Board Meeting XI

2026-04-16, 17:00
UPF Office, AF-Borgen
Board of 25/26
Association of Foreign Affairs Lund

Present: *Ella Hellerup, Emelie Andersson, Gaia Zubrickaite, Filippo Fioretti Boccato, Ismail Ali, Klara Sjöström, Lina Ingstrand, Maya Bukhory, Max Ulander, Nomena Andrianjafy, Sofia Mina Pessina, Wera Hänsch Mauritzon*

Online: *Sam Löfström*

Co-opted: *Michael Müller Volkonsky, Milla Kotani, Paula Grandas, Benjamin Östlund, Mattias Juni Ferreira, Finn Heinecke, Fabio Cavaliere, Santeri Rönty*

1. Opening of the meeting

   President Ella Hellerup opens the meeting at 17.02.

2. Election of Chair of the Meeting

   Ella Hellerup is elected the Chair of the Meeting at 17.02.

3. Election of Secretary of the Meeting

   Emelie Andersson is elected the Secretary of the Meeting at 17.03.

4. Election of Attestors and Vote Counters of the Meeting

   Klara Sjöström and Max Ulander are elected as the Attestors and Vote Counters of the Meeting at 17.03.

5. Approval of the Electoral Roll

   The electoral roll is set to 12 at 17.03.

6. Approval of the Agenda

Ella proposes to add the motion on the Ratification of the Per Capsulum Decision on the non-Inclusion of non-Board members during the Vote of No Confidence.

The agenda is approved at 17.04.

7. Decision Point: Ratification of Per Capsulam Decision

Ella presents the Per Capsulum Decision, stating that the Board voted on Slack not to include non-Board members during the Vote of No Confidence. She proposes proceeding with this ratification.

Michael Müller Volkonsky states that the five non-board members who are present here today are not in attendance for the sake of gossip; they are here as his witnesses. He states that, in accordance with the Accountability Guidelines, he has the absolute right to defend himself and that witnesses are directly relevant to the evidence he wants to present. Michael, therefore, urges the Board to co-opt the non-board members to the meeting.

Ella says that the inclusion of these non-board members has already been discussed by the Board. She explains that it is not up to us as individuals to say who or who isn't relevant to the discussion. She holds that it does not make sense to only have 'one side' present.

Emelie discusses the importance of maintaining individuals' anonymity throughout the discussion, and having non-board members present could compromise this principle. Additionally, she states that to make this decision, we should try to be as unbiased as possible, and that it is important that everyone has the correct information to be able to partake in the discussion. The non-board members present do not have access to all relevant information, such as the Auditor's report.

Max points out that the report mentions the environment within the Debate Committee, and therefore, the non-board members present are relevant for us all to get a good understanding of this.

Sofia Mina Pessina expresses that the non-board members present are all within the Debate Committee.

Lina Ingstrand refers to section 3.3 of the report, noting that it does not address the right to bring witnesses. She clarifies that while Michael has the right to attend, he does not necessarily have the right to bring witnesses with him. She emphasizes that the focus should not be on how many people speak positively about Michael or the committee, nor on countering those who have been interviewed for the report. Instead, the discussion should center on those who have raised concerns, as that is the main purpose of this meeting. She believes that countering witnesses is inappropriate in this context.

Sam Löfström joins the meeting at 17.14

Michael states that there is no one to protect because there are no names mentioned in the report. He emphasizes that the non-committee members present can attest to the Committee's environment. He says that they will facilitate the discussion, helping everyone better understand the context. He expresses that this will enable the Board to ask questions effectively.

The electoral roll is set to 13 at 17.18.

Nomena Andrianjafy references the Statutes detailing that in § 5.9.3, the Board has the ability to decide not to co-opt people to the BM.

Ismail Ali says that, as he understands it, Michael has the absolute right to defend himself, but he questions whether these witnesses are necessary. Ismail explains that it is not about Michael as a person; it is about these specific contexts, which are detailed in the report.

Michael answers that, as he sees it, the witnesses are directly concerned with the report.

Ella notes that we don't have all perspectives and emphasizes that the report should serve as the foundation for the discussion and decision-making, while also noting the possibility of sensitive information being raised.

Maya Bukhory requests a secret ballot vote.

The Board approves the motion of the ratification of the per capsulum decision at 17.38

Milla Kotani, Paula Grandas, Benjamin Östlund, Mattias Juni Ferreira, and Finn Heinecke leave the meeting at 17.38.

8. Decision Point: Motion to Proceed

The Board approves the Motion to proceed with a vote of no confidence at 17.40.

9. Decision Point: Vote of No Confidence

Nomena begins by presenting the Auditor's report, detailing that a no-confidence vote was filed against Michael and sent to the Auditor for evaluation.

Ella wants to add, before the discussion begins, that the Auditor has done a very good job and dedicated a lot of time and effort to the report.

Michael agrees with Ella on this.

Michael wants to remind everyone that he hopes they will view him as innocent until proven guilty. He begins by referencing the agreement, noting that the report states he acted unilaterally without support from UPF. He points out that the agreement is not signed by Ella. Additionally, he presents screenshots of Slack and email conversations between himself and Ella. Michael states that he brought this agreement to the board, emphasizing that he did not do so unilaterally and that it was neither concealed nor unknown to the leadership. In the critiques of the report, it is mentioned that the Auditor claims the agreement is unavailable; however, Michael asserts that it is accessible. He therefore contends that one-third of the report is incorrect and should not be considered significant to the decision-making process. He urges the board to exercise caution when evaluating the rest of the report with this context in mind.

Michael proceeds to discuss the recording, stating that there is no context provided for its content. He mentions that the Auditor initially indicated he would meet with him to review the evidence, but later changed his mind about the in-person meeting. Michael says that the Auditor then claims he does not need to share the recording or any other evidence with Michael. Michael asserts that, under normal circumstances, an accused person should have the right to view the evidence against them.

Michael insists that he did not act unilaterally. He identifies what he believes to be the weakest point of the report, specifically regarding collaboration and the working environment within the Debate Committee. According to Michael, the Accountability Guidelines state that this process should never be used for personal issues or matters related to sexual harassment and discrimination. He adds that the Auditor's report should include concrete examples within its context, which he feels is lacking. The report does not point out clear incidents but instead relies on impressions, which he argues does not constitute misconduct. He emphasizes that the report should be more specific. Michael acknowledges that it is not uncommon to face difficulties when working with others, but he finds the material to be vague. He also expresses his belief that the Auditor seems unsure within the report; while it should not address personal matters, it nonetheless references them, such as collaboration issues.

Michael also adds that information from conversation he has had with The Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Contact Persons regarding allegations against him being racist and sexist has been shared with Ella. Says it is not a small matter that things have been shared. Says Ella has been unprofessional and shared details with people. Overall, Michael says that he feels that there has been a lot of gossip and negativity being spread of him. He also adds that Ella has said to a committee member at a PR meeting that Michael is an unserious head. Additionally, Michael notes that he wanted to have a conversation with Ella about the report, but that she ghosted him, and therefore dialogue was not allowed.

Michael mentioned that two days before this meeting, the Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Contact Persons raised issues concerning him. He explained that these new allegations created significant pressure on him before the meeting. Overall, Michael described how the situation has led to him feeling overwhelmed in Canada, prompting him to start seeing a therapist, and resulting in stomach issues and poor sleep. On an operational level, he believes this has affected his work, particularly in relation to Sofia's absence from the committee recently. He states that the only reason he is present at this meeting is to defend his name; otherwise, he would have left.

Michael emphasizes that he has been an asset to UPF, contributing to trips and keeping the committee alive. He details that he has, for example, given people the *opportunity to go debate in Scotland, who otherwise might not have had that opportunity. He details that he has created a real impact.*

He explains that there has been a very negative environment surrounding him within UPF, which has affected the neutrality of the report. He emphasizes that the report was developed in a context that was already personal and charged. He urges the Board to take this into account.

Continuing on, Michael raises a procedural point, noting that one of his friends compared this process to a military tribunal. This friend has never encountered a situation where the accused does not get the chance to see the evidence against them. Michael also mentions that a former Head congratulated him on taking on his role within the Debate team, acknowledging that he has accomplished a lot and set a high standard for future Heads. Lastly, Michael expresses his gratitude for the opportunity to defend himself here and for others' receptivity to the issues he has presented today.

Ella starts off by mentioning that the Auditor has reported to several presidium members that it is in fact the opposite of what Michael is portraying and that it is rather him who has been having difficulty getting in touch with Michael to schedule a meeting. Ella states that she has not said what is being claimed by Michael. Wera confirms that Ella did not participate in the discussion that Michael is referring to. Regarding the issue of ghosting, Ella states that she does not use Facebook and prefers to use Slack or Email for all UPF related conversations. She also emphasised that she has always been responsive to all communication on the proper channels.

Ella emphasizes that she was the one who reached out to Michael when tensions were high between them. When Ella submitted the no-confidence motion, made it clear that she did not feel like it was appropriate for them to discuss the situation by themselves outside of the proper channels. Additionally, she disagrees with Michael about the negative portrayal he has of her and insists that she has never claimed he is racist or sexist, as he alleges.

Sam believes that Michael's case could be valid, as well as the other case. First of all, Michael is in his second year, and the semester is coming to an end. He questions whether it would be harmful to the association for Michael to remain until the end of the operational year. Sam feels that it seems more like a punishment or a statement *being made. He acknowledges that he may be mistaken, but he doesn't see any positive outcome from this situation. Additionally, he points out that there is no one available to take on Michael's role.*

Emelie wants to clarify Michael's statement regarding the Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Contact Persons. As one of the Contact Persons, Emelie emphasizes that she takes anonymity very seriously. She assures that neither she nor her partner would ever disclose confidential information or conversations. Regarding Michael receiving information about other reports a few days prior to this meeting, Emelie explains that this was not planned; it was simply a matter of unfortunate timing. She expresses her apologies if this has caused additional stress for Michael in this situation.

Ella says that she takes her position seriously and handles anonymous information professionally. Ella says that the information she has has been given to her in her capacity as SHAD 2024/2025, the Crisis Team 2025/2026 as well as by members who claim Michael told them about these allegations

Wera Hänsch Mauritzon mentions the aforementioned statement Michael made about negative things being said within the PR Committee. She says that the PR Committee is not one that would talk badly about anyone, and this is not something that she would permit either.

Michael says he was not there for this context, which is why he wanted to bring in witnesses to support it.

Wera says she wishes this had been brought up earlier, not six months later.

**The Board and the accused were in consensus to let the Auditor be a part of the discussion in order to clarify any questions in relation to the report.*

Fabio Cavaliere enters the meeting at 18.31.

Nomena states that, if she recalls correctly, the agreement was shared with the Board only as a committee reporting and not as a Board discussion. Regarding the recordings, she notes that if Michael had met with the Auditor and gained access to them, it would violate confidentiality and undermine trust in the process. She also addressed his comments on conflicts and collaboration, referencing the Stress

Prevention Policy, which outlines that it is the Head's responsibility to foster a positive and open working environment within their Committee.

Ella expresses that one of her main concerns regarding the report is Michael's desire to establish a new independent association. She views this as compromising his ability to represent the interest of UPF, in accordance with his role description. She believes he does not demonstrate the qualities of a good representative for UPF.

Michael counters that her claims are unsubstantiated.

Lina asks Michael whether he believes he actually said the things recorded, specifically regarding the statement that the Board should either accept the new Association or not. Additionally, Lina inquires if Michael has ever considered forming an independent society.

Michael denies. He shares that there have been group discussions within the Debate Committee about this, but he has not himself brought it up.

Lina also inquires about whether Michael has any idea what the allegations, including those from the Contact Persons, pertain to, as he himself says he has had several discussions with them this operational year.

Michael says he does not recognize these allegations and cannot point it to any particular context. He also states that there is a safe and open environment within the Debate Committee and therefore does not understand where these allegations come from.

Emelie acknowledges that situations can be challenging when it's one person's word against another's. However, she emphasizes that there have been multiple allegations from various individuals in different contexts over an extended period, indicating that Michael has not fostered a safe environment.

Michael emphasizes that he is not racist in any way and that it is difficult for him to counter these allegations when he doesn't have the exact context to look back on.

Filippo Fioretti Boccato expressed his intention to utilize the Auditor now that he is present. He also mentions that he personally took offense at the comparison made by

Michael's friend, who likened this process to a military tribunal. He believes that when someone repeats certain statements, it usually implies agreement with them.

Fabio believes that anonymity is important, as it allows people to feel comfortable bring up issues. His report is based on actual events, which he considers to be factual. For instance, when Michael denies the existence of an independent society, but Fabio has a recording of him expressing a desire to establish one, it becomes difficult for Fabio to rely solely on Michael's word. Fabio also details that in the recording, Michael states that he signed the contract as an independent debate society in partnership with another debate society.

Michael brings up the agreement and says that there is no signature.

Max states that while Fabio claims that the recording is a fact, it can still be taken out of context; Michael might simply be exaggerating. He explains that Michael has not made efforts to establish an independent society and currently enjoys a positive working environment during committee meetings. He stresses that it's difficult to assess the recording without the full context. Max also expresses concerns about Sofia's lack of presence as Head of the Committee, raising questions about whether voting out Michael is truly beneficial to UPF.

Fabio explains that there was context because it was a longer recording. Additionally, all the gathered evidence showcased a pattern of conduct, making it easier to identify how the recording makes sense.

Ismail points out that, since Sofia is present, we should ask her how she envisions her further involvement in Debate. He also believes that Michael is taking this personally, but the main question is whether he is fit to be a Head or not. Ismail wants to remind everyone that this is not a legal process. He emphasizes that, as an Association, we have decided on how to conduct our affairs. According to the steering documents of UPF, we have prioritized protecting anonymity. While Ismail acknowledges that it is not logical to make a decision when the evidence is unclear, he feels that the Auditor's presentation has provided clarification. He understands that the vagueness of the report is intentional and recognizes the importance of not disclosing names or details that could identify individuals who made anonymous claims. However, he asks the Auditor if it is possible to share more details regarding the evidence.

Fabio states that the pattern reflects how an independent society goes against the best interests of the Association. He believes, as recorded, that this situation has been ongoing and unilateral, and therefore constitutes a clear pattern when considered alongside the other facts. This is not merely about a single issue, such as racist remarks; rather, it encompasses several concerns that demonstrate a recurring pattern of conduct.

Ismail asks if Michael has had an opportunity to rectify these things.

Emelie explains that the Accountability Guidelines do not include a clause about providing a warning or giving individuals time to rectify issues. However, she notes that she has been in discussions with Michael since the fall term regarding remarks he has made that have made people uncomfortable. From her perspective, when this issue was first raised, Michael should have ensured that such incidents would not happen again. Unfortunately, that has not been the case.

Sofia wants to clarify that Michael specifically asked her to create a separate friendship treaty with the Canadian debate society, which is distinct from the one he claims is not signed. She explains that even before taking on the role of co-Head of the Committee, Michael had already suggested creating a separate association. For a long time, Sofia has witnessed Michael antagonizing and vilifying both UPF and Ella, which has created a very negative atmosphere within the Debate Committee. As a result of this tension, she decided to step back from the Committee. She emphasizes that many people within the Debate Committee were unaware of what UPF was and that the Committee was part of UPF. When they did learn about it, they were met with a vilification of UPF.

Sofia feels it is important to defend Ella's character. She describes how, before becoming Head of UPF, Michael had presented a distorted and villainized version of both Ella and the entire Board to her. This made her hesitant to join the Board, but when she finally met everyone, she found them to be very nice. She explains that the ongoing tensions have caused her significant fatigue, leading her to distance herself from Debate. Additionally, Sofia highlights that Michael has made blatantly racist remarks to her and her friend. While Michael sees his comments as differing opinions, she views them as outright racism, which is completely unacceptable.

Michael firmly denies that he is racist and rejects all the allegations against him. Regarding the racist remark mentioned by Sofia, he states that he believes the discussion is not about racism but rather a difference of opinion.

Sofia wants to emphasize that multiple truths can coexist. For instance, while Michael can be a good friend to Max and a capable leader, this does not negate the validity of other concerns, such as his behavior mentioned in the report.

Ella points out that, regardless of Sofia's willingness to be more active in the Debate committee, the primary focus of the decision should be on the unacceptable behavior that has occurred. She emphasizes that, even if this occurred on the last day of the Operational Year, we, as an Association, must stand up for our values and not accept poor conduct.

Michael would like to provide a summary. He reiterates his earlier points and disputes the claims in the Auditor's report against him.

Fabio leaves the meeting at 19.47.

The Board performs a secret ballot vote.

The vote of no confidence passed with a qualified majority at 19.52.

Michael moves that the votes be protocolled explicitly in accordance with the Statutes, paragraph 3.2: 10 yes, 2 no, 1 abstain.

Ella proposes a break at 19.52

Filippo leaves the meeting at 19.55

Sam left the meeting at an unknown time during the break.

Ella reopens the meeting at 20.04.

10. Discussion Point: Partnership Agreement with CBSUN

Santeri Rönty joins the meeting at 20.04.

Nomena presents the discussion point. She explains that during one of the Travel trips to Copenhagen, she mentioned the NCIA conference to CBSUN, and they talked about *the potential for increased collaboration. Nomena and Micol had a meeting with the president, which led to the drafting of an agreement. This agreement is intended to be informal, emphasizing opportunities for collaboration, such as invitations to various events. It will take effect in the next operational year.*

Emelie says that this sounds like a super good and fun idea.

Wera asks about the extent of this agreement. She inquires if it is similar to the collaboration we had with RSR. She thinks it could benefit from being simpler.

Nomena says that this would be more of a simple agreement.

Ella says she and Klara can submit a draft of the agreement to the Board before signing.

11. Discussion Point: Grant Coordinator Position

Ella brings up this discussion point. She connects it to our last discussion, mentioning that she has been thinking it might be better not to have the Grand Coordinator Position under the presidium. She believes that extending the presidium could risk more internal discussions being held within the presidium for efficiency, rather than being taken to the Board. She doesn't want to divert from the Board.

Klara mentions that an idea she had is that this position could be under the Treasurer.

Lina adds that it could be a Treasurer Trustee position.

Gaia Zubrickaite mentions that this position could be similar to the Ball Coordinators, where they work mostly independently but attend regular meetings with the Activity Heads.

Lina and Klara both think it could be a good idea to have two people for this position.

The Board's overall consensus is that it sounds good to have it under the Treasurer as Grant Trustee.

12. Information Point: Nomination Committee Update

Santeri, as Chair of the Nomination Committee, would like to remind everyone to apply and encourage more people to do so. Interviews will be conducted on the 25th *and 26th of April. He also wants to remind everyone that recommendations are due today.*

13. Presidium reporting

13.1. Presidents

- Met with external partners
- Attended weekly presidium meetings
- Attended and photographed lectures
- Attended sittning
- Attended career talk
- Kept up the regualar work, including answering emails and questions

- Joined the weekly praesidium meetings
- Had half of the check-ins with the heads
- Reached out to more Alumni for the post series
- Met with the Presidents of CBSUN (Copenhagen) for a possible partnership

13.2. Secretary

- Finalized the BM10 protocol
- Participated in presidium meetings
- Published 2 newsletters
- Approved Orbi memberships
- Started working with the Policy Working Group

13.3. Treasurer

- Attended presidium meeting
- Supported the presidium in their work
- Answered emails
- Handled reimbursements
- Checked the merch inventory
- Attended Career CV workshop
- Attended Activity’s Coachella sittning

13.4. UFS Representative

- Participated in presidium meetings
- Participated in a UFS BM
- Participated in NCIA organisation meetings
- Started to work with the Policy Working Group

14. Committee reporting

14.1. Activity

- Planned the Coachella 2016 sitting
- Planned a yoga session with Gerdahallen
- Held weekly meetings

14.2. Career

- Worked on collaboration with social science student union
- Planned a kickout
- Worked on UPF certificates

14.3. Debate

- Followed with the weekly debates
- Delt with internal matters

14.4. Lecture

- Held a lecture with the Indonesian Ambassador together with ACE & PPI
- Held a lecture on West Sahara together with Solidarity Rising
- Held the Project of the Year-lecture with Patrik Andersson
- Held weekly meetings
- Set the final lecture schedule for the spring and continued the planning of the respective lectures

14.5. Magazine

- Received the 3rd Issue
- Held Regular Meetings
- Continued working on the 4th Issue (With RSR and Project of the Year Team)
- Continued collaborating with the Project of the Year to be included in the 4th Issue

14.6. Pod&Radio

- Had regular meetings

- Tested the new podcasting format and decided on moving forward with it
- Made posts on instagram for our podcasts episodes
- Recorded new podcast episodes for both news from the castle and connecting the dots
- Planning a podcast episode for the project of the year
- Decided to increase our popularity and reach amongst the members and non members to increase our listeners with PR (might be pushed to next semester)

14.7. PR

- Photographed during different events
- Photographed portraits during the CV workshops
- Created marketing for the project of the year
- Participated in the marketing work for NCIA

14.8. Travel

- Held regular committee meetings
- Visited Copenhagen+Helsingör (Project of the Year trip)

14.9. Webzine

- Held weekly meetings
- Published 4 articles

15. Other Points

15.1. *Sabina mentions that there are spots left for the trip to the Maritime University and encourages all to join. Sign up ends tonight.*

15.2. Lina brings up something that was brought up in her committee meeting, that someone asked about why we are not on STUK. She thinks that this could be good for visibility and something we could have further discussions about.

16. Confirmation of the next Board Meeting

The next Board Meeting will be held on the 7th of May.

17. Meeting adjourned

Ella adjournes the meeting at 20.01.

Ella Hellerup

Chair of the Meeting

Emelie Andersson

Secretary of the Meeting

Klara Sjöström

Klara Sjöström

Attestor and Vote Counter

Max Ulander

Max Ulander

Attestor and Vote Counter