support a strong and vibrant community. Local planning authorities should seek to empower and support communities to develop their plans, ensuring they align with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area, national policy and legal requirements. Neighbourhood plans, therefore, must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, and local authorities should therefore have a duty to assist communities in engaging in a deliberative process similar to that used in consulting on the Local Plan. Neighbourhood plans and local plans should seek to identify deficiencies in the components of a lifetime neighbourhood, for example areas with little access to open space and nature, and develop plans to address these. All neighbourhood plans should seek approval – from the local community in a referendum – so as to attain the same legal status as a local plan and enable local concerns to be enforceable”.

Replace title “Identifying land for development” with “Improvements to the Built Environment”

Delete LP505 which reads:

“LP505 Local planning authorities would be given a duty to bring forward sufficient capacity for new housing, the local economy and infrastructure. This can include land for development, and the potential to intensify existing uses, for example adding further storeys to a block of flats. This provision should meet the need identified in housing strategies (see [HO401–409](#)).”

Replace with:

“LP505 Local planning authorities have a duty to implement their Local Plans within the constraints of the existing built environment and land they oversee, and within carbon budgets set at national and regional levels. This provision should meet the need identified in housing strategies (see [HO401–409](#)).”

Delete LP506 and LP507 which read:

“LP506 As far as possible, the demand for new urban land should be minimised through a combination of demand–reduction policies (see for example [HO401](#)) and through optimising densities. Land value taxation would create incentives to bring forward empty sites for development, and local authorities would be given stronger powers to tackle remaining land hoarding (see [LP516](#)). Any development of present settlements should be confined within the existing boundaries where possible, and where a loss of countryside is deemed necessary it should go on the least sensitive land that is most accessible by public transport, cycling and walking to existing economic and social facilities. The maximum value should also be obtained on land used for development, for example by integrating natural habitats into solar forms or on rooftops.

LP507 Local authorities should make more use of small sites, which are often overlooked or undervalued in the current land availability assessments. Dense infill developments could significantly offset the need to build on larger brownfield and greenfield sites that provide natural habitats.”

Replace with:

“LP506 As far as possible, the demand for new urban land should be minimised through a combination of demand–reduction policies (see for example [HO401](#)) and through optimising densities. Land value taxation would create incentives to bring forward empty brownfield sites for development, and local authorities would be given stronger powers to tackle remaining land hoarding (see [LP516](#)). Any development of present settlements should be confined within the existing boundaries where possible, and where a loss of countryside is deemed necessary it should go on the least sensitive land that is most accessible by public transport, cycling and walking to existing economic and social facilities. The maximum environmental value should also be obtained on land used for development, for example by integrating natural habitats into solar forms or on rooftops.

LP507 Local authorities should make use of existing buildings and small sites, which are often overlooked or undervalued in the current land availability assessments. Retrofitting existing building fabric and creating dense infill developments could significantly offset the need to build on larger brownfield and greenfield sites that provide natural habitats.”

LP510 currently reads:

“LP509 While the policy of ‘brownfield first’ is supposed to consider the environmental value of brownfield sites, too many valuable habitats for other species are identified for development. The Green Party would give wildlife–rich brownfield land greater protection following the approach set out in LP508, and require local authorities to review their local plans to remove high–value sites.”

Replace “remove high–value sites” with “remove sites with high environmental value”

So that it reads:

“LP509 While the policy of ‘brownfield first’ is supposed to consider the environmental value of brownfield sites, too many valuable habitats for other species are identified for development. The Green Party would give wildlife–rich brownfield land greater protection following the approach set out in LP508, and require local authorities to review their local plans to remove sites with high environmental value.”

Delete LP510 which reads:

LP510 Local authorities should review their green belt on a periodic basis where they are failing to achieve sustainable development, for example where they are causing sprawl and commuting beyond their bounds, and where there is scope for more sustainable development on existing green belt sites, for example near transport hubs. Reviews should seek to achieve the policies set out in LP406–407, ensure no net loss in the quantity and quality of green belt land, and should aim to ‘green the greenbelt’.”

Replace with:

“LP510 Local authorities should review their green belt on a periodic basis where they are failing to achieve a sustainable built environment, for example where they are causing sprawl and commuting beyond their bounds, and where there is scope for a more sustainable built environment by building on existing green belt sites, for example near transport hubs. Reviews should seek to achieve the policies set out in LP406–407, ensure no net loss in the quantity and quality of green belt land, and should aim to ‘green the greenbelt’.”

Replace title “Bringing development land forward” with “Bringing development opportunities forward”

Delete LP514 which reads:

“LP514 Local authorities should have an active role in assembling land, providing infrastructure and drawing up the spatial plans for development. Currently they are left in a largely reactive role, giving permission based upon local development frameworks, which has led to a shortage of available land and too many poor quality developments. The Green Party would move towards the ‘custom build’ model more common in countries like the Netherlands and Austria. Under this new model, local authorities should be able to use streamlined compulsory purchase powers to assemble areas with fragmented ownership, and to buy the land at existing use value. We would also support the allocation of more land for self–build. The Green Party would explore how the Land Bank and Community Land Trust models developed in the USA could be used to maximise the benefits from land and property acquisition. Land should be chosen based on its potential to achieve the principles of sustainable development set out in LP400–406.”

Replace with:

“LP514 The Green Party would empower local authorities to use streamlined compulsory purchase powers to assemble areas with fragmented ownership, and to buy the land at existing use value. We would also support the allocation of

more land for self–build. The Green Party would explore how the Land Bank and Community Land Trust models developed in the USA could be used to maximise the benefits from land and property acquisition. ”

LP515 currently reads:

“LP515 Local authorities should then develop detailed plans for each development, provide the social, environmental and transport infrastructure, and promote good standards of design. They would then sell the land in small parcels for development by private, cooperative, charitable or publicly owned companies at a price that at least recovers their costs. Where this isn’t possible, the local authority and national government should assess the social and environmental case for subsidising development.”

Add “to include carbon budgets” so that it reads:

“LP515 Local authorities should then develop detailed plans for each development to include carbon budgets, provide the social, environmental and transport infrastructure, and promote good standards of design. They would then sell the land in small parcels for development by private, cooperative, charitable or publicly owned companies at a price that at least recovers their costs. Where this isn’t possible, the local authority and national government should assess the social and environmental case for subsidising development.”

Delete LP517 which reads:

“LP517 To improve transparency and efficiency in the land market, making it easier for small, community and self–builders to acquire land, the Land Registry (which should be publicly owned) would be required to collect and publish an open registry on land ownership, and open data on land prices by site and hectare. Local authorities would also be required to publish open data on planning permissions with some details of the plans. All other public authorities that collect data on transactions and options agreements would also be required to publish this in an open format. All public authorities considering disposal of land assets would be required to do so transparently, publishing its intention to do so, publishing key financial information after the land has been sold, and exploring options for other public or community bodies to purchase the land (see also H0514).”

Replace with:

“LP517 The Land Registry (which should be publicly owned) would be required to collect and publish an open registry on land ownership, and open data on land prices by site and hectare. Local authorities would also be required to publish open data on planning permissions with some details of the plans. All other public authorities that collect data on transactions and options agreements would also be required to publish this in an open format. All public authorities considering disposal of land assets would be required to do so transparently, publishing its intention to do so, publishing key financial information after the land has been sold, and exploring options for other public or community bodies to purchase the land (see also H0514).”

Insert LP518 and LP519.

“LP518 The Green Party would act to diversify the housebuilding industry. This would be achieved in large part through the parcelling of land into smaller plots (LP515), bringing transparency to the land market (LP517), and retaining public land in public or local community hands rather than selling it to big developers (H0514). We would also work with financial bodies listed in H0606 to improve access to development finance for small and medium sized developers.

LP519 The Green Party would legislate to grant communities in England and Wales equivalent powers to those in Scotland to buy land. This would include rights to first refusal, and to compulsory purchase in cases where existing land uses are causing a detriment to the wellbeing of the local community. The Green Party would also give communities and councils the power to stop landowners sitting on or neglecting land by introducing Compulsory Sale Orders, enabling abandoned land to be brought back into community ownership.”

Delete LP601 and LP602 which read:

“LP601 A wide range of local shops and services within walking distance is essential to a sustainable community. Yet local shops are closing or being replaced with chain–store ‘clones’ and formula retailers every day, and just a few supermarkets dominate the market for groceries. Current government and local government policies are not protecting local shops and markets.

LP602 Retailing is a highly visible part of the business sector with a huge influence on society, local communities and employment. Almost half of UK shops are owned and managed by a sole trader, and many more have fewer than five employees. Retail also provides routes to self employment for groups such as migrants to the UK and ethnic minorities, who are proportionately more likely to start their own businesses. In rural areas, retailing is now the single largest employer.”

LP603 currently reads:

“LP603 Many of the Green Party’s policies on localisation and small enterprises will help local, independent retailers, such as the abolition of VAT (see EC771) and combining National Insurance with Income Tax (see EC721), and some of our policies already seek to control parking in new developments (see TR035). However, some specific planning policies to preserve the viability of local shops and the services provided by these enterprises are also necessary.”

Replace “such as the abolition of VAT” with “These include the reduction of VAT on ecologically sustainable behaviours (eg insulation retrofit)” so that it reads:

“LP603 Many of the Green Party’s policies on localisation and small enterprises will help local, independent retailers. These include the reduction of VAT on ecologically sustainable behaviours (eg insulation retrofit) (see EC770d) and combining National Insurance with Income Tax (see EC721), and some of our policies already seek to control parking in new developments (see TR035). However, some specific planning

policies to preserve the viability of local shops and the services provided by these enterprises are also necessary.”

Delete LP604 g which reads:

“g) prohibit new retail parking in large developments, apart from disabled parking,”

Replace with

“g) prohibit new retail parking in large developments, apart from accessible parking,”

Delete LP700 which reads

“LP700 Our built environment should create a sense of place and community life. Buildings should not obscure or unduly disrupt popular viewpoints from local amenities such as parks or hills, and should be broadly consistent with the height of existing buildings in the local environment. Specific buildings providing a distinctive feature to the locality can be an exception to this.”

Delete LP701 which reads

“LP701 Buildings of special historic interest need to be preserved for future generations. The present regulations and guidance for conservation areas and listed buildings should be maintained and improved to provide incentives for the retention of listed structures, and to protect or enhance the special historical character of conservation areas. Local authorities would be given a statutory duty to provide historic environment records.”

Replace with:

“LP701 Buildings of special historic interest need to be preserved for future generations. The present regulations and guidance for conservation areas and listed buildings should be improved to provide incentives for the retention of listed structures, and to protect or enhance the special historical character of conservation areas, however to also enable mass retrofit which will sometimes require overcladding of buildings and altering the appearance of some buildings within conservation areas. Listed buildings and traditional buildings in conservation areas should be retrofitted in a way which is sensitive to preserving heritage and taking account of their construction. Planning retrofit of traditional buildings should involve professional input prior to works taking place. Traditional building retrofit assessment should be carried out on a case by case basis and avoid damage buildings’ structure and historic features and prevent worsening of moisture, internal environment and air quality issues. Since traditional buildings are considered ‘higher risk’ in terms of retrofit, it is accepted that there may be limits to the potential energy savings realisable. The benefits to future generations in preserving built heritage must be balanced with the prevention of harm to future generations by decarbonising the economy. Local authorities would be given a statutory duty to provide historic environment records.”

LP702 currently reads:

“LP702 Legal sanctions must be stiffened against those

who demolish listed buildings, or who allow them to fall into a state of disrepair. The relevant bodies must make proper use of legislation enabling them to do this and must earmark sufficient resources, financial and staff, to operate it effectively. Interim protections would also be introduced to prevent the demolition of or damage to buildings that are being considered for heritage designation.”

Remove “listed” so that it reads:

“LP702 Legal sanctions must be stiffened against those who demolish buildings, or who allow them to fall into a state of disrepair. The relevant bodies must make proper use of legislation enabling them to do this and must earmark sufficient resources, financial and staff, to operate it effectively. Interim protections would also be introduced to prevent the demolition of or damage to buildings that are being considered for heritage designation.”

Delete LP704 which read:

LP704 It is recognised that blue–rich white light (BRWL) at night is harmful to human health and ecology, due to human and wildlife circadian disruption. Furthermore, it is detrimental to road safety and contributes to undesirable sky glow, due to excessive glare caused by the so–called “Rayleigh Scattering Effect”. Finally, there is a considerable negative aesthetic impact, particularly in areas with heritage lighting. Based on the growing body of scientific research which shows that BRWL is harmful, emissions of short wavelength, blue–rich light should be minimised in all outdoor lighting applications.

For the above reasons, all lighting of streets, roads and other outdoor public places should be of a “Warm White” specification, and ideally have a CCT (Correlated Colour Temperature) of 2700K – but in any event must not exceed a CCT of 3000K. The wavelength, angle and intensity of new or replacement lighting intended to save energy should be tested in situ before a scheme is implemented and be preceded by thorough Health and Environmental Impact Assessments.

Replace with:

“LP704 All lighting of streets, roads and other outdoor public places should be of a “Warm White” specification.”

Insert LP900 to LP905 with title “Building Standards”

“LP900 The Green Party would review the Building Act to ensure that the Act and Building Regulations continue to apply during the first two years of occupation of the building (after the Final Certificate) such that building performance in use can be monitored and wherever possible brought closer in line with the design intention.

LP901 The Green Party would review existing building regulations and codes and introduce new regulations to require:

- a) Retrofit, modification, and refurbishment of existing building fabric is generally preferred to new construction
- b) All habitable space meets high standards of energy and water efficiency and avoids overheating during summer

- months without reliance on energy intensive cooling systems, taking account of projections for our changing climate. Building Regulations will require a fabric first approach for energy compliance using best available methods. Water efficiency standards would also be set for all buildings, taking account of current best practice.
- c) Building standards are to be based on regulated operational energy and water use, not designed figures that may or may not be achieved. Unregulated energy (for example used for cooking, computers, tv etc) should also be included alongside regulated energy (for example for heating, hot water, lighting etc). Building standards will require (as per LP416) quality assurance inspections to take place at intervals during construction.
 - d) The use of carbon-intensive materials must be dramatically reduced from current levels with low-carbon materials such as timber and earth favoured over high-carbon materials such as steel and concrete
 - e) All construction is designed to Circular Economy principles
 - f) That the whole life carbon and energy of all retrofit and new construction is measured, reported, and within targets. Targets will be set to ensure carbon budgets can be met and will be achievable through the use of low-impact materials and reused and recycled built fabric, components and materials.
 - g) Drainage design must take account of the climate emergency, for example in preparing for a 1 in 100 year storm event. Care must be given to ensure that plants such as trees are given adequately sized pits to increase their resilience to the climate emergency.
 - h) All projects shall be required to deliver a structural report to include utilisation ratios of all primary structural members.
 - i) All projects shall be required to submit a design for disassembly strategy to include a methodology for safely accessing connections to enable the disassembly of all beams, columns, floor slabs, external and internal walls.
 - j) The Green Party support the restrictions on the use of combustible materials however these should apply to external wall construction only, to include plasterboard, sheathing boards, insulation, outermost cladding, and significant materials in balconies, brise soleil and similar building elements. The restrictions should not include the buildings primary structure such that the environmental benefits on timber construction (for example the use of cross-laminated timber) are not undermined. The primary structure should have adequate fire protection. The Green Party would fund research into the performance of structural timber when subject to real fire loads to ensure fire safety of timber structures is understood.
 - k) Minimum space standards based on the 'Parker Morris' standards, to improve residents' quality of life, ensure that homes are accessible, and are built to the Lifetime Homes standard so that they are able to accommodate changing personal circumstances and growing families. These standards should enable anyone with a disability to live in any home in Britain.
 - l) Comfort standards addressing ergonomics, sound, privacy

and light, considering that light pollution can be harmful to both humans and biodiversity.

- m) Consideration of the importance of the built environment for other species such as lichens, birds, bats and insects, avoiding impacts where possible and enhancing the local ecology as part of the local planning policy (see LP514).
- n) Provision of facilities to make sustainable lifestyle choices the easiest choice for occupants, for example in the provision of recycling bins and cycle parking.

LP902 All documentation associated with a development (eg structural reports, design for disassembly strategies, energy performance reports, fire safety information etc) should be held by the local authority alongside planning permissions and land registration information. Such information will be published in full and be publicly accessible.

LP903 The Green Party would ensure that local authorities and building control devote sufficient resources to enforce standards after construction. In particular, building control officers should be involved throughout the construction process to ensure standards are met. Standards will be based on measured performance through an accreditation scheme. Building control professionals will be required to undertake specific technical training on environmentally conscious construction as part of their accreditation and will be required to have Continued Professional Development in sustainability.

LP904 Built environment strategies should include condition surveys, assessing the existing stock against the standards set out in LP900, with options for raising the quality of buildings that fail to meet the standards.

LP905 At the point when buildings are bought or re-let, and where planning permission is sought for major changes, there will be a requirement for the owner to raise these standards to a reasonable degree. “

Changes to the Housing Chapter of the PSS

H0102 Change “lay” to “lie”. So that it reads:

H0102 Some areas of the UK suffer from severe housing shortages, while large quantities of housing lie vacant in others. Under-occupation of housing sits side by side with overcrowding. Severe problems such as rough sleeping are highly concentrated in a minority of local authorities, for reasons broader than local housing policy. For these reasons, housing policy cannot meet local housing needs in isolation, and must be fully integrated with other social, economic and environmental policies.

H0103 After “major source of” insert “the”. So that it reads:

H0103 Much of our housing stock is very inefficient in terms of energy and water usage, making our homes a major source of the greenhouse gas emissions which cause the climate emergency. This also causes high levels of fuel poverty, and causes and contributes to physical and mental health problems. Improving the energy efficiency of all homes is a priority.

H0302 Delete from “developments” to “care” and substitute

“the provision of work, leisure, education, transport and health care facilities.” So that it reads:

H0302 Housing policy will be fully integrated with other policies to build more sustainable, self-reliant communities. The provision of housing should be coordinated with the provision of work, leisure, education, transport and health care facilities.

H0400 Delete “reduce environmental impacts” and substitute “reverse environmental damage”. So that it reads:

H0400 National government, devolved administrations, the Greater London Authority and local authorities, should publish housing strategies, setting out policies to improve the affordability and quality of local housing, end fuel poverty, reverse environmental damage and end severe problems such as temporary accommodation and rough sleeping.

H0401

In section (b) delete “abolishing national and local tax breaks” and substitute “abolishing any national and/or local tax breaks” and changed “related to “relate”. So that it reads:

b) deter speculative investors by introducing rent controls and more secure tenancy agreements (see H0519), abolishing any national and/or local tax breaks for Buy-to-Let investors and landlords that relate to mortgage and purchase costs (see H0521), and banning the purchase of residential property by people who are neither British citizens nor resident in the country (see H0531).

In section (c)

- at the start delete “require” and substitute “ensure there are no incentives for owning multiple properties over one through policies such as requiring”
- change “introduce” to “introducing”

So that it reads:

c) ensure there are no incentives for owning multiple properties over one through policies such as requiring council tax premiums on second homes and long-term empty homes (see H0603), and introducing a new planning use class for second homes (non-permanent residences) so that planning permission must be sought if homes are built or bought for that purpose, enabling local authorities to control their proliferation

In section (f) delete “make stimulating economic development in other regions,” and substitute “seek to better distribute economic activity across regions and between rural and urban areas,” so that it reads:

f) to reduce the pressure on overheated housing markets such as London and the South East, we would seek to better distribute economic activity across regions and between rural and urban areas, particularly those with large numbers of long term empty homes, and the reduction of income inequalities, key priorities in our

housing and economic strategy (see for example IN302–304 and IN410–414);

H0402 After “taking account of” insert “empty homes, second homes, underutilised housing and buildings” so that it reads:

H0402 Housing strategies should set out targets for the provision of housing, which shall be sufficient to meet the needs of the current and future population, taking account of current levels of homelessness, overcrowding, concealed households, affordability, inadequate or unsuitable housing, and households unable to meet their housing needs without some form of assistance, and taking account of empty homes, second homes, underutilised housing and buildings, the need to protect land for habitats, industrial and commercial uses, and recreation. Targets shall take account of the current population, and forecast changes to the population’s size and composition. Our chapter on population sets out related policies to reduce population growth, while emphasising in PP111 that housing must be provided in such a way that respects the rights of new and existing residents.

H0405 Delete all words after “this option” so that it reads:

H0405 The provision of housing should include the construction of new homes, conversion of existing buildings to homes and the refurbishment of empty buildings. Priority will be given to the maintenance and improvement of existing properties where they can be improved in line with the local energy plan and to adequate levels of energy and water efficiency (see H0410 (c) and (d)). In the short term we would seek to remove VAT from repair and refurbishment to remove the disincentive for this option.

H0406 After “discouraged” insert “as set out in LP411” and delete everything from “unless it” to the end so that it reads:

H0406 Demolition will be discouraged, as set out in LP411, particularly where it would lead to the loss of social or co-operative housing.

H0407 Delete “Large numbers of empty homes are a waste of a valuable resource, and a blight on neighbourhoods” so that it reads:

H0407 Local authorities should aim for no more than 0.5% of homes to be empty for more than six months, and should draw up registers of empty property in their areas. They should also make much more proactive use of Empty Dwelling Management Orders and work with self-help co-operatives to bring homes into use. The Green Party would review and amend the EDMO legislation to make EDMOs more effective and easier for local authorities to use.

Delete paras H0410 to H0415.

H0504

- Delete “and most”

- Insert after “Housing Associations” the words “or companies wholly-owned by councils.”
- Delete all from “The Green Party” to the end.

So that it reads:

H0504 The Green Party opposes the transfer of ownership and/or management of social housing to non-democratic bodies. This includes the transfer of council housing to Arms-Length Management Organisations, Housing Associations or companies wholly-owned by councils.

H0505 Delete “participation, and if possible the ALMO should” and substitute “decision making, including in the governance and structure of the organisation and options to” so that it reads:

H0505 Delete all and substitute: We support initiatives encouraging tenants to take greater control of their homes and communities by becoming involved in co-operatives, tenant management organisations and estate management boards, so long as these don’t provide a first step towards privatisation. In those areas where an Arms-Length Management Organisation exists, tenants should be given opportunities for genuine decision making, including in the governance and structure of the organisation and options to transfer the homes to a co-operative or back to the council.

H0506 Delete “with substance misuse problems” and substitute “people who use drugs problematically” so that it reads:

H0506 Housing associations (or registered social providers) can be effective providers of housing to rent, and can serve particular needs, for example for people with mental health or learning disabilities, people who use drugs problematically, the formerly homeless, ex-offenders and people fleeing domestic violence. They have also been responsible for considerable innovation in the housing sector, for example in championing refurbishment rather than redevelopment and supporting further tenant involvement.

H0510 Delete from “The Green Party does not support” to “housing development.” So that it reads:

H0510 Rent levels and tenancy agreements should offer tenants genuine affordability and security. The Green Party would set a national rent policy that would require Housing Associations to set rents at levels that ensure genuine affordability for those on low incomes. Housing associations should work with local authorities to meet the needs of all those in the local community excluded by private market housing. The default tenancy agreements should be secure, lifetime tenancies.

Change heading from “Co-operative housing” to “Community led housing”

H0511 Change “Co-operative” to “Community led” and at end add “and residents” so that it reads:

H0511 Community led forms of home and land ownership and management would be supported and prioritised in housing strategies where they improve access to secure, long-term affordable homes. They can engender increased satisfaction, pride in the community, enhanced training and employment opportunities, and a greater degree of enfranchisement for tenants and residents.

H0512 Delete all and substitute: “The Green Party would support community and co-operative enabling bodies at the regional or county level, as appropriate. These would provide technical support in areas such as legislation, business planning, governance, accounting, land acquisition and development, and provide seedcorn funding to communities wishing to establish a new community led housing organisation or project.”

So that it reads:

H0512 The Green Party would support community and co-operative enabling bodies at the regional or county level, as appropriate. These would provide technical support in areas such as legislation, business planning, governance, accounting, land acquisition and development, and provide seedcorn funding to communities wishing to establish a new community led housing organisation or project.

H0513 Delete all and substitute: “Community led housing organisations will be assisted by provision of easier access to sources of finance and simplification of the conveyancing process and other regulations. The Green Party would ensure revenue and capital funding is available on terms that are suitable for the variety of local projects communities develop. We would also require the Bank of England’s regulatory bodies to enshrine the International Co-operative Alliance’s Cooperative Principles in their policies and practices, for example to better tackle demutualisation.”

So that it reads:

H0513 Community led housing organisations will be assisted by provision of easier access to sources of finance and simplification of the conveyancing process and other regulations. The Green Party would ensure revenue and capital funding is available on terms that are suitable for the variety of local projects communities develop. We would also require the Bank of England’s regulatory bodies to enshrine the International Co-operative Alliance’s Cooperative Principles in their policies and practices, for example to better tackle demutualisation.

H0514 Delete “to ensure as far as possible that they aren’t subsequently privatised.” so that it reads:

H0514 Where public land is used for the provision of housing, it should either remain in public ownership or be transferred to a Community Land Trust to preserve it as a community-owned asset. Where any public land or homes that are transferred to a co-operative, a legally binding non-demutualisation clause should be written

into the contract.

H0516 Delete “Co-operative ownership models offer greater flexibility, security and control than shared ownership.” so that it reads:

H0516 In the medium-to-long term, co-operative ownership models will supplant existing shared ownership models to prevent affordable house prices from rising faster than average incomes, complementing policies on Land Value Taxation that suppress housing market price rises (see EC791).

H0517

- Delete “with substance misuse problems,” and substitute “people who use drugs problematically,”
- Delete all from “Co-operatives have significant potential” to end.

So that it reads:

H0517 Mutual retirement housing and specialist retirement co-housing would be promoted. Like housing associations, the potential for co-operatives to serve particular needs would be also recognised, for example for people with mental health or learning disabilities, people who use drugs problematically, the formerly homeless, ex-offenders and women fleeing domestic violence.

H0518: Delete all.

H0519

In section (b) delete “at this time” so that it reads:

- b) The abolition of section 21 “no fault eviction” powers for landlords, so it is the choice of good tenants whether they wish to remain in the property. The landlord may only end the tenancy in order to sell the property (with proof of purchase), to move in or where there has been a serious breach of the contract.

H0522 Delete “It would be illegal for lettings agents to charge potential and current tenants any fees.” and “nor those in receipt of housing benefit.” so that it reads:

H0522 The Green Party would bring lettings agents under the definition of an estate agency and give the Office of Fair Trading the ability to ban agents who act improperly. We would introduce measures to ensure that black and minority ethnic people were not discriminated against. Local authorities would be encouraged to establish ethical, or social, lettings agencies, with the aim of helping people find affordable and suitable accommodation, linking with local authority, housing association and co-operative landlords where applicable.

H0524 Delete “Discrimination within the private rented sector is a significant problem.” so that it reads:

H0524 The Green Party would make it illegal to discriminate against tenants who receive housing benefit, and scrap requirements for landlords to check the

immigration status of tenants.

H0525 Insert at end “The Green Party would promote and fund the formation and development of renters unions.” so that it reads:

H0525 The Green Party would support the development of a “Tenants’ Movement” to provide a voice for tenants at a local and national level. The Green Party would promote and fund the formation and development of renters unions.

H0528 After “co-operatively owned.” Insert “Exceptions will be made for community-led housing organisations, and others with ethical uses for leasehold.” so that it reads:

H0528 Residential leasehold would be phased out, and all new developments would be freehold, commonhold or co-operatively owned. Exceptions will be made for community led housing organisations, and others with ethical uses for leasehold. Existing leaseholders would be given the right to buy their freehold at a fair price. Leaseholders under the same freehold will also be able to transfer to commonhold on a simple majority vote and without paying the unfair marriage value penalty. Leaseholders would gain stronger protection against forfeit of lease if they get into a small debt or other breach of lease.

H0600

- Delete “the Citizens’ Income” and substitute “Universal Basic Income”
- After “will be” insert “reviewed to establish how housing benefit (and the housing element of Universal Credit) could be incorporated into Universal Basic Income.”
- Delete “sufficient to cover basic housing costs, which will be lower as a result of other policies in this chapter. Other benefits and tax reliefs will be gradually phased out.”

So that it reads:

H0600 In the long term Universal Basic Income (see EC730 and subsequently) will be reviewed to establish how housing benefit (and the housing element of Universal Credit) could be incorporated into Universal Basic Income.

H0601 Delete “the Citizens’ Income (see EC730 and subsequently) will provide for a proportion of housing costs. To allow for regional variations, this will be supplemented by a specific” and substitute “the housing benefit system will remain in place alongside Universal Basic Income.”

So that it reads:

H0601 In the short term the housing benefit system will remain in place alongside Universal Basic Income. Housing benefit will be payable to all tenants in rented accommodation, with payable rates set annually at actual rent levels for social tenants and at the median local market rent for private tenants. Benefit levels should support people on low incomes, the unemployed,

retirees, those unable to work and carers to stay in and contribute to their local communities. There shall be no discrimination or variation of housing benefits, such as on the basis of age or employment status, and no withdrawal of benefits through sanctions or other means.

HO604 After “funding for” insert “buying back, refurbishing, and building new”

So that it reads:

HO604 A Green government would ensure sufficient capital funding for buying back, refurbishing, and building new social housing to meet needs and provide for the backlog of social housing within ten years. In the long-term, this would be repaid by the reductions in housing benefit payments.

HO607: Delete all

HO702

- After ‘intentionally homeless’ insert “beyond the provisions set out in the ‘relief’ duty.”
- Delete “discharge this duty” and substitute “discharge the main housing duty (but not the relief and prevention duty)”

So that it reads:

HO702 The existing homeless persons legislation would be amended to give local authorities the same duties with regard to single people and childless couples as to families, we would abolish priority need criteria, and we would ensure provision for the ‘intentionally homeless’ beyond the provisions set out in the ‘relief’ duty. Local authorities will be given a duty to provide sufficient social rented and co-operative housing to meet local needs, and the power to discharge the main housing duty (but not the relief and prevention duty) into the private rented sector will be abolished, which in many local areas will require a huge increase in the stock of social rented and co-operative housing.

HO707

- After “European Union citizens” insert the words “and other migrants”.
- After “claim benefits” change “that” to “than”.
- After “Social Security support.” Insert the words “This will mean removing ‘Recourse to Public Funds’ as a prerequisite for accessing homelessness assistance.”

So that it reads:

HO707 We recognise that European Union citizens and other migrants make a significant contribution to the economy of the UK and are much less likely to claim benefits than their UK counterparts. The Green Party will bring greater equity to the tax and benefit system by ensuring that when they fall into difficulties such as homelessness or rough sleeping they are entitled to the help as UK citizens such as local authority advice and basic levels of Social Security support. This will mean

removing ‘Recourse to Public Funds’ as a prerequisite for accessing homelessness assistance. It is unacceptable that people who came to the UK to work are left to die on the streets.

HO800 Replace “immediate” with “immediately”.

So that it reads:

HO800 The Green Party would immediately restore a comprehensive set of emergency grants and loans to local authorities and to households and individuals who have special housing-related needs. These should cover housing costs, and associated costs such as moving and furnishing their home.

HO804 Replace “CoHousing” with “cohousing” and delete “those with learning difficulties and persons recovering from drug or alcohol abuse” and substitute “those with learning difficulties and persons with drug or alcohol dependency.”

So that it reads:

HO804 The Green Party supports the provision of cohousing as a means of fostering a greater sense of community and mutual support, with its mixture of public and private space. Those who might particularly benefit from this include lone parents and older people. Suitable sheltered accommodation, where possible with these design principles in mind, will be provided by local authorities in association with housing associations, health authorities, charitable and community organisations for the housing of more vulnerable members of society, in particular women and others threatened with violence, the older people and infirm, those with learning difficulties and persons with drug or alcohol dependency (see SW501 and DU411).

0004 SYSTEMIC SAFEGUARDING REVIEW

Jessica Goldfinch, Alison Simmons, Alison Whalley, Alix Goldring, Andrea Paterson, Bernadette O'Malley, Daniel James, Glyn Goodwin, Janine Pyke, Jo Campbell, Karen Kruzycka, Kelly O'Brien, Lina Numan, Louisa Gladwin, Maire Smith, Marcus Grant, Margaret Adams, Marie Robson, Niamh Mac Mahon, Paula Hermes, Sarah O'Connell, Stephen Green, Susan Jones.*

SOC ruled this motion out of order on the basis that it requires no consequential action (Section F paragraph 8, part d of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because there is no systemic review safeguarding review of The Party ongoing, so this motion would not add any additional parameters to anything.

SOC ruled this motion out of order on the basis that it is vague (Section D paragraph 8, part d of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because there is no systemic review safeguarding review of The Party ongoing, so it is not clear what this motion would seek to add parameters to.

Synopsis

In the wake of exposing wrongdoing/ Safeguarding breaches, within organisations, it is common practice to carry out a systemic review of the breached organisation. In particular, to look at all the work/ actions/ input from named individuals in breach.

Motion

In the wake of Verita and IICSA (Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse) Reports, Conference directs GPEX to add the following parameters to its systemic safeguarding review of The Party.

To include all works/ actions/ policies/ motions/ all documents with the names, of named persons in breach, until cleared as sound and as having followed due process.

[SOC has redacted a section of text from this motion on that basis that we considered that to publish it would potentially be in breach of the code of conduct, and as the publishers of the document, SOC could potentially be held responsible for that. Autumn Conference 2018 confirmed that it was permissible for SOC to not publish proposed text in this way.]

0005

FRAGMENT OF PROTECTING TRANS CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

SOC ruled this fragment out of order on the basis that it is vague (Section D paragraph 8, part d of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because it is not clear who would be tasked with setting up this group as well as being out of order on the basis of being Contrary to the Constitution (Section D paragraph 8, part a of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because in the constitution in “bylaws referred to in clause 5(xii)” the setting up of members working groups is an action explicitly given to members to undertake.

B. Set up a “Members Working Group to protect the trans-identified child” (MWG2PTIC) to consider evidence and form a clear policy proposal to protect the trans-identified child in cases where they are considering potentially harmful medical interventions.

SOC ruled this fragment out of order on the basis that it has no consequential action (Section D paragraph 8, part f of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because it is additional background information which should be placed in a background paper. SOC has also placed it in a background paper and published this alongside the motion.

A. The amendment to RR405 is modelled on United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRA) Article 19, which states:

States Parties shall take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse, while in the care of parent(s), legal guardian(s) or any other person who has the care of the child.

Such protective measures should, as appropriate, include effective procedures for the establishment of social programmes to provide necessary support for the child and for those who have the care of the child, as well as for other forms of prevention and for identification, reporting, referral, investigation, treatment and follow-up of instances of child maltreatment described heretofore, and, as appropriate, for judicial involvement.

B. The 21st century has seen an exponential rise in medical interventions for trans-identified children and young people, which are expensive and potentially harmful. What is driving this, considering what a small, marginalised group transpeople are?

“Follow the money”, the mantra from the Watergate scandal, now guides Jennifer Bilek at www.the11thhourblog.com to focus on the profits that Big Pharma and medical corporations are making by creating a market for lifelong, costly hormone treatment and sex-change surgeries on physically healthy individuals.

As Greens should readily understand, corporate, consumer capitalism constantly strives to find new markets for economic growth and profit. Medical intervention for transpeople is the latest promise of the brand new product or service that will finally provide happiness.

The issue of the age of consent for medical interventions for trans-identified children, defined as people under 18 years old, needs important and urgent attention.

Currently the age of consent varies according to whether the medical intervention is hormone treatment (for example, puberty blockers) or sex-change surgeries (illegal in UK for under-18s).

Puberty blockers are not a ‘neutral intervention’ according to psychotherapist Marcus Evans, formerly Associate Clinical Director of the Tavistock Clinic’s Gender Identity Development Service (GIDS) – see <https://quillette.com/2020/01/17/why-i-resigned-from-tavistock-trans-identified-children-need-therapy-not-just-affirmation-and-drugs>

A helpful new book on this topic was published in July 2020: Irreversible Damage, The Transgender Craze Seducing Our Daughters by Abigail Shrier – see <https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/52076947-irreversible-damage> – there is a helpful YouTube interview with the author on the Benjamin Boyce channel.

C. Possible solutions

In light of the above Conference should set up a “Members Working Group to protect the trans-identified child” (MWG2PTIC) to consider the issue of medical interventions for trans-identified children and young people with a view to finding alternative ways of guiding parents and children in all but the minority of cases where someone cannot live in the sexed body they were born with.

How could this be done?

This is essentially a matter of child protection and age of consent to medical treatment. There should be more stringent requirements in place to ensure 1. That the trans-identified child gets the empathic support that they need and 2. that medical interventions are approved only where they are in the child's best

A special panel or tribunal could be established to approve interventions. It could include representation from doctors and other health professionals, psychiatrists, educational psychologists, social services and so on.

(Borrowing from Extinction Rebellion's Demand number 3), a Citizens Assembly could be convened to oversee whatever process is put in place and to review it from time to time.

This body – the Citizens Assembly to protect the trans-identified child (CA2PTIC) – could include representation from parents and both the gender rights and gender critical ends of the spectrum. It would decide the best approach on the rights and responsibilities of parents, professionals, children and relevant others, and on the age of consent for surgical and drug intervention.

To address the issue of parents or others taking under-18s overseas for sex-change surgery (which would be illegal if carried out in the UK), such action by these adults could be made a criminal offence.

It is urgent and important that GPEW forms a clear policy to protect the trans-identified child in this way. This is above all to push back at the powerful medico-pharmaceutical corporations that don't really care about transpeople, but only about their profits.

The MWG2PTIC could be under either the Policy Development Committee (which approves "Policy Working Groups") or under the Equality and Diversity Committee (which approves equality related working groups).

The main initial goal of the MWG2PTIC is to provide the accreditation necessary for a further Motion to go forward to a future Conference as a Section C Motion.

0006 FRAGMENT OF A PACKAGE OF TRANSPORT MEASURES TO RESPOND TO THE CORONAVIRUS CRISIS

SOC ruled this fragment out of order on the basis that it has no consequential action (Section D paragraph 8, part f of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because it is additional background information which should be placed in a background paper. SOC has also placed it in a background paper and published this alongside the motion.

- fifteen-minute neighbourhoods, with people friendly streets in towns and cities
- smart, fair, privacy-friendly road pricing
- a strict review of all infrastructure investment, with cancellation of any projects that don't reduce carbon emissions

Conference notes:

The lockdown to control the coronavirus pandemic has transformed our towns and cities.

The ongoing need for physical distancing with reduced capacity on public transport and lift capacity limiting access to tall buildings means the whole model of daily flows of workers into city centres is broken. It also means massively reduced footfall for city centre businesses that depend on office workers for their trade.

The reduced travel during the months of lockdown left us with cleaner air and quieter skies – you could wake up to birdsong even in the heart of a city.

The government has shown it is possible to react quickly on local transport. They took money already allocated to walking and cycling, suggesting it be used for emergency measures.

Many councils have taken this opportunity to create:

- low traffic neighbourhoods to prevent traffic cutting through residential streets
- school streets removing traffic outside schools when they open and close
- pop-up bike lanes on main roads providing missing links in cycle networks, and
- space for physical distancing on high streets – this started with space for queueing outside shops and is now turning into space outside for seating for cafes and bars to support local business

These measures will support fifteen-minute neighbourhoods. That's places you can live where all you need for daily life is accessible within a fifteen-minute walk of your home. And with less traffic dominated streets there's more space for planters and parklets in parking bays – a real boost to biodiversity where people don't have a garden.

The way we use cities is going to fundamentally change. Rather than seeing flows of people into the centre every day, we're going to see much more life and activity in the places where until recently many people only expected to live and not to work.

For fifteen-minute neighbourhoods to work well, our streets must be less traffic dominated and more inclusive. It should be easy to get around in a wheelchair or to reach the park on a mobility scooter. And enabling everyone to be more active should be a public health priority.

This means rethinking car use. A move away from car ownership, and towards access to a car only for the journeys it is really needed for.

As we decarbonise, we must ensure that although some internal combustion engine (ICE) cars will be replaced with an Electric Vehicle (EV), we reduce the number of motorised vehicles on the road. Many ICE vehicles should be replaced by e-bikes along with access to shared car use and better public transport.

With public transport capacity reduced for the foreseeable future to a fraction of normal capacity by the ongoing need to stay apart, it's vital our streets are inclusive and work for walking and cycling to avoid a car led recovery, bringing worsened congestion, air pollution and road danger to our cities.

Conference supports: a package of three road transport measures to tackle both the ongoing coronavirus pandemic and the climate crisis, by reducing traffic and making future transport resilient, low carbon and liveable.

0007

FRAGMENT OF E2 ATONEMENT AND REPARATIVE JUSTICE FOR THE TRANSATLANTIC TRAFFIC IN ENSLAVED AFRICANS

SOC ruled this fragment out of order on the basis that it has no consequential action (Section D paragraph 8, part f of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference) because it is additional background information which should be placed in a background paper. SOC has also placed it in a background paper and published this alongside the motion.

GPEW notes that the United Kingdom played a major role in the Trans–Atlantic Traffic in Enslaved Africans (TTEA) that saw at least 15 million Africans forcibly trafficked to the Western Hemisphere.

Community activists and movements, including the International Network of Scholars and Activists for Afrikan Reparations (INOSAAR), the Pan–Afrikan Reparations Coalition in Europe (PARCOE), CARICOM (Caribbean Community and Common Market) Reparations Commission (CRC), the Stop The Maangamizi Campaign, the Global Afrikan People's Parliament (GAPP), the Afrikan Emancipation Day Reparations March Committee; and many others have been working for many years to raise awareness of the lasting impact of enslavement on contemporary society.

Global inequalities and harms caused by the process and legacy of slavery and colonialism have created inter–generational social injustices that include both social, economic and ecological harms. In other words, the crimes against humanity committed in the past did not end with the 1833 Abolition Act but have continued under different names and guises into the present–day, whether that is through the racial discrimination of minoritized peoples, resource extraction and environmental degradation, or the imposition of capitalist systems that prevent the equitable distribution of common wealth. Green Party conference utterly deplores this situation where those who profited from human trafficking should continue to benefit from these systemic racist structures, while the descendants of Africans continue to suffer socio–economic and environmental inequality and injustice.

(1) The terms of reference for the commission of inquiry will focus on the need to inform the public of the nature of colonialism and slavery, as well as its long–term consequences including present–day impacts upon both individuals and communities. The Commission's work will

be of a participatory nature, calling for submissions from all those with knowledge of the nature and impacts of colonialism and slavery. This will aim to include, but not limit testimony from: individuals; organisations; academics; communities and nations.

Affected communities and individuals must have their own voice, agency and self–determined solutions in effecting reparatory justice and steps must be taken to facilitate their participation in any reparatory process in which the United Kingdom is engaged.

(2) The United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to A Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law' provides a framework of reparatory justice system including, among other measures:

- an investigation of the facts
- an official acknowledgement and apology
- a receipt of answers
- an opportunity for victims to speak in a public forum about his/her experiences
- to be actively involved in the reparatory justice process.

0008

SECTION OF A2 GPEX REPORT

The following section of the Treasurers report was ruled out of order on the basis of Section D, clause 8, part a of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference “contrary to the constitution”.

Part 4 section iii of the constitution states:

“(iii) The rates of subscription for membership, and the proportions in which they shall be divided between Local Parties, Regional Parties and The Green Party, shall be set by the Party Conference. Following a quorate 2/3rds majority vote of GPEX, they shall be authorised to offer discounts for new members joining on direct debit, of up to a third, for a period not more than 3 months in any calendar year. Membership subscriptions and capitation rates shall be subject to regular reviews as of Green Party AGM 2001. Such reviews shall be carried out on a 3 yearly basis by GPEX in consultation with GPRC. Capitations to Regions and Local parties shall each be a weighted average subscription value per member of the relevant party.”

The minutes of GPEX which were presented to SOC in order to support this proposal contained the following quote from the representative of GPRC present at the meeting:

“Kat [[the GPRC representative present at the meeting]] raised concern that it was not constitutional to hold the vote today, given need for GPRC input; to

which Jon noted Kat's concerns but iterated that it was better to do something by voting than do nothing.

Heather informed the meeting that Rachel from GPRC is a member of the Development Committee and fully engaged in discussions on this topic.

Kat stated their express discomfort with the Membership Review not having been properly reviewed and GPRC not having been consulted on this (as this is unconstitutional). Kat reiterated that one member of GPRC being on Development Committee cannot be considered to be full GPRC oversight.

Kat informed the meeting that previously there was thorough consultation when this has taken place, as is required by the constitution.”

Which makes it clear that consultation with GPRC did not take place, and the proposal is therefore contrary to the constitution.

In addition to this, SOC notes that items on the agenda can be ruled out of order on the basis of Section D, Clause 8, part g of Standing orders for the conduct of conference:

“substantially changing policy areas or having complex implications for other areas, without having passed through the agreed process of consultation”

There is an historic precedent of motions proposing a change in the membership fees to have gone through the full democratic process of the party being proposed as a D motion, being open to scrutiny and amendment by the membership and not being proposed as a section in a report which is not open to the same level of discussion, debate, and scrutiny.

Below is the section of the report ruled out of order.

“We undertook the three–yearly review of membership fees and approved modest increases.”

0009

SECTION OF A3, TREASURERS REPORT.

The following section of the Treasurers report was ruled out of order on the basis of Section D, clause 8, part a of the Standing orders for the conduct of conference “contrary to the constitution”.

Part 4 section iii of the constitution states:

“iii) The rates of subscription for membership, and the proportions in which they shall be divided between Local Parties, Regional Parties and The Green Party, shall be set by the Party Conference. Following a quorate 2/3rds majority vote of GPEx, they shall be authorised to offer discounts for new members joining on direct debit, of up to a third, for a period not more than 3 months in any calendar year. Membership subscriptions and capitation rates shall be subject to regular reviews as of Green Party AGM 2001. Such reviews shall be carried out on a 3 yearly basis by GPEx in consultation with GPRC. Capitations to Regions and Local parties shall each be a weighted average subscription value per member of the relevant party.”

The minutes of GPEx which were presented to SOC in order to

support this proposal contained the following quote from the representative of GPRC present at the meeting:

“Kat [[the GPRC representative present at the meeting]] raised concern that it was not constitutional to hold the vote today, given need for GPRC input; to

which Jon noted Kat’s concerns but iterated that it was better to do something by voting than do nothing.

Heather informed the meeting that Rachel from GPRC is a member of the Development Committee and fully engaged in discussions on this topic.

Kat stated their express discomfort with the Membership Review not having been properly reviewed and GPRC not having been consulted on this (as this is unconstitutional). Kat reiterated that one member of GPRC being on Development Committee cannot be considered to be full GPRC oversight.

Kat informed the meeting that previously there was thorough consultation when this has taken place, as is required by the constitution.”

Which makes it clear that consultation with GPRC did not take place, and the proposal is therefore contrary to the constitution.

In addition to this, SOC notes that items on the agenda can be ruled out of order on the basis of Section D, Clause 8, part g of Standing orders for the conduct of conference:

“substantially changing policy areas or having complex implications for other areas, without having passed through the agreed process of consultation”

There is an historic precedent of motions proposing a change in the membership fees to have gone through the full democratic process of the party being proposed as a D motion, being open to scrutiny and amendment by the membership and not being proposed as a section in a report which is not open to the same level of discussion, debate, and scrutiny.

Below is the section of the report ruled out of order.

Review of Membership fees

In line with the constitutional requirement that we review membership fees every three years GPEx, in consultation with GPRC have made the following proposal.

“We recommend that membership prices increase to reflect current economic circumstances, whilst ensuring that Party membership remains accessible to all. We also recommend that the naming of different membership options is updated.”

“This conference accepts and instructs the Green Party Executive to implement the following changes to membership fees and naming convention:

1. The standard membership fee is increased by 33pence per month to £40 per year with the option to continue to pay either on a monthly or annual basis.
2. The low waged rate is increased by less than the rate of inflation to £13 per annum.
3. The unwaged rate will remain as is at £6 per annum.

4. The international rate to be increased to £30 per annum.
5. The low waged rate is renamed reduced rate.
6. The unwaged rate is renamed concessionary rate.

The Green Party Executive is not recommending any changes to the capitation formula currently used."SOC is proposing to composite the two motions on gender balance in the leadership elections in the following way. A discussion with the proposers has been initiated, but at the date of publication we have not had agreement from both of the proposers on the composite wording.

COMPOSITES

COMPOSITE PART 1

REMOVE THE LIMIT ON WOMEN AND GENDER NON-CONFORMING/NON-BINARY PEOPLE IN LEADERSHIP AND DEPUTY LEADERSHIP POSITIONS

3568 Points

Tom Pashby, Alice Bennett, Alice Hubbard, Amelia Womack, Amy Heley, Ben Knowles, Chris A Williams, Cleo Lake, Jake Welsh, Kahina Bouhassane, Kelsey Trevett, Lawrence McNally, Liam Blakey, Matthew Townsend, Meg Day, Nick Hartley, Raphael Hill, Richard Wyatt, Rosemary Sexton, Sabrina Poole.*

Synopsis

No synopsis supplied.

Motion

Current text in the constitution

Subsection i) of Article 8, Green Party of England and Wales Constitution:

“There shall be a leader and two deputy leaders of the party. The leader shall be a voting member of the Executive and the deputy leaders be treated as a job–share.”

Subsection iv) of Article 8, Green Party of England and Wales Constitution:

“The post of deputy leader will be held as a job share with two individuals of a different gender, noting that gender is self–determined.

“Two members of a different gender may together stand for the office of Leader in order to hold the post as a job share in which case they shall be known as ‘Co–Leaders’. In this case a single Deputy, the individual who polls the highest vote, regardless of gender, will be elected. Members standing to be Co–Leaders may not simultaneously be candidates as individuals for either Leader or Deputy Leader.”

Subsection v) of Article 8, Green Party of England and Wales Constitution:

“The Leader and Deputy Leader(s) or Co–Leaders shall be elected every two years. The election shall be by a postal ballot of all members of the Party.”

Proposed new text for the constitution.

Change Subsection iv) of Article 8 to:

“The post of deputy leader will be held as a job share with two individuals, at least one of whom must be a woman or a gender non–conforming/non–binary person, noting that gender is self–determined.

“Two members, of whom at least one must be a woman or a gender non–conforming/non–binary person, may together stand for the office of Leader in order to hold the post as a job share in which case they shall be known as ‘Co–Leaders’. In this case a single Deputy, the individual who polls the highest vote, regardless of gender, will be elected. Members standing to be Co–Leaders may not simultaneously be candidates as individuals for either Leader or Deputy Leader.”

COMPOSITE PART 2

REMOVE GENDER BALANCE FROM GREEN PARTY LEADERSHIP ELECTIONS

1459 Points

Jessica Goldfinch, Caitlin Collins, Glyn Goodwin, Janine Pyke, Jo Campbell, Maire Smith, Marcus Grant, Margaret Adams, Martha James, Mike Shone, Niamh Mac Mahon, Paula Hermes, Stephen Green, Susan Jones.*

Synopsis

Gender balance rules, put in place to encourage women to stand in selections/ elections for good reason, is now placing us in a position of not being able to fully select who we want. Current job–share options for either/and/or both positions would still apply.

Motion

In article 8:

Replace current subsection i) with “There shall be a leader and deputy leader of the party. Both the leader and the deputy leader shall have a voting role on the Executive”.

Delete subsection iv) entirely and renumber subsequent subsections accordingly.

CONTACT DETAILS OF MOTION PROPOSERS

A MOTIONS (ENABLING MOTIONS)

Enabling Motion A2 Amendments to Standing Orders for the Conduct of Conference to enable an online and telephone Extraordinary Conference to be held in Autumn 2020 – Claire Nash –
soc@greenparty.org.uk

Enabling Motion A3 Enabling Motion for an Extraordinary Autumn Conference 2020 to be held online – Claire Nash –
soc@greenparty.org.uk

B MOTIONS (POLICY VOTING PAPERS)

B1 Food and Agriculture Voting Paper –
David Davies – david.ithaca@btinternet.com

C MOTIONS (ACCREDITED POLICY MOTIONS)

C1 Deforestation – Tony Firkins –
tony.firkins@gmail.com

C2 Car and vans to go zero carbon by 2030 –
Tony Firkins – tony.firkins@gmail.com

C3 Ban on advertising of high-carbon goods and services –
David Flint – davidclint@gmail.com

C4 The 2019 General Election Manifesto and Climate Change Mitigation – Tony Firkins –
tony.firkins@gmail.com

C5 Adopt the Principle of Rationing to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions Arising from Travel, Amending the Climate Emergency and the Transport Chapters of PSS – Greg Dring –
gdring2000@yahoo.com

C6 Updating the philosophical basis to reflect doughnut economics – Rachel Collinson – rachelcollinson@gmail.com

C7. Self Declaration of Gender – Kathryn Bristow – No contact details provided

C8 Animal Rights: Fireworks; limit use and quiet – Emma Randall – emmarandall2804@aol.co.uk

C9. Access to Fertility Treatment – Kathryn Bristow – No contact details provided

D MOTIONS (ORGANISATIONAL MOTIONS)

D1. Winning over workers is crucial to fighting climate change – Peter Murry –

yrrumuk@googlemail.com

D2. Diversity in target seats – Benali Hamdache –
bhamdache@gmail.com

D3. Remove gender balance from Green Party leadership elections – Jessica Goldfinch – jessicagoldfinch@hotmail.com

D3. Remove the limit on women and gender non-conforming/non-binary people in Leadership and Deputy Leadership positions – Tom Pashby – tjpashby@gmail.com

D4. Motion to request that the Code of Conduct oversight group append “Antisemitism: A Guidance” to the Code of Conduct – Vivien Lichtenstein – vivienlgreenp@aol.com

D5. DC4 Independence of the complaints process – John Coyne – john-coyne@zen.co.uk

D6. DC1 Disrepute in the disciplinary process – John Coyne –
john-coyne@zen.co.uk

D7. DC3 Inconsistency in the Complaints Referral Group membership between the Constitution and Standing Orders for Party Discipline –
John Coyne – john-coyne@zen.co.uk

D8. DC2 Breach of contract litigation and the disciplinary process – John Coyne –
john-coyne@zen.co.uk

D9. An Extraordinary Party Conference to debate a constitution that delivers the recommendations and intent of the Holistic Review Commission and Incorporation of the Party – Adrian Spurrell –
adrian.spurrell@btinternet.com

D10. Accessibility and change process for party branding – Emma Carter – emmacarter344@gmail.com

D11. Consultation and Right of Reply for Liberation Groups on Proposed Policy –
Phil Vabulas – phil.vabulas@gmail.com

D12. Liberation manifesto approval –
Benali Hamdache – bhamdache@gmail.com

D13. To require GPEW members to have been members for two years before standing for SOC – Claire Nash – soc@greenparty.org.uk

D14. Allow criticism of other candidates in internal elections – Rob Bryher –
robertjessetelford@gmail.com

D15. Proactive stance for Standing in elections – Emma Carter –
emmacarter344@gmail.com

D16. IHRA, Palestine, and Free Speech –
Shahrar Ali – shahrar.ali@greenparty.org.uk

D17. Make campaigning and advocating voting
for other parties subject to disciplinary action –
Rob Bryher – robertjessetelford@gmail.com

D18. Make membership of the Young Greens
an automatic opt-in right for young members
16–29 inclusive – Jessica Goldfinch – jessicagoldfinch@
hotmail.com

D19. Affiliated Groups – Adrian Spurrell –
adrian.spurrell@btinternet.com

E MOTIONS (UNACCREDITED POLICY MOTIONS)

E1. Wildlife & Habitats Policy Enabling Motion – Mike Shipley –
sue_mikeshipley@yahoo.co.uk

E2. Teach British Sign Language in schools – Charlie Keller –
ckelle03@mail.bbk.ac.uk

E3. Atonement and Reparative justice for the transatlantic
traffic in enslaved Africans –
Cleo Lake – cleolakecreativity@me.com

E4. A package of transport measures to respond to the
coronavirus crisis – Caroline Russell – carolinerussell3@
me.com

E5. Environmental Education learning entitlements – Mike
Shipley – sue_mikeshipley@yahoo.co.uk

E6. Staying close to the single market –
Molly Scott–Cato – molly@gaianeconomics.org

E7. Recognise trans parents – Benali Hamdache –
bhamdache@gmail.com

E8. A Local and Public Strategy for Zero Covid Britain – Vivien
Lichtenstein –
vivienlgreen@aol.com

E9. Enabling Motion for the Security Peace and Defence
Chapter

E10. Nuclear power – Malcolm Bailey –
jmbaileyx@yahoo.com

E11. High speed 2 (HS2) – Rob Bryher – robertjessetelford@
gmail.com

E12. Strengthening the Regulation of Election Spending – Brig
Oubrigde – brig@phonecoop.coop

E13. Enabling motion for the revision of Green Party Criminal
Justice Policy – Rupert George – rupert.george@gmail.com

E14. Future Referenda – Brig Oubrigde –
brig@phonecoop.coop

E15. Removing a statement on dental health – Rosemary
Sexton – rosemary@solihullgreenparty.org.uk

E16. Reaffirm support for BDS and oppose a key IHRA example
– Les Levidow – les.levidow@btinternet.com

E17. Ensuring that sex and gender are not conflated – Emma
Bateman – emmail@hushmail.me

E18. Rights of transgender, non–binary and agender people –
Daniel James – chair@isleofwight.greenparty.org.uk

E19. Directly elected individual positions –
Brig Oubrigde – brig@phonecoop.coop

E10. Protecting trans children and young people – Robbie
Spence – roadlesstravelleruk@gmail.com

E21. Abolish the Office for Students – Emma Carter –
emmacarter344@gmail.com

