

Minutes GMA Organisation of Study Associations

Date, time: 17th of December 2020, 14:00

Location: Online



Present Lieke Pullen (OSb 2020-II)
 Patrick van Oerle (OSb 2020-II)
 Lars Essenstam (OSb 2020-II)
 Imke Nijenbanning (OSb 2020-II)
 Boudewijn Steenbreker (OSb 2020-II)
 Ruben Bos (OSb 2020-II)
 Ruben den Hertog (CB OSB 2021-I)
 Niels de Groot (Activism Grant Committee)
 Jeanine ter Horst (Activism Grant Committee)
 Manouk Ramselaar (Student Union)
 Kevin Witlox (UReka)
 Daan Velthuis (W.S.G. Abacus)
 Gerard Groot Obbink (C.T.S.G. Alembic)
 Meltem Lampe (S.V. Arago)
 Jan den Uijl (S.A. Astatine)
 Alexander de Ranitz (S.A. Atlantis)
 Koen Rispens (S.A. Communiqué)
 Lieke van Haastregt (Concept)
 Nick van Nijen (CB Concept)
 Maarten Smit (S.G. Daedalus)
 Christine Mulrane (S.V. Dimensie)
 Jelle Maas (I.C.T.S.V. Inter-Actief)
 Ryan Wakamiya (Komma)
 Jonne van Haastregt (W.S.G. Isaac Newton)
 Koen Geurtsen (CB W.S.G. Isaac Newton)
 Sander Teune (H.V. Ockham)
 Nikki Zandbergen (S.V. Onwijs)
 Lisette Masselink (S.V. Paradoks)
 Gerben Wennemars (S.V. Paradoks)
 Imke Verschuren (S.A. Proto)
 Wouter Nijenhuis (E.T.S.V. Scintilla)
 Brian Egberink (Sirius)
 Jeroen Assink (S.V. Stress)

Chair Lieke Pullen (OSb 2020-II)

Secretary Patrick van Oerle (OSb 2020-II)



1 Opening

Lieke Pullen (OSb 2020-II) opens this General Members Assembly.

14:01

2 Setting the agenda

The agenda is adopted without changes.

5 3 Notifications

3.1 OS Board

Lieke (OSb): We have some announcements. First of all, Patrick (OSb) has sent the link to the attendance list in the chat, so please fill this in for the minutes. The second announcement is that grammar mistakes on the minutes of the previous GMA can be sent to secretary@os.utwente.nl.

10 Thirdly, we will organise an OS Pubquiz on the 21st of January for all boards. This will also be the last moment you can earn OS points for this half year's sprint. Last but not least, Ruben (OSb) will leave our board, and he will be replaced by Ruben (CB OSb).

Ruben (CB OSb) shortly introduces himself and finishes with 'something like that?'

3.2 OS Committees

15 Niels (ABC): Jeanine (ABC) and me will be present during this GMA to answer your questions regarding the document about the activism grants and the errata sent during the last days.

3.3 Study Associations

Jelle (Inter-Actief): There will be another chairmen outing this evening.

Jonne (Newton): I have brought my successor, who will now introduce himself.

20 *Koen (CB Newton) shortly introduces himself.*

Lisette (Paradoks): I have brought Gerben (Paradoks), one of my fellow board members, who was curious what OS does and what a GMA is like.

3.4 Student Union

25 Manouk (SU): I already mentioned it during the PCM; we are looking into ways to find out how associations from all umbrellas are doing, of which you will probably get a questionnaire. This will be about how you are doing in general, but also COVID-19 related.

3.5 University Council Parties

30 Kevin (UReka): We have concluded our last plenary meeting for this cycle. I have two education-related updates. First, Thank you for everyone who filled in the survey about educational evening activities. Generally, students don't want evening activities and in exam weeks want more online activities during the day rather than physical activities in the evenings. We have consented to give faculties and study programmes the possibility to organise physical activities online, but only as a last resort and thus as little as possible. The second thing is that proctoring will be added to the OER just to allow for the possibility to use this technique, especially during
35 the lockdown we are currently in. It is still up to the faculties whether they want to make use of online exams with proctoring or still have physical exams.



4 Minutes

4.1 Minutes GMA 26-11-2020 (Document 20201202)

Niels (ABC): I noticed my name was not on the attendance list. Also, at the discharge of the UTEA it says ABC.

40

Alexander (Atlantis): I was missing on the attendance list as well.

Brian (Sirius): Me too, I filled in the form an hour afterwards.

Decision *The minutes of the GMA of 26-11-2020 are approved with the proposed changes.*

5 To-do List

Number	Action point	Status
GMA Nov.01	OS Board Set up a communication pathway between study associations and the Student Union and Executive Board	Done

Lieke (OSb): We had a meeting this morning and a document has been sent today as well. We will shortly discuss it at agenda point 8, in case you have any questions about it.

45

6 Activism Grant Distribution 2020

Manouk (SU): Firstly, let me shortly explain how FOBOS works. FOBOS is to compensate students who can't follow their studies the usual way. This can be because of illness, pregnancy, professional sports or in your case; a board year. You will receive information on how to apply for the grants this week or next week. This is only for the calendar year 2020, not for 2021. Activism grants are divided into five categories; Category 1 to 4 and Extra & Incidental (E&I). Category 1 is especially for small organisations with part-time boards, and will only receive grants if Category 2 to 4 are filled. Category 2 is where full-time board members are in, as well as big part-time boards. This is also the category where you are all in. Category 3 is for big committees approved by the Executive Board. Think about the Kick-In Committee or Create Tomorrow. Category 4 is where the student teams fall in, for example the Solar Team, Green Team and E-sports. The E&I Category is where the ABC committee is dividing grants upon, and are mostly divided over committees.

50

55

Within E&I we have a couple of categories. These are decided to know the prioritization based on the impact the committee has on the association and their workload. In total there are 427 grants to divide among all umbrellas. We go through all these committees and see how many grants they will receive. The categories within E&I is; Boards, Must, Boards Extra (which essentially is the 6th board member), Should, Could and Not. An example, a Kick-In committee belongs to Should for study associations, but Audentis and Taste depend on the Kick-In for new members and therefore it belongs in Must for those associations.

60

65

We had a lot of conversation with all umbrellas since a lot of umbrellas think a 6th board member should get FOBOS as well. It has quite an impact on the total of the E&I Category, 150 of the 427 total grants as it is now. We did decide to only allow for Boards Extra to get grants when Boards and Must are filled. This would mean that OS would receive 60 grants for 6th board members, as Boards Extra is filled for 61% and OS reserved for 99 grants in Boards Extra.

70

Imke (OSb): Last year we decided on the provisional document for 2020. Then we decided that the grants to divide will be prioritized by study tours, then symposia and then business



75 trips. However, the rules for this division have changed and therefore we had to come up with
a different division. The first erratum for the document sent initially does not consider the
6th board member, and all grants received will be distributed amongs the committees. The
problem with this version is that this is against the new regulations and will likely be rejected
by the other umbrellas, resulting in less grants. The second erratum does consider the 6th board
80 member, which have been deducted from the study tours.

Jonne (Newton): Why do we have to decide about our own grants? Why isn't the grants for
the 6th board member separated from the division made by the ABC?

Niels (ABC): We had the same thought in the original erratum, because we felt it is not the
task of OS to divide board grants. Within the E&I Category we see study tours and symposia
85 as Must. We could state that we think the 6th board member is more important to us, but
that would have to apply for other umbrella associations. For example the sports umbrella,
tournament committees might fall under Must for them and get the negative effect of us claiming
the 6th board member to be more important. It's a difficult position to be in as SU, and it's
confusing that a part of the board grants is done via Category 2 and another part via Category
90 E&I. As the ABC we hope to see a solution that it is not our responsibility to divide board
grants, but it seems difficult at this moment.

Jonne (Newton): I think I'm still a bit confused. You have the Boards, then you have the Must
and if you then place the 6th board category under the Must then you can at least fill those
important committees and with the grants left you can fill the Boards Extra Category. But
95 why would that not be the case or is that already the case and are there not enough grants?

Manouk (SU): That is of course a great idea and that is just following the sheet that was decided
upon during the E&I meetings. OS has an internal distribution and 90 grants go to the Must
Category of OS, which are divided over study tours and symposia. If you do it like you propose,
then the total amount of grants for OS will be way lower. It will then be around 15 grants for
100 a big study tour. In the past, the OS GMA agreed upon another system and now the thing
is that umbrellas agreed on giving the 6th board member grants under the condition that the
Must Category is filled. If the ABC decided to hand out the grants to the 6th board member
then their Must Category is filled, just not according to the internal agreement made by OS.

Niels (ABC): We have sent two errata over the document. If you accept erratum 1, that means
105 that this division will go to all umbrellas and they have to discuss it again. If they decide
not to accept this division, there are 2 options. Either there are no grants at all for the 6th
board member, or they will be taken from somewhere else. This means that, for example, a
tournament committee from the sports umbrella will lose grants because we are not willing to
change our system. Of course those other umbrellas will not agree to losing grants because we
110 don't want to change our system. The second document is not the perfect solution, it is just
the best compromise in which we prevent a large discussion at the umbrella meeting and the
probability that our distribution will not be accepted by the other umbrellas.

Wouter (Scintilla): I am looking for clarification what the grants are for. Are they for work put
into activism or missed ECs that have to be compensated?

115 Manouk (SU): The main idea of these grants are to compensate for courses that you missed.
Everyone pays a tuition fee and you are not using the UT facilities (i.e. lectures, tutorials and
other educational activities) as a full-time board member. Small activism usually doesn't mean
you miss courses but we also want to stimulate activism, which is why we have the E&I Category
for which you can get grants. The Must Category usually means you miss some courses, the
120 others usually don't.

Wouter (Scintilla): Okay, so it is for the tuition fee you paid and did not use. The amount of
board grants has not changed in a couple of years, while the tuition fees did increase. Why is



there an unbalance?

Manouk (SU): It was changed one or two years ago that the value of a full-time grant will be 1/12th of the tuition fee. For part-timers this is €170 because this also once was 1/12th of your 125 tuition fee. Some international students got quite a lot of money for doing part-time boards earning 1/12th of their tuition fee, which was about €2500 per year so they changed that some time ago.

Lieke (ConceptT): Is the big loss of the study tours only this year or also for the coming years?

Manouk (SU): It will definitely have effect but how much, we will have to look into this. 130

Imke (OSb): What we are going to do is to make a new document to make the activism grants model better. This will be approved by the GMA. Now a lot of these grants are given to the 6th board member, which means that if we don't approve the second erratum, then using the first erratum OS will receive a lot less grants which will be a problem for the upcoming years.

Niels (ABC): There are two options to do this. We would very much like that the SU finds a 135 solution to this and that it is not the responsibility of the ABC to divide grants for the 6th board member. If this is not possible, we will change our model and probably add a Category E and include these board grants in our model as a standard in the future. We would like the SU to fix this problem, though.

Maarten (Daedalus): If you have the idea of changing the model next year and giving the 140 responsibility of the 6th board member to the SU, why does this not change this year already?

Niels (ABC): We only realised this quite late as well. We made the division and got the choice to include the 6th board member. It wasn't our priority so didn't include it, and later heard that the division for all umbrellas would be set. In this division we would get 160 grants total, of which a certain number is set for the 6th board member. If we were not to use these grants 145 for the board members, it was bound to happen that the other umbrellas would not accept our division as it is not in line with the regulations made with the earlier umbrellas. To stay in line with the earlier made agreements we made the second erratum to show you where we will take these grants from and how we will solve this issue.

Maarten (Daedalus): In the second erratum the study tours of Newton and Stress get a deduc- 150 tion of 10 grants and Inter-Actief and Daedalus get a deduction of 13 grants. Why is that?

Niels (ABC): What we did here is that there is a deduction on both. This is because generally we have less grants because of cancelled activities. Therefore we made a difference between study tours that took place and study tours that got cancelled. We would rather take a little bit more grants from the cancelled study tours and leave the study tours that took place a little 155 bit more intact as the tour itself is quite a part of the total workload. The ratio of 9 and 19 grants per committee is because we made the decrease in grants by ratio of the decrease in grants we receive in total.

Imke (OSb): We are now going to vote between the two errata. This will be a vote on which erratum we are going to continue working with. In case we still want to change things in the 160 document we vote for now, that is still possible.

Manouk (SU): Before voting I want to point out that I am really sceptic about the fact whether erratum 1 will be approved by the SU and the other umbrellas.

Jonne (Newton): I object against voting. We only got a mail this morning and got explanation about it in an hour. I feel like we need some time to process and see what our fellow board 165 members think. I feel like there are more people involved than just me, and it would be beneficial to have a little time to discuss this with the rest of our board.

Lieke (ConceptT): Actually I believe we can vote, as it was already announced that there will be a change and that you had to plan time to prepare for this meeting. Even though this was



170 sent yesterday, I do think it is enough time to prepare for this GMA.

Niels (ABC): I understand that there is a very short deadline, and for us it was exactly the same. We tried our very best and with everything we explained right now we think you should be able to make a decision for your association. The document also has to be ready as soon as possible, but the deadline is the 31st of December. If we could finalise this as soon as possible, 175 that would be very nice. If you still have any questions, please ask them. For the rest I do urge the associations to vote on it right now.

Manouk (SU): I suggest to vote on whether to give the grants to the 6th board member or to the study tours, since there are people objecting to the division rather than the idea behind it. Lieke (OSb): That is indeed what the first voting will be about. After that we will have another 180 discussion about the actual distribution and have a second voting after that. A link to the voting Forms has been sent in the chat, so please cast your vote there.

Jeroen (Stress): I am still hesitant to vote right now. Could we take a break to think about it a little bit more?

Lieke (OSb): Yes sure, then we take a short break.

185 *We take a small break of around 10 minutes where Gerard (Alembic) tells that forming manboobs goes faster when you drink a lot of IPAs.*

Jonne (Newton): I understand the reason why study tours are reduced, but I don't agree that almost all grants are reduced while study tours actually have quite some people who miss out on their ECs, where symposium committees don't miss out on courses and they don't get reduced 190 in the second erratum. I feel this is unfair toward the study tour.

Niels (ABC): All of the symposia have fully taken place except for Scintilla and in respect to the number of hours put in, 5 grants for symposia opposed to 29 grants for a study tour is not a fair distribution either. We only get 15 grants for a study tour normally, so for the distribution we now have in the second erratum, study tours that did continue still get more grants than 195 they usually would get. Those that got cancelled get a little less, but didn't put in the work they normally would have done. We didn't want to take grants from the symposia since they did take place and put in all the effort. If we do not substantially decrease the study tours that means there are no grants left for Category C. Activism is in our opinion very valuable and should be rewarded, and therefore should Category C also receive some grants. In our opinion 200 this is the best way to divide the grants over everyone.

Jonne (Newton): Does that also mean that the amount of grants as decided upon by the ABC is different from the amount of grants per study tour as decided upon with the SU?

Niels (ABC): If you look at the document provided by the SU study tours would have received 15 grants. In our model we have decided to give them more which we take from other committees. 205 We already give study tours more than they should technically get and these grants already come from the other activities. The other activities are already negatively effected by the increase in grants for the study tours, and we therefore think it is fair to decrease the amounts of grants given to the study tours rather than other committees. So if we don't include the 6th board member, we are taking too many grants and that will cost the other umbrellas from 210 committees they would like to reward as well. I can see why other umbrellas think it would be unfair if we decide to do so.

Jeanine (ABC): I just wanted to say that following the OS grants division model, the maximum amount of grants for study tours is 29 and the maximum grants for symposia is 8. We already lowered the symposia in the first erratum since we didn't have enough grants to divide. We 215 didn't lower it any further because we already did so in the first erratum.



Jeroen (Stress): Why is there a difference in total amounts between erratum 1 and erratum 2?

Niels (ABC): The difference in total grants in erratum 1 is a mistake, this should also be 162.

Jeroen (Stress): In what extent is OS obligated to distribute the grants for the 6th board member?

Imke (OSb): If we vote upon the first erratum, we have to go back into discussion with the other umbrellas. We are going to try to receive all the grants, but it will be more likely that the other umbrellas would disagree and therefore all grants in the E&I Category would have to be redistributed, causing less grants to be given to OS because we are taking a lot of grants because we have a lot of 6th board members. 220

Imke (Proto): There are still boards missing in the second erratum. Where will the grants for the missing boards come from? 225

Imke (OSb): If there are boards missing, the 50 grants which are now reserved will be divided among all of them, thus including the missing ones now. We won't get extra grants for them.

Lieke (OSb): If there are no more questions, we can vote. We are going to vote between continuing to work with the first or second erratum. In essence we will vote for whether or not to include the grants for 6th board members. You can also vote blank, these do count towards the voting count but have no preference. By abstaining from voting your vote does not count towards the voting total. If you vote for either one of the errata, that does not mean you also agree with the exact distribution in that document. 230

Decision *The GMA decides to continue working with the erratum 2 of the Activism Grant Distribution with 13 associations voting for erratum 2, 3 associations voting for erratum 1 and 2 associations abstained from voting.* 235

Lieke (Concept): If someone who is now in a committee, is not a student anymore when receiving grants. Is that possible? That person was a student when working for the committee.

Ruben (OSb): That should not be a problem. They look at whether or not the person was a student during September of the calendar year the activity took place. 240

Daan (Abacus): If your study tour this year is cancelled and a new committee is formed for next year, how does that work?

Niels (ABC): We discussed this. As the activity changed to 2021 it indeed means that the grants will be available for 2021. We just reward the activity. If the committee has changed it is up to you to divide the grants between the two different committees. 245

Daan (Abacus): It is now treated as a moved activity. It has been cancelled and setup to the same location again, officially. How does that work?

Niels (ABC): If new preparations were needed, we would consider that a new tour. If you choose the same location you probably reuse work that has already been done, and we see it as one study tour that has been postponed. 250

Alexander (Atlantis): I was wondering why Atlantis has 7 projected grants while we had 7 board members for 12 months in 2020.

Imke (OSb): You are a part-time board, which means 7 grants for a year.

Jelle (Inter-Actief): You said the ratio was the same for decreasing grants for study tours. When I checked that there was quite a lot of difference. With 9 grants it would be 16% and with 22 grants it would be 21%, which is quite a difference. Maybe you can take a look at this as well. 255

Niels (ABC): Do you base your percentages on the total grants? We found it more important to reward completed study tours rather than cancelled ones. The goal was to lower the grants to approximately the same ratio. 260



Jeroen (Stress): How was the percentage of 6th board member grants decided? How much playing room do you have and how did you come up with this distribution?

265 Jeanine (ABC): We also discussed this with the SU and 50 grants would be enough to accept this. We then divided these 50 grants evenly over the associations to ratio of how long they have had a 6th board member, and after rounding error correction we got to this division.

Imke (OSb): We should have given the 6th board member grants 60, but we thought this was quite a lot and therefore agreed with Manouk (SU) that if we divide 50 among them, that would be acceptable to the SU.

270 Jeroen (Stress): I don't understand why some of the Category C activities have more grants than projected. They have been reduced to fill the board grants. Where does that difference come from? In the first erratum it still says the distributed grants is one more than the projected grants.

275 Niels (ABC): It's probably partially a mistake because we looked at the model, and the other argument being the same as for study tours. We prefer activities that have taken place rather than cancelled activities, but still do want to give some grants for cancelled activities.

Lisette (Paradoks): For the division of the grants for the 6th board member, why does Paradoks have only 4 projected grants? We had a full-time board with 6 persons from January to August.

280 Imke (OSb): In the division of last month we believed Paradoks had a part-time board from September to December and therefore got less grants than for example *Inter-Actief*.

Maarten (Daedalus): I still don't understand why symposia remain on the same level. Why do the Newton and Stress study tours get a deduction while being completed while symposia don't get a deduction.

285 Jeanine (ABC): I already mentioned before; the symposia already got less grants than the maximum amounts and have already been reduced in the first erratum. It seems unfair to lower that amount even more because they have already been reduced almost by half.

Niels (ABC): You say it's a 30% reduction for study tours, which is true. However, symposia have already had a reduction of 40% in the first erratum and it would be unfair to further decrease this. We would therefore rather decrease the study tours.

290 Imke (Proto): Lars said earlier that we don't get any extra grants in the division because we already have four board members which get compensated with the grants from Category 2, but then our previous board ends up with 60 grants in total even though they should get more because they were with 6 people. So how would that then work?

295 Jeanine (ABC): That is because your board would be able to apply for more grants than you deserve following the guidelines. After you have received your grants, you should give part of that to your previous board.

Jonne (Newton): This is maybe not for now, but a remark that should be looked into. Not enough grants keeps being a problem, I think we really should update the ABC model. If you apply for 19 grants and actually receive those 19, it feels way better than being reduced by 10.

300 Lieke (OSb): This has already been mentioned during the discussion, so we will work on improving the model and discuss this at another GMA.

Niels (ABC): If you have any other points where we should look into, either send them to the ABC or the OS Board, or create an agenda point for another GMA.

305 Maarten (Daedalus): If we vote and approve, we approve the distribution as it is presented in the second erratum, right?

Lieke (OSb): That is correct.

Jeroen (Stress): What if we don't approve the current distribution?



Lieke (OSb): Then the ABC will have to come up with another distribution based on the feedback that is given today and with which you do agree.

Lieke (OSb): Then we will now vote. You can vote to approve the presented distribution as 310 presented in the second erratum, reject the distribution, vote blank and abstain from voting.

Decision *Erratum 2 of the Activism Grant Distribution has been approved with 11 associations in favor, 4 associations against and 2 associations abstained from voting.*

7 Membership Ockham

Lieke (OSb): According to our bylaws, we need to approve the membership of new associations. 315 This means we have to vote once more today.

Sander (Ockham) shortly introduces himself and Ockham as an association.

Jeroen (Stress): Just our of curiosity; how many members does Ockham have?

Sander (Ockham): We have about 500 members. Usually we have about 250 to 300 active 320 honours students.

Decision *The membership of H.V. Ockham is approved.*

8 Communication towards and from the UT

Jonne (Newton): I have a question. If I understood it correctly, once we have feedback about new regulations, we should tell our student assessor. Is this to filter out questions that the student assessor can answer and not bother the SU with it? 325

Lieke (OSb): The student assessor has a short contact with the building manager, but also the faculty council and faculty board. If you have questions about the new regulations, they can ask it directly and have an answer more quickly. Also, if more associations have questions they can gather those and ask those at the same time.

Jonne (Newton): I wanted to say thank you, it is a clear document and the way it describes 330 probably works well.

9 Evaluation FocOS Group: Effective Leadership

Lieke (OSb): Were there points we could improve on, or anything else you want to say about the FocOS Group about Effective Leadership?

Wouter (Scintilla): I like the idea of the FocOS Group, but it was a little bit vague and lacked 335 the informative part.

Lieke (OSb): Would you then have liked more discussion, or how exactly could we improve?

Wouter (Scintilla): I can't really put a finger on what could be improved, but the informative part didn't really add anything in my opinion.

Boudewijn (OSb): The main point was the discussion part, the informative part was about 20 340 minutes and showed a perspective of leadership. After that we talked about what that means specifically and didn't intent to show the presentation given was the only right answer.

10 Current COVID-situation

Lieke (OSb): Are there any problems regarding COVID-19?

Lieke (ConcepT): More of a small announcement; we planned our feutenrondje at the 15th of 345 January, but I guess you can all tell that this will not be possible and we will try to plan a new date.



11 Upcoming Topics

11.1 FocOS Group: Motivation

350 Lieke (OSb): We will try to do this about motivation as we have seen that a lot of board members, but also students in general, seem to have a lack of motivation because of COVID-19, working from home and not seeing a lot of people. Therefore we thought it might be a good idea to have a discussion about this and how you are tackling certain problems.

11.2 Charging UTEA

355 Lieke (OSb): We have some people who are interested, but please ask your board in case you haven't done so yet so we can charge them in January.

11.3 Provision Activism Grants 2021

Lieke (OSb): Next GMA we will provide a provision of the Activism Grants for 2021 for which you have already handed in your proof.

360 11.4 GMA February

Lieke (OSb): In February we will present our semi-annual report as well as our semi-annual financial report. Besides that we will also have our change of Rubens, as already announced.

12 Any Other Business

Lieke (ConcepT): This is my last GMA here since we have our change GMA before the next
365 OS GMA. Thank you all, and we hope to see you at some form of a constitution drink!

13 Resumé Action Points and Decisions

13.1 Resumé Action Points

There are no ongoing action points.

13.2 Resumé Decisions

- 370
- **GMA DEC.01** The minutes of the GMA of 26-11-2020 are approved with the proposed changes. (page 3)
 - **GMA DEC.02** The GMA decides to continue working with the erratum 2 of the Activism Grant Distribution with 13 associations voting for erratum 2, 3 associations voting for erratum 1 and 2 associations abstained from voting. (page 7)
 - 375 ● **GMA DEC.03** Erratum 2 of the Activism Grant Distribution has been approved with 11 associations in favor, 4 associations against and 2 associations abstained from voting. (page 9)
 - **GMA DEC.04** The membership of H.V. Ockham is approved. (page 9)

14 Closing

380 *Lieke Pullen (OSb 2020-II) closes this General Members Assembly.*

16.13