



ALANYA 2026

6TH REGIONAL SELECTION CONFERENCE OF EYP TÜRKİYE

RESOLUTION BOOKLET

© 2026 - 2027 European Youth Parliament Türkiye. All Rights Reserved.





ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Resolution Booklet has been compiled by the Academic Team of Alanya 2026 6th Regional Selection Conference of European Youth Parliament Türkiye.

Authored by:

Salomé Nogue (FR)
Ege Velidedeoğlu (TR)
Ali Sinan Yel (TR)
Ada Sarp Kırık (TR)
İpek Kara (TR)
Hamza Sedat Gümüşel (TR)
Rüya Atalağ (TR)
Fatima Osmanova (AZ)
Levent Erdem (TR)
Ece Güler (TR)

Checked by:

Ada Gezik (TR)
Deniz Duru Eratak (TR)
Nehir Kök (TR)

Edited by:

Talha Tekin (TR)
Yaman Karakuş (TR)

Published May 2026

Published on behalf of European Youth Parliament, a not-for-profit educational foundation of
Sophienstr. 28-29, 10178 Berlin, German by the

European Youth Parliament Türkiye Tomtom Mahallesi, İstiklal Caddesi No:187/130 34434 Beyoğlu
/ Istanbul // Türkiye

Website: www.eyp.org.tr

Email: info@eyp.org.tr



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN A DIGITAL WORLD (AIDA)

Robotics in action! : *Recent advances in AI systems in Medicine and Healthcare present extraordinary opportunities in many areas of social interest, together with significant questions and drawbacks, such as the dangers of introducing AI, a still-growing technology in such an important part of our lives, calling for a close consideration of its implementation. With both of these sides in mind, what stance and/or steps should the EU take in the near-future applications of AI in this particular sector?*

The European Youth Parliament aims to provide a transparent, fair, and reliable integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in European healthcare systems while protecting patients' privacy as well as strengthening accountability, and improving public trust in AI-assisted medicine. Furthermore, it wishes to support AI-focused education of medical students, and avoid the shortcuts while diversifying the poor datasets in order to ensure an inclusive medical process for all patients across Europe,

Submitted by: Ece ATILAY (TR), Uğur BOZHÜYÜK (TR), Shakur GONCHAROV (TR), Ecenaz GÖMEÇ (TR), Selime Ceylin KARATAĞ (TR), Eylül Lina KARAPINAR (TR), İrem Ece KELEBEK (TR), Ömer MOHAMAD (TR), Arailym ZHAXYLYKOVA (TR), Ece GÜLER (Chairperson, TR)

Because

- A. [Accountability](#) is not clearly defined when it causes incorrect diagnoses,
- B. As there is an [increase in cyberattacks](#), using AI in medicine without strong security exposes patients to dangerous [data leaks](#),
- C. Patients may develop [trust issues](#) toward doctors due to the fear of a lack of human judgment and empathy,
- D. Healthcare AI systems may produce [biased or inaccurate](#) medical advice due to an underrepresentation of different genders, races and ethnic groups,
- E. AI systems can encourage biased patterns by using [incorrect shortcuts](#) that associate race, gender and age with medical conditions, abilities or social roles, leading to unreliable outcomes,
- F. Insufficient expertise regarding medications may result in errors in prescriptions ,while AI may also overlook [harmful drug interactions](#),



- G. The AI black-box¹ principle prevents patients from [getting enough information about their treatment](#),WQAWSR
- H. Across the EU, only [15%](#) of healthcare workers can access pre-service AI training;

by

1. Inviting the [European AI Office](#) to establish a clear and structured legal framework specifically for penalties for the use of AI in healthcare to prevent confusion and ensure accountability in cases of medical errors;
2. Suggesting [European Union Agency for Cybersecurity](#) to form a group of medical AI experts to develop a filtering system to monitor healthcare data and algorithms to reduce biased outcomes and improve the reliability of AI systems in medicine;
3. Calling upon [Digital Diversity: Crafting Inclusive AI Activities Erasmus+](#) to organise interactive workshops, awareness campaigns, and patient-oriented seminars within its upcoming sessions to promote transparent communication between healthcare institutions and patients;
4. Asking the [European Health Data Space](#) to increase data diversity to represent different age, gender and ethnic groups by:
 - a. selecting pilot hospitals and collecting detailed data from patients belonging to different groups,
 - b. providing further funding to the researchers who already focus their research on minority groups;
5. Demanding the [European Patients' Forum](#) to organise public awareness advertisements and workshops, such as comparative diagnosis case studies between doctors and AI, to reassure the public that doctors are still the primary decision-makers;
6. Recommending the European Medicine Agency ([EMA](#)) to give healthcare workers obligatory one-time seminars in order to ensure that they are aware of the potential pharmacological inadequacy of AI tools;
7. Further inviting EMA to launch a framework that stresses every health metric specifically by 2027, to prevent opacity in the diagnosis process of AI tools and ensure that they necessarily consider all the metrics when it is given by the correct prompt;

¹ [Black Box effect](#) refers to AI tools' data process which is only a matter of input and output, excluding the process itself.



8. Encouraging [European Institute of Innovation and Technology](#) to increase accessibility of AI literacy for medicine students by providing:
 - a. internships to the medicine students in AI-related technical faculties such as AI engineering,
 - b. financial support to universities to ensure they have access to current AI tools and technologies in medicine fields.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON CULTURE AND EDUCATION (CULT)

Unity Without Uniformity: *EU member states hold profoundly divergent memorial cultures, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe, where communist-era crimes and the Holocaust are sometimes placed in direct competition rather than approached in complementarity.*

The EU's 'European Remembrance' programme funds cross-border projects, but lacks binding commemorative standards. How should the EU develop a common framework for Holocaust and totalitarian memory without undermining the principle of subsidiarity in memorial policy?

The European Youth Parliament aims to promote critical historical awareness, strengthen intercultural dialogue, and empower younger generations to build a more united, intellectual, conscious and vigilant Europe by making sure that Member States do not advocate division because of their diverse historical struggles,

Submitted by: Merve Akğeyik (TR), Bertuğ Büyükkayıkçı (TR), Nazlı Çelik (TR), Açelya Çınar (TR), İdil Demirci (TR), Ecrin Duru Kale (TR), Belinay Nur Tes (TR), Arsam Navab (TR), Nar Cömert (TR), Arina Shatskykh (UA), Levent Erdem (Chairperson, TR)

Because

- A. The instrumentalisation of historical [memory](#) occurs when governing bodies or political factions manipulate the past to bolster specific agendas, often resulting in the selective or biased representation of historical events to serve partisan interests,
- B. Full national competency over history education allows government to shape historical narratives for [political purposes](#), which spreads false and fragmented information that causes [marginalisation](#),
- C. The divide among Member States regarding robust EU engagement in remembrance policies stems from the perceived threat to national sovereignty and identity, as the centralisation of historical narratives and cultural heritage may appear as an [attempt to supersede local traditions](#) with a singular, uniform historical framework,
- D. Due to the lack of the EU's commemorative abilities, numerous varieties of historical sites have been forgotten or in the process of being ruled as an oversight, [resulting in misinformation](#) and the gathering of fragmented information,



- E. The repercussions of Nazi and Soviet atrocities continue to [afflict](#) numerous Member States, manifesting in profound social trauma, the disintegration of communities, and significant cultural erosion;

by

1. Urging Member States to highlight the importance of an equally distributed curriculum, those who are taught multi-perspective history and are likely to engage in democratic processes and reject populist, anti-EU political narratives;
2. Recommending the Directorate-General of Education, Youth, Sport and Culture ([DG EAC](#)) develop a Unified European Digital History Repository to be a centralised, verifiable online platform in all Member States by 2027, to eliminate potential nationalistic distortion;
3. Calling upon Member States to create a collective memory library framework to prevent the possible divisions across education by creating a joint EU curriculum and digital archives;
4. Further urging the Member States to work together in strengthening independent, evidence-based history education through the [Erasmus+](#) programme and the [European School Education Platform](#);
5. Suggesting the DG EAC to fund teachers-training projects, cross-border history-teaching networks, and joint curricula that present Nazi and communist crimes in a balanced way to make historical narratives guided by critical inquiry;
6. Calling upon the Joint Research Centre ([JRC](#)) to establish cross-border research programmes about the Holocaust and Soviet-era crimes to provide different perspectives across nations;
7. Encouraging the [European Commission](#) to further fund the [European Remembrance Program](#) in partnership with the support of Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values Programme ([CERV](#));
8. Encouraging DG EAC to fund restorations and promotions of both the holocaust and Soviet-era related historical sites;
9. Urging Member States to improve the accessibility of cultural sites with practices such as:
 - a. creating a dedicated wide register of endangered historical landmarks,
 - b. allocating targeted funding from programmes such as the European Regional Development Fund ([ERDF](#)).



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AFFAIRS (JURI)

Standing as one: *Across Europe, concerns are growing over governmental interference in peaceful manifestations, with recent examples in the EU ranging from excessive police force to outright bans on assemblies, such as Poland attempting to ban any LGBTQ+ public show. Such actions disproportionately impact vulnerable groups whose rights to free expression and assembly are already fragile. How can the EU strengthen safeguards to ensure that Member States respect and take actions to protect the fundamental right of citizens to peacefully protest?*

The European Youth Parliament aims to create a safe and inclusive environment for protesters to express their opinions. It aims to address issues related to democratic and peaceful protests in accordance with the European Convention on Human Rights, which guarantees the freedom of expression, association, and peaceful assembly in a diplomatic environment,

Submitted by: Barın Barış Başdoğan (TR), Eren Fevzi Elçi (TR), Bilgen Güneş (TR), Umut Kılınc (TR), Elif Körük (TR), Ece Kumaş (TR), Andii Mukharskiy (UA), Hilal Şamlı (TR), Fatima Osmanova (Chairperson, AZ)

Because

- A. Governmental structures are [inflicting unnecessary harm](#) on innocent and unarmed citizens,
- B. Governments cause [damage to residents](#) because [protestors are supporting opinions that the government opposes](#),
- C. Governments are [showing discriminatory actions](#) against protestors due to their ethnicity, religion, or nationality,
- D. There are [inequalities](#) in rights between major and minor communities' rights while advocating for equal representation and protection,
- E. The [governmental support is provided to religious groups](#), even though the states are separated from religion,
- F. The excessive use of [force and suppression by police authorities](#) may contribute to the radicalisation and escalation of violence within future protest movements,
- G. Growing oppression of people causes [interference with peaceful manifestations](#) and non-violent assemblies by state policies and disproportionate forces, which are an infringement on [the European Convention on Human Rights](#),



- H. There is a [lack of transparency regarding police interference](#) during protests, and limited [accountability of law enforcement](#) actions in some Member States,
- I. Governments are increasingly using [public order](#) as a [justification to restrict freedom of expression](#) through excessive surveillance, which is against the [Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU](#),
- J. Governments are taking away the [rights to protest and political expression](#) of particular minority groups, such as LGBTQ+;

by

- 1. Recommending the [Council of Europe](#) to establish independent bodies to monitor police violence and unlawful protest bans in the coming years to ensure accountability;
- 2. Calling upon the [European Commission](#) to encourage Member States to respect the rights of protestors in the coming years to safeguard freedom of expression and democratic participation;
- 3. Urging the [Council of the European Union](#) to provide transparent legal justifications before imposing bans on protests over the coming years to ensure accountability and protect citizens' rights to peaceful assembly;
- 4. Encouraging Member States to have equal protest rights for all harmless groups regardless of ethnicity, religion, or political opinion;
- 5. Further encouraging Member States to share transparency requirements regarding public financial support given to religious organisations;
- 6. Inviting Member States to establish independent oversight bodies to monitor state funding as well as to ensure equal treatment of all religious and non-religious communities;
- 7. Calling upon the European Commission to address the misuse of vague public safety laws restricting peaceful minority assemblies, such as LGBTQ+ Pride events, through legal enforcement, funding conditionality, and human rights monitoring to ensure compliance with the [Treaty on European Union](#);
- 8. Calling upon the European Commission to use legal encouragement, funding conditions, and human rights monitoring to ensure that Member States respect the fundamental rights of their citizens;
- 9. Supporting [Amnesty International](#) to use transparent communication campaigns to clearly explain new laws and reduce misinformation that may escalate protests into violence;



10. Recommending Member States, in line with the [European Convention on Human Rights](#), to strengthen transparency regarding police interference in protests by mandating the use of body-worn cameras for law enforcement and event officers during public assemblies to ensure accountability and prevent abuse of power;
11. Urging Member States to strengthen the protection of immigrants and minority groups from discriminatory policing during demonstrations to prevent abuse of power by upper authorities, such as the justification for suppressing criticism.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE (INTA)

Profiting from conflict: *Despite EU resolutions calling for an immediate halt to arms export to Saudi Arabia due to documented war crimes in Yemen, in 2023, several Member States resumed such operations. Moreover, war crimes evidence has been overlooked in other conflicts, where economic interest prevailed over humanitarian considerations. How should the EU evolve in its foreign policy to ensure ethics and economic interests are aligned?*

The European Youth Parliament aims to create a harmonised and legally binding oversight mechanism for arms export licences within the European Union by bridging the enforcement gap of Common Position 2008/944/CFSP² through supranational monitoring powers granted to the European External Action Service (EEAS)³. Furthermore, it seeks to ensure that ethical commitments and International Humanitarian Law (IHL)⁴ strictly supersede national economic and strategic interests in active conflict zones such as Yemen, while implementing rigorous ethical screening protocols for European Defence Fund (EDF)⁵ allocations in order to guarantee coherence between EU humanitarian aid and defence procurement policies,

Submitted by: Arhan Bora (TR), Duru Kaçar (TR), Salih Sarp Özkan (TR), Öykü Sadullohoğlu (TR), Ahmet Şükrü Ünal (TR), Ahmet Evren Yücel (TR), İpek Kara (Chairperson, TR)

Because

- A. The Common Position 2008/944/CFSP [lacks sufficient enforcement](#) and deterrence mechanisms to effectively prevent arms exports that lead to the violations of,
- B. The EU's economic dependence on trade relations with [states accused of violating EU arms export measures](#) undermines its [strategic autonomy](#) and its ability to uphold a coherent human rights-based foreign policy,
- C. Approximately [75%](#) of the EU's defence procurement is directed toward non-EU suppliers, causing economic leakage and constraining growth in the European defence industry,
- D. [European Defence Fund](#) overlooks the end-use and exports of funded weapon systems, including concerns surrounding [funding of Israeli state-owned defense](#) companies accused of contributing to the violations of IHL,

² [Common Position 2008/944/CFSP](#) of 8 December 2008 defining common rules governing control of exports of military technology and equipment.

³ [European External Action Service](#) serves as a de facto ministry of foreign affairs that implements the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and manages its diplomatic missions (delegations) worldwide.

⁴ [International Humanitarian Law](#), also known as the law of armed conflict or just in bello, is a set of international rules that seeks to limit the effects of armed conflict for humanitarian reasons.

⁵ [European Defence Fund](#) is an initiative managed by the European Commission aimed at fostering innovation, competitiveness, and cooperation within the European defense technological and industrial base.



- E. The lack of [transparency](#) and independent oversight in arms export licensing procedures limits democratic accountability and prevents effective monitoring of transfers linked to human rights violations,
- F. The [inconsistency](#) in implementation of EU arms export measures among Member States undermines the [coherence, credibility and effectiveness](#) of a unified EU foreign policy approach;

by

1. Calling upon the [Council of the EU](#) to adopt an amendment to the Common Position 2008/944/CFSP by introducing a suspension mechanism that freezes arms export licences to a destination where United Nations expert bodies have documented a clear risk of IHL violations in order to create a binding deterrence;
2. Encouraging Member States to participate and comply with the introduced documentation system in Common Position 2008/944/CFSP to maintain procedural unity in international export;
3. Recommending Member States to divide the amount of goods imported internationally between various countries, in order to reduce dependency to particular states and thus foster the EU's strategic autonomy;
4. Calling upon the [Directorate-General for Trade and Economic Security](#) to introduce a change in regulations on the export of dual-use goods⁶ and defence-related trade cooperation in order to balance economic profit with the prioritisation of IHL;
5. Requesting the [European Commission](#) to regulate the European Defence Fund to ensure that it refrains from funding weapon manufacturers that maintain trade relations with states who violate human rights, in order to protect civilian rights;
6. Urging Council Working Party on Conventional Arms Exports ([COARM](#)) to publish the Annual EU Arms Exports Report in a searchable format within six months of each licensing year, in order to enhance transparency and accessibility of arms export data;

⁶ [Dual-use goods](#): Products and technologies that can be used for both civilian and military purposes, also regulated by EU Regulation 2021/821.



7. Designating COARM to establish a monitoring advisory panel empowered to flag inconsistencies in Member State submissions in order to strengthen democratic accountability and real-time oversight of arms transfer decisions;
8. Urging all Member States to adopt a joint national implementation protocol for Common Position 2008/944/CFSP being liable to EU arms export measures with [EEAS](#), in order to reach a common approach on a unified EU foreign policy approach.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL LIBERTIES, JUSTICE AND HOME AFFAIRS (LIBE)

The Data Divide: *The use of AI is spreading expeditiously on different frameworks and workspaces, including border security across the EU. This widespread use of AI tools, especially decision-making ones, which concerns the committee most, may disrupt the mechanisms and algorithms of these tools and cause them to have biases on a large scale, as reported by several investigative journalists. With the EU AI Act now in force, which specific safeguards and applications should the EU put in force for the prevention of such discriminative and biased cases?*

The European Youth Parliament aims to ensure that Artificial Intelligence (AI) used in asylum and migration procedures respects the fundamental rights, dignity and psychological well-being of refugees. Due to the growth of automated discrimination, invasive surveillance and the black-box effect, the committee seeks to establish transparent and human-centred AI systems capable of recognising linguistic, cultural and psychological nuances in order to avoid the misinterpretation of trauma-related behaviour as suspicious conduct, while guaranteeing applicants the right to understandable explanations, human review, and legal objection mechanisms,

Submitted by: Naz Bayramoğlu (TR), Damla Küçükler (TR), Kemal Utku Çavdar (TR), Egor Ganiuchenko (TR), Rawan Mohammed Kanan (TR), Elif Özdemir (TR), Derin Ada Taşkın (TR), Ata Şengül (TR), Hamza Gümüşel (Chairperson, TR)

Because

- A. Due to the AI used in the EU being trained based on the Eurocentric approach, [AI discriminates against individuals](#) who are not from EU regions,
- B. The existence of the black-box effect⁷ in AI at border security [impairs the confidentiality rights](#) of the refugees to be informed about their application process,
- C. The applications can be misunderstood by AI systems' emotion detection tools [due to the applicants' trauma](#),
- D. [Refugees' rising stress](#) due to the tensions within and against their country might reflect on their [border security check procedure](#) negatively,

⁷ The **Black-Box Effect** is where the receiver (the human) is aware of the input and output variables, but the transmission process between them is hindered or not accessible to them.



- E. Since machine learning algorithms are [trained on historical datasets](#), the datasets provided to AI may include racist and discriminatory observations made by past border officials,
- F. [The loss of objectivity in AI resulting from biased coding](#) leads to the software misinterpreting and misclassifying legitimate expressions of vulnerable asylum seekers,
- G. The AI can only provide online service and [cannot intervene in the procedure physically](#), such as assistance in case of an emergency;

by

1. Asking the European Network for AI Safety ([ENAI](#)S) to mandate the activation of a multi-agent system that evaluates the asylum seeker on different aspects to filter the Eurocentric bias and define the outcome;
2. Encouraging the [European AI Office](#) to establish an AI system to provide additional feedback to the applicants about the reasoning of their selection outcome;
3. Recommending ENAI S to introduce 2-factor authorisation, encrypting local AI networks, and securing & scanning those AI networks for breaches and alterations;
4. Requesting Member States to ensure that AI systems are capable of understanding human psychology and responding adequately to those who have experienced a traumatic event;
5. Encouraging the [European Network of National Human Rights Institutions](#) to program human-like and welcoming “Safe AI” systems to accompany applicants and combat increased stress;
6. Demanding that the [European AI Board](#) and national border authorities prevent automated discrimination by implementing safeguards such as:
 - a. forcing tech experts to test all AI for bias before they are allowed to be used,
 - b. deleting any flawed past dataset that contains regional or racial profiling,
 - c. turning off any software that shows higher error rates for refugees until the code is completely fixed;
7. Inviting the [European Union Agency for Asylum](#) to calibrate the AI in order to differentiate the different linguistic nuances;
8. Demanding the [European Commission](#) to freeze all financial funding for AI projects until a mandatory safety check that will be conducted by the [European Data Protection Board](#) proves the software does not discriminate against asylum seekers;
9. Suggesting the [European Union Agency for the Operational Management of Large-Scale IT Systems in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice](#) to provide the AI used by the border



patrol with direct access to emergency hotlines to minimise the damage in times of possible armed attacks.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS (AFCO)

The Democracy Deficit: *The EU's Rule of Law Conditionality Regulation, used against Hungary and Poland, has proven slow and politically contested. The European Court of Justice has upheld the mechanism, but disbursements have resumed in cases where reforms remain incomplete. How should the EU strengthen its rule of law conditionality mechanisms to ensure that structural funds are not disbursed to member states that undermine judicial independence?*

The European Youth Parliament aims to achieve judicial independence by reinforcing the Rule of Law Conditionality Mechanism⁸. We aim to make the freezing of the funds for Member States that are in violation of this mechanism a faster and more efficient process. We hope to make the disbursement of the funds a clearer procedure by achieving greater transparency over financial assets. Through these implementations, we aim to protect the citizens and local communities from suffering due to governmental misconduct.

Submitted by: Balamir Aden Halaç (TR), Diana Demir (TR), Ekin Su Atmaca (TR), Lara Dağ (TR), Mert Kircaburun (TR), Sena Erarslan (TR), Yağmur Suna Arslan (TR), Rüya Atalağ (Chairperson, TR)

Because

- A. The [ineffectiveness](#) of Article 7⁹ procedures does not allow timely action against rule of law violations,
- B. Freezing a Member State's funds may [negatively affect](#) citizens, local communities, and educational institutions, instead of only targeting governments,
- C. The Member States are not [fully immersed](#) in the regulations due to [sanctions not being implemented enough](#),
- D. Member States may [misuse](#) the funds due to the lack of a sufficiently strict disbursement system,
- E. The evaluation of the rule of law violations [is not trusted](#) because it is [politically influenced](#),
- F. The pressure from the EU's overfunding drives Member States away from providing [transparent information](#) regarding their financial assets;

⁸ [The Rule of Law Conditionality Mechanism](#) is an EU regulation that allows the Union to restrict funding to member states that violate fundamental rule-of-law principles.

⁹ [Article 7](#) of the Treaty on European Union is an enforcement mechanism designed to protect the EU by addressing violations.



by

1. Encouraging the European Anti-Fraud Office ([OLAF](#)) to provide legal teams for the countries undergoing the Article 7 procedure until it is resolved, replacing the teams if needed during the process without halting proceedings;
2. Inviting the Directorate General for Budget ([DG BUDG](#)) to create budgets specifically for national institutions and communities in order to ensure that citizens are not affected by the sanctions of the mechanism;
3. Recommending the Directorate General for International Partnerships ([DG INTPA](#)) to propose new laws by using the right of initiative¹⁰ and addressing every punishment with clarity;
4. Further encouraging the Directorate General of the Economic and Financial Affairs ([DG ECFIN](#)) to employ a team of financial consultants to act as an advisory body while determining the amount of recovery funds given directly to relevant institutions to get ahead of potential misuse of the funds;
5. Advising the DG INTPA to assist national courts of EU Member States in picking jurors from different regions;
6. Proposing a collaboration between OLAF and the [European Public Prosecutor's Office](#) to form a team of ambassadors from the member states that will contribute to the supervising process of the Member States that violate the rule of law.

¹⁰ [The right of legislative initiative](#) is defined as the power to formally propose a new law or bill to a legislature.



MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND DEFENCE (SEDE)

The security paradox: State-sponsored cyberattacks against EU energy grids, hospitals, and electoral systems have increased sharply since 2022. The Cyber Solidarity Act, adopted in 2024, establishes a European Cybersecurity Shield, but voluntary coordination mechanisms have historically proven insufficient against sophisticated actors such as Russia-linked groups. How should the EU strengthen its Cyber Solidarity Act to create a coherent collective defense against state-sponsored cyberattacks targeting critical infrastructure?

The European Youth Parliament aims to strengthen the EU's collective cybersecurity defence by establishing mandatory and coordinated mechanisms against state-sponsored cyberattacks targeting critical infrastructure. It further aims to reduce inequalities in cybersecurity capabilities among Member States through unified recovery frameworks, AI-powered threat detection systems, and equal cooperation between nations. Lastly, it aims to improve digital literacy and cybersecurity preparedness among both citizens and institutions to build a more resilient and secure European Union,

Submitted by: Emir ARAS (TR), Fahrettin Hasan BACAK (TR), Altuğ BÜYÜKKAYIKÇI (TR), Ali Deniz KIZGUT (TR), Azra ÖZDEMİR (TR), Artin ROSHANFAR (TR), Kamilla SİLUYANOVA (TR), Suna SUNELCAN (TR), Deva TOPÇUOĞLU (TR), Zeynep Sevgi AKSOY (TR), Ada Sarp KIRIK (Chairperson, TR)

Because

- A. The significant [differences](#) in cybersecurity capabilities and digital infrastructure among EU Member States, which [hinder coordinated responses](#) to cyberattacks and demonstrate that individual states are not sufficiently equipped to address such threats alone,
- B. The [Cyber Solidarity Act](#)'s reliance on voluntary cooperation, which has proven insufficient against [state-sponsored cyberattacks](#),
- C. The use of [AI by state-sponsored hacker groups](#) to conduct faster and more adaptive cyberattacks on critical infrastructure outpaces the EU's detection and capabilities,
- D. Nearly half of EU citizens lack [basic digital skills](#), and the EU faces a shortage of approximately [299,000 cybersecurity professionals](#),
- E. The lack of a [unified](#) EU-level recovery framework is causing an increase in cyberattacks targeting critical infrastructures,
- F. The [lack of trust](#) between Member States prevents effective cooperation while leaving cybersecurity efforts fragmented and inefficient;



by

1. Inviting the [European Commission](#) to establish a unified EU Cyber Response Authority to:
 - a. coordinate cybersecurity responses across all Member States,
 - b. operate with full independence from all political bodies and Member States,
 - c. hire employees and white hat hackers¹¹ drawn equally from all Member States, ensuring no single country will hold less than 2% and more than 15% of positions,
 - d. aim to deploy emergency resources to support weaker Member States;
2. Calling upon the European Commission to introduce a hybrid EU cybersecurity cooperation mechanism to:
 - a. establish a four-tier cyberattack severity system, holding the sole authority to classify the urgency and importance of each incident,
 - b. maintain voluntary coordination for low and medium-level threats, allowing Member States to manage smaller incidents with flexible cross-border support,
 - c. require mandatory collective response from all Member States for high and critical level incidents, particularly those targeting critical infrastructure or involving state-sponsored actors, ensuring no attack at this level goes unanswered;
3. Recommending the European Union Agency for Cybersecurity ([ENISA](#)) mandate periodic AI red-teaming exercises¹² for all critical infrastructure operators to identify and address vulnerabilities before they are exploited by state-sponsored hackers;
4. Supporting ENISA to establish an EU-wide AI-powered threat detection system enabling real-time identification of cyberattacks on critical infrastructure across Member States;
5. Encouraging the [Directorate-General on Communications Networks, Content and Technology](#) to promote cybersecurity education for students from middle school to high school, and seminars that adults could join to increase their knowledge about cybersecurity technologies;
6. Further recommending the European Commission to establish a mandatory Common Cyber Recovery Framework requiring Member States to implement standardised restoration protocols for critical infrastructure within 18 months of adoption;

¹¹ [White-hat hackers](#): cybersecurity experts who legally identify, test, and help fix vulnerabilities in computer systems, networks, or software in order to improve security and prevent malicious cyberattacks.

¹² [AI red-teaming](#): the practice of simulating cyberattacks on AI systems to identify vulnerabilities and improve security before real attacks occur.



7. Encouraging the European Commission to strengthen the [European Cyber Shield](#) established under the Cyber Solidarity Act through the standardisation of anonymised threat metadata¹³ sharing within cross-border cyber hubs in order to improve trust and cooperation while respecting national sovereignty and data protection regulations.

¹³ **Metadata:** data that provides information about other data, such as the time, source, type, location, or characteristics of a digital activity or communication, without necessarily revealing the actual content itself.



INITIATED BY:



SPONSORED BY:



SUPPORTED BY:



IN PARTNERSHIP WITH:



EUROPEAN **YOUTH** PARLIAMENT
TÜRKİYE

