



To the kind attention of
President of the European Commission,
Ms Ursula von der Leyen
Executive Vice-President and
Commissioner for Social Rights and Skills
Ms Roxana Mînzatu
Commissioner for Democracy, Justice,
the Rule of Law and Consumer Protection
Mr Michael McGrath

Brussels, 11 December 2025

Dear President von der Leyen,
Dear Commissioner Mînzatu,
Dear Commissioner McGrath,

We are writing to draw your attention to three recent project review reports issued by the European Education and Culture Executive Agency concerning projects 101161785 (YA 2024), 101161773 (WYAE OG 2024) and 101134732 (WHGD), assigned to the World Youth Alliance – Europe (REG Number 761301733102-03).

Taken together, these projects amount to more than EUR 400,000. Given the significance of the funds involved and the sensitive nature of the assessments carried out by the Agency, we believe that institutional clarification is necessary regarding the methodology, criteria and respect for political neutrality that the Commission and its executive agencies are obliged to uphold.

A comprehensive analysis of the reports reveals several concerns regarding the correct application of the Grant Agreement. In several sections, non-binding resolutions of the European Parliament – notably the one of 24 June 2021 on sexual and reproductive health and rights – are used as if they were legally binding sources and as if beneficiaries were under an obligation to align with

them. The Grant Agreement does not reference these acts as normative standards, and their use as compliance criteria introduces elements that are neither foreseen in the contract nor compatible with the Treaties.



A further and particularly troubling issue is the reliance on political documents that did not even exist at the time the projects were designed, approved or implemented. References made to the EU LGBTIQ Equality Strategy 2026–2030 (adopted in October 2025) and to the Roadmap for Women’s Rights (Commission Communication of March 2025) illustrate this clearly. These instruments postdate both the call for proposals and the implementation period of the grants concerned. Not only are they non-binding communications, but their retroactive application as compliance benchmarks appears incompatible with the principles of legal certainty and non-retroactivity, which are essential to the proper administration of EU funding.

Equally concerning is the highly expansive interpretation of Article 14 of the Grant Agreement, which is meant to refer to the core values of the Union. The reports suggest that an organisation would be considered non-compliant if it promotes an anthropological view that recognises human dignity from conception or upholds the family as a fundamental unit of society. These positions, deeply rooted in Europe’s cultural tradition, are portrayed as incompatible with Erasmus+, even though they clearly fall within the ethical, religious and associative freedoms protected by the Charter of Fundamental Rights. The implication — which we deem unacceptable — is that numerous Catholic, Christian, pro-family or otherwise traditional-value organisations would no longer be eligible for EU funding.

Furthermore, the reports label certain materials as “disinformation” merely because they do not adhere to the so-called “comprehensive sexuality education” model or because they present approaches based on abstinence or

natural family planning. No scientific evidence, methodological comparison or objective justification is provided to substantiate this serious claim. Divergence from particular political positions of the Union is treated as if it constituted a breach of EU values, creating a dangerous precedent and potentially transforming Erasmus+ and Youth from instruments of inclusion and dialogue into mechanisms of ideological conformity.



Another issue of concern is the reference made in the reports to an alleged lack of “contradictory perspectives” or balance. This observation appears questionable, especially considering that many EU-funded projects — through Erasmus+, DG SANTE, DG JUST and other programmes — are entirely devoted to the promotion of abortion, SRHR policies or gender ideology, without any form of pluralism or countervailing viewpoint. We would hence like to understand if the demand for “contradictory perspectives” is being applied consistently and coherently across programmes. The danger is that this principle is invoked selectively, primarily to penalise organisations that adhere to traditional anthropological or ethical frameworks.

In light of these concerns, we request that the Commission clarify whether it considers it appropriate for an executive agency to use politically oriented, non-binding acts as compliance benchmarks; whether Article 14 of the Grant Agreement can be interpreted as authorising the imposition of specific ethical, bioethical or anthropological positions; whether dissent from particular political positions of the Union may be considered a violation of EU values; and whether the Commission intends to verify that EACEA evaluations respect the principle of neutrality and ensure equal access to Erasmus+ and Youth programmes for all associations, including those upholding traditional views of life, family and the human person.

Furthermore, we ask the Commission to clarify what safeguards are in place

to ensure that project reviewers apply EU legislation objectively and expertly, and that they do not introduce into grant calls or evaluations political interpretations or positions that reflect a biased perspective; to confirm that education, family policy and bioethical matters — including those related to reproductive health — remain areas of national competence that cannot be indirectly harmonised through funding programmes; and to reaffirm that civil society beneficiaries of EU grants are free to hold and express their own ethical, anthropological or religious positions, within the limits of EU law, without fear of losing access to European programmes solely on the basis of such views.



Given the implications for democratic pluralism, legal certainty for beneficiaries and the credibility of the European institutions, we look forward to receiving a formal and timely response.

Kind regards,

Mr. Paolo Inselvini, MEP

Mr. Stephen Nikola Bartulica, MEP

Ms. Miriam Lexman, MEP

Mr. Bert-Jan Ruissen, MEP

Mr. Sergio Berlato, MEP

Mr. Dominik Tarczynski, MEP

Mr. Karlo Ressler, MEP

Mr. Michele Picaro, MEP

Ms. Mariateresa Vivaldini, MEP

Ms. Laurence Trochu, MEP

Mr. Geadis Geadis, MEP

Ms. Nora Junco García, MEP

Mr. Diego Solier, MEP

Mr. Jacek Ozdoba, MEP

Mr. Claudiu Târziu, MEP