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# Annex 1 Policy documents adopted in the Open Method of Coordination in the youth field in 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of action</th>
<th>Level of attention</th>
<th>Policy documents adopted by the Council of the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Council Recommendation of 2012 on the validation of non-formal and informal learning[^1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Employment and entrepreneurship | High | - Council Conclusions on the active inclusion of young people: combating unemployment and poverty (ES PRES, 2010)  
- Council Resolution on the structured dialogue with young people on youth employment (HU PRES, 2011)  
- Council Conclusions on maximising the potential of youth policy in addressing the goals of the Europe 2020 Strategy (IE PRES, 2013)  
- Council Conclusions on promoting youth entrepreneurship to foster social inclusion of young people (EL PRES, 2014) |
| Social inclusion | High | - Council Conclusions on the participation and social inclusion of young people with emphasis on those with a migrant background (CY PRES, 2012)  
- Council Conclusions on the contribution of quality youth work to the development, well-being and social inclusion of young people (IE PRES, 2013)  
- Council Conclusions on enhancing the social inclusion of youth not in employment, education or training (LT, 2013)  
- Council Resolution on the overview of structured dialogue on social inclusion (EL PRES, 2014) |
| Health and well-being | Low | No policy document adopted in the youth field |
| Youth participation | High | - Council Resolution on encouraging new and effective forms of participation of all young people in democratic life in Europe (HU, 2011)  
- Council Conclusions on the participation and social inclusion of young people with emphasis on those with a migrant background (CY PRES, 2012)  
- Council Resolution on the structured dialogue on youth participation (CY, 2012)  
- Council Conclusions on promoting young people’s access to rights in order to foster their autonomy and participation in civil society (IT PRES, 2014) |
| Voluntary activities | Medium | - Council Resolution on youth work (BE PRES, 2010)  
- Council Conclusions on the Eastern dimension of youth participation and mobility (PL PRES, 2011) |
| Culture and creativity | Medium | - Council Conclusions of access of young people to culture (BE PRES, 2010)  
- Council Conclusions on fostering the creative and innovative potential of young people (DK PRES, 2012) |
| Youth and the world | Low | No policy document adopted in the youth field |

[^1]: ICF analysis based on the Council Conclusions / Resolutions adopted in the youth field in 2010-2014

[^1]: Adopted under the ET 2020 framework, but with contribution from the youth field.
# Annex 2  Overview of national interviews conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Youth Ministry / Dpmt</th>
<th>Other Ministry</th>
<th>Volunteering org.</th>
<th>Erasmus + agency</th>
<th>Youth Council</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeFR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeNL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Youth Ministry / Dpmt</td>
<td>Other Ministry org.</td>
<td>Volunteering + agency</td>
<td>Erasmus + agency</td>
<td>Youth Council</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norther Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3  Breakdown of surveys’ responses and targets

In the table below, response rates are presented against desired targets. Targets were calculated on the basis of the share of young people aged 15-29 in the EU28\(^1\) present in each country. This share, expressed in percentage, was then applied to the general targets of 150 responses of the survey for youth organisations and 1000 responses of the survey for young Europeans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Youth Organisation</th>
<th>Target Youth Org</th>
<th>Young Europeans</th>
<th>Target Young People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third countries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>250</td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>719</strong></td>
<td><strong>1050</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Eurostat data, [demo_pjan] accessed on the 26/08/2015
## Annex 4  Examples of effects of the structured dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy recommendations at EU Youth Conferences</th>
<th>Political outcomes</th>
<th>Policy initiatives or actions implemented at EU level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[...] 'Since internships are a valuable tool for a smooth transition to the labour market, a quality framework is needed to guarantee the educational value of such experience.' (HU, 2011)</td>
<td>Council Resolution of 19 May 2011 on the structured dialogue with young people on youth employment mentions that a 'quality framework for internships is desirable in order to guarantee the educational value of such experience'. Council conclusions from 17 June 2011 on 'Promoting youth employment to achieve the Europe 2020 objectives' invited the Commission to provide guidance on conditions for high quality traineeships by means of a quality framework for traineeships. Council Recommendation of 10 March 2014 on a Quality Framework for Traineeships – includes a reference to the Council Resolution on structured dialogue and to the Council Conclusions of 17 June 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Improve flexibility as well as security for young people to combine employment with further education, training, voluntary activities and private life' (HU, 2011)</td>
<td>In its conclusions of 17 June 2011 on promoting youth employment to achieve the 'Europe 2020' objectives, the Council invited Member States to intervene rapidly by offering further education, (re)-training or activation measures for NEETs, including early school-leavers.</td>
<td>Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Create a European Employment Service fostering employment mobility for young people by supporting job search and facilitating all additional procedures, including housing, insurance and linguistic support' (HU, 2011)</td>
<td>Council Resolution of 19 May 2011 states that 'promoting easier access for all young people to a youth-friendly, quality information about the labour market is crucial'</td>
<td>Your first EURES job portal was launched in 2012 to provide job-search, recruitment and financial support for young jobseekers willing to work abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'There should be a program funded by the EU allowing Eastern European and Caucasus youth organisations to cooperate sustainably and in varying ways with EU youth organisations' (PL, 2011)</td>
<td>Council Conclusions of November 2011 invited the Commission to 'continue fostering youth cooperation between the EU and Eastern Partnership countries in the framework of the Eastern Partnership youth programme'</td>
<td>The Commission created the 'Eastern Partnership Youth Window' within the Youth in Action Programme and allocated additional funds of 31.5 million euro for 2012-2013 in order to increase the number of projects for cooperation among young people and youth organisations from the European Union and Eastern Partnership countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'The existing European Youth Council Conclusions of the Commission launched a new programme'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 It ran as a pilot between 2012 and mid-2015. This "preparatory action" was financed by the EU budget years 2011-2013. The aim was to help young EU citizens aged 18-30 find a job, traineeship or apprenticeship in any EU country. As of 2014, Your first EURES Job is financed under the EURES axis of the EaSI programme.

3 Council Conclusions on the Eastern dimension of youth participation and mobility, of November 2011, OJ C372.
### Policy recommendations at EU Youth Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political outcomes</th>
<th>Policy initiatives or actions implemented at EU level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2011 called upon the Commission to ‘adapt the European Youth Portal to make it useful and accessible for all young people, from all across Europe, including the EEC’</td>
<td>A Council Recommendation on the validation of non-formal and informal learning was adopted in December 2012. It recognises youth organisations among the key stakeholders with an important role to play in facilitating opportunities for non-formal and informal learning and validation processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EU and Member States should recognise youth organisations as a channel for developing the skills and competences of young people, especially youth with fewer opportunities, and promote the positive effect of volunteering and non-formal education (DK, 2012)

Council Conclusions of May 2012 call upon Member States to ‘facilitate and improve the recognition and validation of non-formal and informal learning’ and invited the Commission to ‘make a proposal for a Council recommendation on the validation of non-formal and informal learning’

A Council Recommendation on the validation of non-formal and informal learning was adopted in December 2012. It recognises youth organisations among the key stakeholders with an important role to play in facilitating opportunities for non-formal and informal learning and validation processes.

‘Member States should provide sustainable support (financial, human resources, services) to NWGs, recognising the leading role of the National Youth Councils, to implement the Structured Dialogue at local, regional and national level’; ‘Erasmus+ should include a specific sub-action for the NWGs, avoiding competition with other applicants, with deadlines matching the architecture of the Structured Dialogue process for the 18 months cycle’. (Review of the Structured Dialogue, Nov 2013)

Council Resolution of May 2014 on the overview of the structured dialogue process including social inclusion of young people mentioned that ‘under the Erasmus+ programme, enhanced funding opportunities are made available to support the Structured Dialogue including direct annual grants to the National Working Groups’.

Annual grants to the National Working Groups are provided through a specific action under KA 3 ‘Support for policy reform’ of the Erasmus+ programme since 2014

---

4. Council Conclusions of 11 May 2012 on fostering the creative and innovative potential of young people, OJ C169

---

March, 2016
Annex 5  List of outputs produced under the Mutual Learning instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mandate and issues discussed</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Groups</td>
<td>Expert Group on the mobility of young volunteers across the EU</td>
<td>The first meeting was held in October 2009, the last one in May 2013. Working groups were established to exchange good practice.</td>
<td>Examples of discussions: the Future of the EVS post-YiA/2013; links to the EUYS and Europe 2020 and with the European Year of Volunteering; results of existing longitudinal research on the impact of volunteering in the UK “Measuring the impossible”; results of the EU-CoE youth partnership seminar on cross-border volunteering of young people with fewer opportunities etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Group on the Implementation of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers</td>
<td>It was established for interested Member States (SL, CZ, HU, LT, EL, BE, DE, UK) to facilitate the implementation of the Recommendation by identifying ways and means of cooperation and through the exchange of information and best practices. It met in March 2010.</td>
<td>Issues discussed: Quality Assurance through the development of self-assessment tools; state of play of several EU initiatives toward the recognition of non-formal and informal learning (European Portfolio for Youth workers and Youth leaders,</td>
<td>Four documents collecting good practice and recommendations were produced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mandate and issues discussed</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youthpass); challenges/opportunities regarding mobility of youth workers and those in youth organisations etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expert Group on "indicators in the youth field"

The first meeting was held in January 2010, the last one on November 2013. Members included CZ, LT, EE; Austria; Belgium; Cyprus; Czech Republic; Denmark; Estonia; European Commission; Finland; France; Germany; Greece; Hungary; Ireland; Latvia; Lithuania; Luxembourg; Malta; Montenegro; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Serbia; Slovakia; Slovenia; Spain; Sweden; The Netherlands; United Kingdom.

The aim was to develop indicators for the EUYS to achieve a thorough understanding of the general living and working situation of young people. This group was given two tasks (1) propose a dashboard of indicators in the areas of education, employment, social inclusion and health; and (2) provide an overview of possible new indicators in 'core' youth policy areas where they do not yet exist, such as youth participation, volunteering, creativity and culture, youth in the world and for NEETs.

Examples of discussions: recommendations to improve the dashboard of youth indicators, e.g. availability of data (in terms of country and age group coverage) and continuity in data collection to analyse trends and developments; communication around the dashboard, its labelling and its links with other policy tools.

A report presenting the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mandate and issues discussed</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Group on</td>
<td>&quot;youth work to address the challenges young people are facing, in particular the transition from education to employment&quot;</td>
<td>The group identified and analysed a number of challenges faced by young people. It also aimed to identify good practices and youth work core principles.</td>
<td>The contribution of youth work to address the challenges young people are facing, in particular the transition from education to employment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;youth work</td>
<td>&quot;quality systems in EU Member States&quot;</td>
<td>The first meeting was held in 2014, the last one in 2015. Members were: AT, BE, CZ, DE, DK, EE, FI, FR, HU, IE LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK.</td>
<td>A report presenting the work of the expert group was published in 2015: &quot;Quality Youth Work – A common framework for the further development of youth work&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-formal</td>
<td>The first meeting was held in December 2012, the group has met on a further 8 occasions until the 2014.</td>
<td>A final report on the work of the expert group was published in May 2014: “Developing the creative and innovative potential of young people through non-formal learning in ways that are relevant to employability”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences and</td>
<td>CZ seminar on youth volunteering with Visegrad and Eastern Partnership countries, Prague/Czech Republic - 9-10 September 2014</td>
<td>Information was presented on youth volunteering in Visegrad and Eastern Partnership countries and their participation to EU funded programmes, e.g. the EaP Youth Window 2012-2013 of the former Youth in Action Programme allowed 34 000 young people from Programme and EaP countries to take part in youth exchanges and mobility; SALTO EECA provides figures for EVS in EaP countries: in 2005 50 young people from EaP countries took part in EVS, the number has grown to 500 in 2014. Since 2010 273 hosting or sending organisations have been accredited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterCITY Conferences</td>
<td>“European Peer Europe” representing local in November 2014, of</td>
<td>The 1st conference12 gathered nearly 100 people around culminated in the setup, of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mandate and issues discussed</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning on Local Youth Policy(^{11}) youth work. The aim of the 3 InterCity Youth – the day meeting was to promote European Network of peer learning and networking Local Departments for of local youth work in Europe. Youth Work. The aim of the 2(^{nd}) InterCITY Conference was (1) to develop peer learning as a Europe-wide practice in youth work and beyond and (2) to establish a European Network of Local Government Youth Work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Peer-learning activities on cross-sectoral youth policy; Peer learning activities on e-participation; Peer-learning group on "creative and innovative potential of young people; Peer-learning activities organised under the partnership between the Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of youth

\(^{12}\) 1st one in Leipzig, 10 -12 October 2012; 2nd conference in Helsinki/Finland in December 2013; 3rd conference in Hertogenbosch/NL, 9th to 11th November 2014.
### Annex 6  List of interviews conducted

#### Table 1. Persons interviewed during Inception Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position in organisation</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>DG EAC Unit C1</td>
<td>Principal Administrator</td>
<td>EU level</td>
<td>31-Mar-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>DG EAC Unit C1</td>
<td>Principal Administrator</td>
<td>EU level</td>
<td>01-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>DG EAC Unit C1</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Unit</td>
<td>EU level</td>
<td>09-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>DG EAC Unit C1</td>
<td>Principal Administrator</td>
<td>EU level</td>
<td>15-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>DG EAC</td>
<td>Former Director of Youth</td>
<td>EU level</td>
<td>07-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Youth Forum</td>
<td>Policy and Advocacy Coordinator</td>
<td>EU level</td>
<td>07-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-fl</td>
<td>Flemish Ministry for Youth</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>National level</td>
<td>08-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Czech Ministry for Youth</td>
<td>Director for Youth</td>
<td>National level</td>
<td>10-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>DG EAC</td>
<td>Former Head of Unit C1</td>
<td>EU level</td>
<td>09-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>National Agency of Germany for Europa</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>National level</td>
<td>10-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2. In-depth interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Member of the Secretariat of the European Youth Information and Counselling Agency (ERYICA)</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>30-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Commission, DG Research &amp; Innovation - unit B6</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>1-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Council of Europe or other international partner</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>6-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Commission, DG REGIO</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>7-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EYCA office</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>9-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion</td>
<td>Commission, DG EU</td>
<td>16-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Council of Europe or other international partner</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>16-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Council of Europe or other international partner</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>22-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EU/European organisations organisations</td>
<td>federations of Youth EU</td>
<td>24-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EU/European organisations organisations</td>
<td>federations of Youth EU</td>
<td>24-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EU/European organisations organisations</td>
<td>federations of Youth EU</td>
<td>22-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EU/European organisations organisations</td>
<td>federations of Youth EU</td>
<td>21-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Date of interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EU/European organisations federations of Youth organisations</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>6-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EU/European organisations federations of Youth organisations</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>21-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Employment, Inclusion Commission, Social Affairs and DG EU</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>30-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>EYCA office EU</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>7-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth National</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth National</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth National</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus + National</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>National Youth Council National</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-de</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus + National</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-de</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth National</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-fr</td>
<td>National Youth Council National</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-fr</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering National</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-fr</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth National</td>
<td></td>
<td>28-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-nl</td>
<td>National Youth Council National</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-nl</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus + National</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-nl</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth National</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-nl</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus + National</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth National</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>National Youth Council National</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering National</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Ministry of Education National</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>National Youth Council National</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus + National</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>National Youth Council National</td>
<td></td>
<td>28-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth National</td>
<td></td>
<td>28-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth National</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Date of interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>14-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>16-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>29-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>2-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>24-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>26-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>6-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>19-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>12-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>16-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Youth Work Center</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>18-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>24-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>28-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>23-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>6-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>11-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>18-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>29-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>7-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Ministry of Cities, Youth and Sports</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>5-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Ile de France - decentralized department of state Regional Directorate for Youth, Sports and Social Cohesion</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>1-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>CNAJEP</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>13-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Date of interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>14-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>24-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>2-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>4-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>6-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>24-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>18-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>8-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>16-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>17-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>4-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>8-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Permanent Representation of Latvia to the EU</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>15-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>10-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Ministry responsible for youth policy</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>13-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Permanent representation of Lithuania to the EU</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>14-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>20-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>16-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>15-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>23-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>1-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>30-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>29-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>18-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Date of interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>19-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>26-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>10-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>16-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>28-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>29-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>4-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>5-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>15-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>16-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>21-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>21-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>23-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>25-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>7-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>13-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>6-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>7-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>3-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>21-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>19-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>20-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>23-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>28-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>31-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Date of interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>National agency in charge of Youth in Action / Erasmus +</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>25-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>30-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Ministry in charge of Youth</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>21-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>14-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>National / local organisation engaged in cross-border volunteering</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>16-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Case study interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Child and Youth Impact Assessment ('Youth Check')</td>
<td>Bundes Jugend Vertretung - National Youth Council</td>
<td>1-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Ombudsman for Children</td>
<td>10-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Family and Youth, Division 5, 08-Jan-16 Competence Centre for Youth</td>
<td>23-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Department, Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports</td>
<td>9-Oct-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Chamber of Children and Youth</td>
<td>9-Oct-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Service- and Transfer Agency EU Youth Strategy at JUGEND für Europa</td>
<td>Service- und Transferstelle EU-Jugendstrategie JUGEND für Europa</td>
<td>Nov-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representative of Sachsen Anhalt to the EU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representative of Brandenburg to the EU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>InterCity Youth – the European Network of Local Departments for Youth Work</td>
<td>JUGEND für Europa, Germany</td>
<td>29-Sep-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Helsinki</td>
<td>7-Oct-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL/SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Municipality of Hertogenbosch/ KEKS, Quality and Competence in Cooperation, the Swedish network of local departments for youth work</td>
<td>29-Sep-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>International Volunteering Opportunities for All</td>
<td>Project partner</td>
<td>11-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>International Volunteering Opportunities for All</td>
<td>Department of Youth, Non-Formal Education, and Voluntary Organizations, Ministry for Urban Policy, Youth, and Sports</td>
<td>13-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project partner</td>
<td>13-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Service Department, Ministry of Education, Children, and Youth</td>
<td>13-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project partner</td>
<td>12-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Better Outcomes Brighter Futures - The national policy</td>
<td>National Youth Council of Ireland</td>
<td>10-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Innovation Unit at the Department of</td>
<td>11-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Date of interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Youth Expert Coordination Forum</td>
<td>Ministry for Human Capacities, Office of the State Deputy</td>
<td>23-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Former member of Ministry for the Human Capacities</td>
<td>14-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EuroDesk</td>
<td>8-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>New Law on Volunteering</td>
<td>ProVobis</td>
<td>4-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOLUM Federation</td>
<td>9-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Chamber of the Romanian Parliament</td>
<td>10-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Agency for Erasmus+</td>
<td>12-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Implementation of a transversal youth policy and creation of a White Book on Youth (Livro Branco da Juventude)</td>
<td>Portuguese Sport and Youth Institute (IPDJ)</td>
<td>10-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECOS (Youth organisation)</td>
<td>18-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
<td>18-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>2013-2022 National Youth Programme (Resolucijo o nacionalnem programu za mladino 2013-2022)</td>
<td>Former member of staff of the Slovenian National Youth Centre</td>
<td>18-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office for Youth</td>
<td>24-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science and Sport</td>
<td>24-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation by email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 7  Case Studies
Case Study: National Youth Strategy of the Czech Republic for 2014-2020

Basic facts
- **Country / EU level:** Czech Republic
- **Positive change introduced** (name): National Youth Strategy for 2014-2020
- **Description of the change:**
  - **Type of change:** Introduction of a new national youth strategy
  - **Date when the change was introduced:** 12th May 2014.
  - **Policy field:** education and training; employment and entrepreneurship; health & well-being; participation; voluntary activities; social inclusion; creativity and culture; youth and the world.
  - **Level at which the change was introduced:** National level.
  - **Beneficiaries of the change:** Policy-makers, youth organisations and/or those working with young people, youth, youth researchers.
  - **Other stakeholders involved:**
    - The National Chamber of Youth that is an advisory board to the Minister of Education in the Czech Republic, consisting of the following representatives – all involved ministries, National Agency for the Erasmus+, youth work organisations, Czech Council for Children and Youth, regional and local authorities’ representatives in charge of the youth policy implementation, employers, church;
    - Slovak National Agency for the Erasmus+ (IUVENTA);
    - Other officials from the Slovak Ministry of Education;
    - Experts and young people consulted through structured dialogue and round tables
  - **Expected outcomes:** Improvements in the situation of young people in the Czech Republic; youth research development; more cross-sectorial cooperation; better functioning of the volunteering sector; development of youth work and non-formal learning sector; making youth sector more inclusive; improvement in international youth mobility of Czech young people; increase in the status of youth policy among the national priority areas.
  - **Financial information:** National, regional and local budget and also a combination of EU programmes and funds (European Social Fund, Erasmus+).
  - **Preliminary evidence of the EU Youth Strategy’ influence on the change:**
    - **Implementation instrument which contributed to the change:** mutual learning (peer-learning project among the Czech Republic, Germany, France, Belgium, Lithuania, Netherlands, and Sweden 2011-2013); progress-reporting 2012 (national youth report of Czech Republic); Structured Dialogue; evidence-based policy-making (youth research in CZ).
    - **Other elements of the EU Youth Strategy which contributed to the change:** The EU Youth Strategy document itself in terms of argumentation and structure.
Factors which contributed to the change

Figure 1. The cause-effect chain

Added value of the EU Youth Strategy contribution, its effects and their sustainability

The National Youth Strategy 2014-2020 would probably have been developed even in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy, given the tradition of youth policy in the Czech Republic, which dates back to 1999\(^\text{13}\). However, the process of developing the National Youth Strategy 2014-2020 would not have been the same if it were not for the EU Youth Strategy or in case its influence would have been impeded. If this were the case, the area of the expert knowledge sharing in the field of youth policies at EU and international level, as well as the area of professional development enabled by peer-learning and progress reporting under the EU Youth Strategy, would have been absent and thus the knowledge basis and the professional expertise (drafting process, phases of drafting, evaluation of the drafting) of the National Youth Strategy 2014-2020 drafters would be different (more influenced by the personal preferences of the drafters; such document would be less complex and less ambitious and certain topics would be left out since there are other ministries with competences in those areas, such as health and well-being, culture, media; and the main focus would very likely be on volunteering, participation, employment, and validation of non-formal learning)\(^\text{14}\).

Cross-sectoral cooperation would also have been based on different principles or approaches, should the EU Youth Strategy have been absent. Currently, given the knowledge and good practice sharing mechanisms of the EU Youth Strategy and given the cooperation of different ministries as part of the reporting exercise on national

---


\(^{14}\) Interview 1.
youth policy in 2012, the cross-sectoral cooperation is based on personal relations between officials in different Ministries. The original approach, however, was based more on formalised relationships of different departments at different ministries and these were not as strong as the person-oriented approach supported by the national reporting exercise\textsuperscript{15}.

The EU Youth Strategy provided a framework and an example of how a youth policy can be designed and drafted, which influenced the structure, rationale and content of the National Youth Strategy 2014-2020. Both the strategy’s structure and its content, would be different, should the EU Youth Strategy be absent. Content-wise, the main areas which were included into the National Youth Strategy 2014-2020 under the influence of the EU Youth Strategy are linked to both youth employability (that is traditionally on the agenda of the Ministry of Labour), and youth participation (a topic which has not been very prominent in the Czech Republic over the past two decades)\textsuperscript{16}.

The main added value of the contribution of the EU Youth Strategy to the development of the National Youth Strategy 2014-2020 has been reported in the following areas:

- capacity building of the officials of the Youth Department of the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports;
- increased participation of young people in the process of the development of the new strategy;
- fostering cross-sectoral cooperation on youth issues between various national ministries;
- supporting employability and youth participation as priority areas of the Government for the upcoming period (2014-2020).

The National Youth Strategy 2014-2020 was received well both in the political domain as well as by youth organisations\textsuperscript{17}.

Losing political support on the national level would be detrimental even though the National Youth Strategy 2014-2020 as such is seen as an efficient and positive new policy framework. Another element that could limit the impact of the positive change would be the high turnover in the Youth Department, which is the coordinating body of the National Youth Strategy 2014-2020 or in the other collaborating ministries (i.e. Ministry of Labour). The cross-sectoral cooperation based on personal contacts is vulnerable to the staff turnover and may thus negatively influence, to some extent, further implementation of the National Youth Strategy\textsuperscript{18}.

**Conclusions**

The EU Youth Strategy had a positive influence on the development of the National Youth Strategy 2014-2020. Even though the national youth strategy would, most probably, have been developed even in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy, the contributing factors linked to the EU-level framework were intense (mutual learning, progress-reporting and structured dialogue), and the development of the national youth strategy for 2014-2020 would not have been the same without them. These EU Youth Strategy mechanisms contributed largely to the capacity building within the Youth Department of the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports while the EU Youth Strategy document influenced directly the structure, rationale and priority areas set

\textsuperscript{15} Interview 2.

\textsuperscript{16} Interviews 2 and 3.


\textsuperscript{18} Interviews 1 and 3.

**Sources:**


Case study - InterCity Youth – the European Network of Local Departments for Youth Work

Basic facts

- **Country / EU level:** EU level
- **Positive change introduced:** InterCityYouth\(^\text{19}\) is a network of municipalities involved in youth work. The concept of the network was launched in November 2012 in Leipzig, activities are to start at the end of 2015
- **Description of the change (expected):**
  - **Type of change:** creation of a network for peer learning and capacity-building amongst local departments of youth work via participation to conferences, seminars, courses etc.
  - **Date when the change was introduced:** the network was created on 9 November 2014 – no substantial ‘change’ identified so far as activities are to start at the end of November 2015 and when funding sources have been secured
  - **Policy field:** youth work
  - **Level at which the change was introduced:** EU level and local level
  - **Beneficiaries of the change:** staff in local authorities working on youth work
  - **Expected outcomes:** “(1) Enhance peer learning between local departments of youth work; providing directors and staff opportunities to professional development, mutual support and stimulation; (2) Promote the exchange and development of tools for enhancing and making visible the quality of youth work and promote youth work as an arena for non-formal learning; (3) Contribute to European youth policies; transmitting knowledge and insight from local government experiments and solutions to European policy agendas”\(^\text{20}\). Another general aim is to promote youth work as an arena for non-formal learning.
  - **Financial information:** The network has so far been supported under one of the founding partners’ own funds, however this is not sustainable. Currently members pay an annual membership fee of 500 Eur.
- **Preliminary evidence of the EUYS’ influence on the change:**
  - **Implementation instrument which contributed to the change:** mutual learning (peer learning conferences) and others but to limited extent (contribution was creating a favourable context for the network to be created)
  - **Other elements of the EUYS which contributed to the change:** “supporting and developing youth work”.

\(^{19}\) [http://intercityyouth.eu/about-icy/](http://intercityyouth.eu/about-icy/)

\(^{20}\) Press release - A new European network is born!
Factors which contributed to the change

**Figure 2. Template for the cause-effect chain**

- **Municipalities were not sufficiently involved in EU level discussions on youth work**
- **Municipalities need inspiration on how to conduct youth work**
- **The value of youth work (e.g. for social inclusion, skills development) is insufficiently recognised**
- **Mandate of DE Transfer Agency for Youth Policy Cooperation in Europe to promote EU peer learning**
- **Funding available to support EU peer learning conferences on youth work**
- **EUYS initiatives provided a favourable context for the establishment of the network: (1) expert group on quality of youth work, (2) Value of youth work study**
- **Other EU initiatives provided a favourable context for the establishment of the network: (1) YIA funded projects, (2) Youth work conventions**
- **Key individuals well-versed in EU cooperation pushed for the launch of the EU conferences and conventions**
- **Creation of the InterCITY network**
- **Effective promotion of conferences via SALTO network**
- **Interest from existing national networks of municipalities attracted attention to InterCITY**
- **Municipalities most in need lack capacity and resources to take part in the network**
- **Expected: Municipalities are inspired and their youth work quality systems are improved**

**Legend**

- **Activity / Process**
  - Output
  - Outcome
  - Impact

- **What was done / who was reached**
  - Immediate result of implementing an activity or process (i.e. what is done, who is reached)
  - Output for which evidence of contribution to outcomes and impact is stronger
  - Change produced
  - Impact which the change contributed to

- **Factor**
  - Direct contribution
  - Indirect contribution
  - Key factor which contributed to the positive change
  - Key factor linked to EUYS
  - Key factor which constrained the change to be produced

**Added value of the EUYS contribution, its effects and their sustainability**

The EUYS has enabled the discussion on youth work to take place at EU level, following from what had already been achieved through the funding programmes, the EVS etc. In addition having municipalities discuss youth work at EU level is coherent with the EUYS’ interest to broaden participation. The peer learning conferences kick-started the reflection on the creation of a network and those were initiated by the Transfer Agency for Youth Policy Cooperation in Europe, whose mandate is to promote EU level peer learning and implement the EUYS, and were funded under the EU finding programmes. In the absence of these two elements, the network would most probably not have been able to emerge. The conferences and launch of a network of municipalities working on youth work emerged within a favourable context shaped by other EU and Council of Europe initiatives in the area of field work, e.g. expert group on quality of youth work, YIA funded projects, the Youth work conventions.

Regarding the sustainability of the network, the network is in fact just starting. So far study visits from Dutch and Bulgarian municipalities to Sweden were organised for them to see how Swedish municipalities engaged in quality. The network’s activities have so far been supported under one of the founding partners’ own funds, however this is not sustainable. Currently members are to pay an annual membership fee of 500 EUR. This is not sufficient according to interviewees however and the network’s governing body is currently applying for available funding (project-based rather than

---

21 Interview 3.
supporting the establishment of the network structure itself), in the absence of which the future of the network would likely be compromised. According to interviewees *de facto* larger or wealthier municipalities have the capacity and resources to join the network, when those may not be the most in need of inspiration from European peers and when interest from smaller municipalities exists. This also applied to participation to the EU peer conferences according to interviewees.

**Conclusions**

The peer learning conferences kick-started the reflection on the creation of a network and those were initiated by the Transfer Agency for Youth Policy Cooperation in Europe, whose mandate is to promote EU level peer learning and implement the EUYS. The peer learning conferences were funded under the EU funding programmes and promoted under the website of SALTO (Support, Advanced Learning and Training Opportunities within the Erasmus+: Youth in Action programme). In the absence of these EU cooperation structures, the network would most probably not have been able to emerge.

The conferences and launch of a network of municipalities working on youth work emerged within a favourable context shaped by other EU and Council of Europe initiatives in the area of field work, e.g. expert group on quality of youth work, YIA funded projects, the Youth work conventions.

This being said interest in participating in the network stems from national factors: municipalities convinced of the value of youth work and willing to invest in learning about it, as per the availability of their resources to do so. In certain countries where youth work is under pressure, EU activities are seen as a means to support the improvement of the quality of youth work and thus to fill a gap and help raise the profile of youth work at national level also.

**Case Study: Austria – Child and Youth Impact Assessment (‘Youth Check’)**

**Basic facts**

- **Country / EU level:** Austria
- **Positive change introduced (name):** Child and Youth Impact Assessment - YouthCheck (Wirkungsorientierte Folgenabschätzung - Jugendcheck)
- **Description of the change**
  - **Type of change:** reinforcing existent priorities, policy re-orientation
  - **Date when the change was introduced:** 2013
  - **Policy field:** education and training; employment and entrepreneurship; health and well-being; participation; voluntary activities; social inclusion; creativity and culture; youth and the world;
  - **Level at which the change was introduced:** national level
  - **Beneficiaries of the change:** policy-makers, and indirectly society at large
  - **Other stakeholders involved:** N/A
  - **Expected outcomes:** mainstreaming of youth dimension in various policy areas; better representation of young people in policy-making
  - **Financial information:** national budget

---
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Factors which contributed to the change

Figure 3. The cause-effect chain

Added value of the EUYS contribution, its effects and their sustainability

The Youth Check policy tool would have definitely developed also in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy, since there has been no evident influence of the Strategy on its creation or development.²⁴

The Austrian Youth Check policy tool is seen as a good practice by the neighbouring countries, which are interested to follow this model (i.e. Germany). There have been several delegations from Germany to Austria in order to help in establishing a similar tool in Germany.²⁵

As for the uptake of the Youth Check, most of the Ministries have been reluctant to use the tool wholeheartedly, since it took additional time and in case the check would result negatively, the policy-makers would need to work additionally on it to make a positive impact of the legislation to children and youth.

Conclusions

Child and Youth Impact Assessment (Wirkungsorientierte Folgenabschätzung), also known as JugendCheck/YouthCheck or WFA, was developed in 2013 as an initiative of the government of Austria. This legislative tool in an obligatory element of any policy-making process ever since it was approved. As such, it serves to measure the impact of any legislative initiative, in its draft version before it reaches the Parliament, upon children and young people. The purpose is to ensure the protection and...

²⁴ Interview 2, 3 and 4
²⁵ Interview 3
representation of children and youth rights. Furthermore, the tool measures the impacts of the policies on children and youth from different perspectives. While the EUYS had no evident influence on the creation or development of the Youth Check, it did inspire the National Youth Strategy of Austria, which the Youth Check helps to implement, and strengthened the participatory approach via the structured dialogue EUYS instrument, which contributed to the wide-consultations with youth organisations in the process of elaborating the policy tool. Nevertheless, the Youth Check tool remains mainly a national initiative, stemming from the Austrian Government and having been developed in collaboration with youth organisations in the country.

Case Study: Germany

Basic facts

- **Country / EU level**: Germany
- **Positive change introduced (name)**: The setup of the Service- and Transfer Agency EU Youth Strategy at JUGEND für Europa (the German National Agency for the Erasmus+ Youth in Action program)
- **Description of the change**:
  - **Type of change**: The agency facilitates the cooperation between Länder and Federal level in their policy approach to EU youth policies (which is incorporated into their national policy) to enforce existing priorities notably by having a team at federal level dedicated to the implementation of the EU youth strategy at regional level and between Germany and EU level. The reason for dedicating its resources to this work came from a strong belief that structured coordination would be necessary to make the most use out of the EU youth strategy, particularly as youth policies are set at Länder level. This decision thus originated in the expectation of the added value of the EU youth strategy to Germany.
  - **Date when the change was introduced**: the ‘international youth policy for Germany’ – which was developed to respond to the EU Youth Strategy- was adopted in 2009. In 2010, the Agency was set up as part of the implementation of this policy. Its capacityand role evolved over the years.
  - **Policy field**: The agency covers all policy fields related to the EU Youth Strategy in Germany, but focuses on the priorities set by the Bund-Länder working group for the implementation of the EU youth strategy. For the period 2010-2013 these are: social integration of young people and successful transition from school into work; encouraging participation and strengthening democracy; strengthening and recognising informal and non-formal education and training (with a particular focus on youth work).
  - **Level at which the change was introduced**: The Agency is managed at national level and serves both the federal and the regional (Länder) level as well as the relations between Germany and the EU.
  - **Beneficiaries of the change**: The direct beneficiaries are the members of the Bund-Länder working group for the implementation of the EU youth strategy, which represent practitioners as well as the policy makers in youth policy. Their support varies from writing reports and raising awareness about events to providing direct support to the Länder. The target groups are indirectly beneficiaries of this service: young people, youth organisations and youth workers.
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- **Other stakeholders involved:** The Agency works closely together with all national and regional level youth-related organisations, such as Federal and Länder Youth Councils and Youth Offices. Other stakeholders are the Coordination Point for the implementation of the Structured Dialogue, the German Youth Institute and the Centre for Applied Policy Research who are involved at multiple levels (including in the evaluation of the structured dialogue process) and the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ).

- **Expected outcomes:** the main anticipated outcome of the Agency’s work is to bring ‘more Europe in the child and youth welfare sector’; bringing knowledge, partners, and experience together from other EU Member States but also from other regions in the EU. At the same time, it was also hoped that it would bring youth policy and practice in Germany closer together.

- **Financial information:** The Agency (4-5 staff and their activities) is fully funded by the Federal Government’s budget for promoting coordination and cross-level activities for youth policies.

- **Preliminary evidence of the EUYS’ influence on the change:**

  - **Implementation instrument which contributed to the change:** The Agency is an implementation instrument in and of itself. It was established because of a decision to run a specific implementation process for the European youth strategy in Germany, as was formalised in the German youth policy. This policy called for more and better coordination of EU youth policy in Germany and was widely supported by the Länder. The international component to the German youth strategy evolved from the European Youth Strategy and notably from discussions about how to make best use of the strategy.

  - **Other elements of the EUYS which contributed to the change:** Due to the supporting role of the Agency, its ability to contribute effectively, is dependent upon the use of its services by Länder and the Federal government. To do so, it was found important that the role of the agency and the governments were made clear. This process was supported by existing agreements amongst the Federal and Länder level regarding the exchange of information, frequency and form of governance, respect for autonomy of the regions and mutual understanding of the potential benefits of including the EU youth strategy into its national policy.

---

**Figure 4. Graphic representation of the cause-effect chain**

---

27 Factsheet from their main website and re-affirmed by the interviewees https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/strukturen/service-transferstelle/
The EU Youth Strategy undoubtedly contributed to the setup of the Agency. With its existence and its activities, the Agency contributes to a more structured way of cooperation on youth issues within Europe. The activities of the Agency include organising events, the production of reports and brochures for youth organisations and governments and facilitating collaborations with other Member States, such as the Multilateral cooperation project „Participation of young people in a democratic Europe” (consisting of 3 peer learning seminars and an EU wide conference from 2012-2014).

Its success has been realised because of the interest of the Länder and the other initiatives by the federal government to stimulate the implementation of the EU youth strategy in Germany. The added value of the whole policy process in Germany, mainly supported by the Agency, is in creating a governance structure that strengthens the promotion of youth policies and youth work across the country. It streamlines information, brings attention to good practices, provides a platform for learning, and brings policy and practice closer, for example in an event organised in Berlin on January 28, 2016 on ‘bringing more Europe in the municipalities’).

Before the existence of the Agency, there were activities promoting mobility and participation within an EU context in the Länder, but they were scattered and not necessarily based on a structured framework, work plan or specific approach to policy priority setting. Without the EU Youth Strategy, such activities would likely have continued in that same format, based on the needs and interests of specific organisations (i.e. National Agency for Erasmus+, Ministry for Youth, National Youth Council etc.), who may have a link to similar counterpart-organisations in another EU country. The disadvantage of this approach was its ad-hoc nature and the minimal

---

29 For example ‘A manual with explanations and practical examples for the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy and the use of the funding opportunities offered by Erasmus + YOUTH IN ACTION’

30 See for example the newsletter https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/ueberjfe/publikationen/03-15-newsletter-eu-jugendstrategie.3746/
effects produced for the participating organisations. The advantage of the impetus created by the EU Youth Strategy to the setup of the Agency is the scale and strategic level in which policy learning and youth policy-making is now embedded. For example, the Länder now use the existing working structures to discuss together as well as to discuss with the Federal level on what potential place there is within the structure to implement the EU Youth Strategy regarding the inclusion of refugees. Moreover, the budget of some Länder for mobility and international youth work has been increasing since the integration of the EU Youth Strategy's implementation in Germany’s youth policy. 31

The Agency has thus been generally received as a positive change. It is likely to continue in place as long as there remains an EU youth strategy or some form of EU level cooperation in the youth field. 32

Although the Agency stimulates the involvement of the Länder in the EU Youth Strategy, it has its limitations with regards to promoting the interaction of municipalities with the EU Youth Strategy. It does provide support to the Länder in this process. However, interaction with municipalities comes through the EU youth strategy activities (e.g. the European InterCity conferences which led to the establishing of the InterCity Youth Network) or is based upon a request from the Länder. 33 The role of the Agency in this process is being a facilitator and moderator between the Lander and municipalities.

**Conclusions**

The existence of the EU Youth Strategy has been an important catalyst for the creation of this Agency. Without the EU Youth Strategy, it is unlikely that this Agency and its activities would have been developed in Germany. The Agency is, however, an indirect result of the EU Youth Strategy; it is the direct result of the conviction of Federal and Länder decision-makers that there is value in European peer learning activities in the field of youth policy. Without the Agency, there would still be an EU dimension to the German youth strategy through participation in peer-learning events and Erasmus+, indeed, as this already existed prior to the creation of the agency. Nevertheless, the value in creating more coherence, better mainstreaming of good practices and embedding policy and practice into a framework with selected priorities, has made the Agency a useful new tool in German youth policy.

**Sources:**

- Jugend – und Familienministerkonferenz (JFMK) 17-18 June 2010, Änderungsvorschlag ST v 16.06.2010, Nationale Umsetzung der Europäischen Jugendstrategie (*National implementation of the EU Youth Strategy*)
- Beschlussprotokoll der Jugend- under Familienministerkonferenz (*Decision protocol of the Youth and Family Ministers Conference*) JFMK 4-5 June 2009

---

31 Interview 1 and 2
32 Confirmed by all interviewees
33 Interviewee 2 and 4
• Jugend für Europa, (2013). *A New youth policy for Europe, towards the empowerment and inclusion for all young people*, European Peer Learning on Youth Policy (2011-2013)

• Jugend für Europa, (2015). *Die Umsetzung der EU-Jugendstrategie in Deutschland* (*the implementation of the EU-Youth Strategy in Germany*)

• Factsheet Service- und Transferstelle EU Jugendstrategie

**Case Study: Hungary – Youth Expert Coordination Forum**

**Basic facts**

- **Country / EU level:** Hungary
- **Positive change introduced (name):** Youth Expert Coordination Forum - YECF (Ifjúsagi Szakmani Egyeztető Fórum - ISZEF)
- **Description of the change**
  - **Type of change:** more coordinated policy-making in the field of youth, other: harmonisation of governmental programmes related to the youth issues, and better information of youth
  - **Date when the change was introduced:** 2013
  - **Policy field:** education and training; employment and entrepreneurship; health and well-being; participation; voluntary activities; social inclusion; creativity and culture; youth and the world;
  - **Level at which the change was introduced:** national level
  - **Beneficiaries of the change:** policy-makers and youth organisations
  - **Other stakeholders involved:** external (youth) experts: Deputy ministers of state and youth leaders of youth organisations and representative of youth
  - **Expected outcomes:** improved knowledge of the situation of youth at national level; better and more participatory evidence-based policies; mainstreaming of youth dimension in various policy areas; mutual learning; improved quality of opportunities for young people; improved social, professional and personal skills; better representation of young people; recognition of the value of youth work and volunteering etc.
  - **Financial information:** national budget and EU programme / funds

- **Preliminary evidence of the EUYS’ influence on the change:**
  - **Implementation instrument which contributed to the change:** other: cross-sectoral cooperation on youth issues
  - **Other elements of the EUYS which contributed to the change:** N/A
Factors which contributed to the change

Figure 5. The cause-effect chain

Added value of the EUYS contribution, its effects and their sustainability

Since it is rather difficult to determine the exact influence of the EU Youth Strategy on the National Youth Strategy, and furthermore to the development of the YECF, claiming added value of its contribution might seem presumptuous. As stated above, the Youth Expert Coordination Forum was developed on the grounds of Hungary’s national strategy, following the national action plans. Throughout this case study, it became evident that policy developments at the European level were discussed and taken into consideration across different working groups of the Forum, even though they have not made a great mark on the initial creation of the YECF. For instance, the fact that some of the working groups have discussed about the Structured Dialogue as a separate and independent topic is a good indication that the EUYS instruments were a factor important at national level too.

Conclusions

The formation of the Youth Expert Coordination Forum (YECF) came as a result of a strong national focus on youth and a long tradition in cross-sectional youth studies that have been performed since 2000. The initiative was built under the auspices of the National Strategy and the Action Plans for youth, thus can be defined as being mainly a national initiative. However, the EU Youth Strategy, along with its instruments and tools, have been intertwined through the work of the Forum. Best described as developments that emerged in parallel to each other, the Hungarian national initiative has worked along the lines and has been evaluating the effects of instruments like the Structured Dialogue, evidence-based policy making and implementation of European programmes and funds through the national youth strategy of Hungary.
Case Study: Ireland

Basic facts

- **Country / EU level**: Ireland
- **Positive change introduced (name)**: Better Outcomes Brighter Futures - The national policy framework for children & young people 2014 - 2020
- **Description of the change**:
  - **Type of change**: introduction of a national strategy, reinforcing existing priorities, policy reorientation, improved structured dialogue
  - **Date when the change was introduced**: 2014
  - **Policy field**: Across Government Ministries but anchored on the 5 National Outcomes and Transformational Goals (see annex 1), specifically: education and training; employment and entrepreneurship; health and well-being; participation; voluntary activities; social inclusion; creativity and culture; child safety and protection
  - **Level at which the change was introduced**: national level
  - **Beneficiaries of the change**: Ministries, policy-makers, statutory organisations, youth organisations and/or those working with young people, young people.
  - **Other stakeholders involved**: National Youth Council, Children's Rights Alliance, other ministries\(^{34}\), young people (direct consultation involving 67,000 youngsters), and other stakeholders such as NGOs through public consultations, in total 1000 stakeholders consulted.
  - **Expected outcomes** (target issue that the change addresses): 5 National Outcomes and implementation of the Transformational Goals (see Annex 1), improved quality of opportunities for young people; improved social, professional and personal skills; better representation of young people in policies that affect them; recognition of the value of youth work; increased safety for children; better health for children and young people; improved policy and provision for children and young people.
  - **Financial information**: national budget
- **Preliminary evidence of the EUYS' influence on the change**:
  - **Implementation instrument which contributed to the change**: consultations and Structured Dialogue, participation to other activities (such as EU conferences and peer learning activities) may have contributed to increase awareness on youth issues.
  - **Other elements of the EUYS which contributed to the change**: EU Council Presidency held by Ireland in the first half of 2013.

---

\(^{34}\) Department of Education and Skills; Department of Health, Department of Social Protection; Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation; Department for the Environment, Community and Local Government; Department of Public Expenditure and Reform are involved, as well as other Departments, and Agencies such as Tusla – The Child and Family Agency and the Health Service Executive.
Factors which contributed to the change

Figure 6. The cause-effect chain

Added value of the EUYS contribution, its effects and their sustainability

The interviewees agreed that despite the EU Youth Strategy proving to be a useful and guiding document, the National framework Better Outcomes Better Futures would have been adopted in any case. However, they also recognised that it may have been deeply different.

First of all, the scope would have been narrower. The previous strategy, "National Children’s Strategy: Our Children - Their Lives"[^35], was targeting only children aged 0-18. Building on this existing document, the post 2010-strategy could have likely had the same target group.

The EU Youth Strategy also helped define the priorities and needs of young people. Employment, youth work, creativity, participation, social inclusion, are themes where the EU Youth Strategy was a source of inspiration.

The EU Youth Strategy and the participation to EU activities, in particular those connected with the structured dialogue, helped young people (over 18) to be included in the national structured dialogue. This allows them to better advocate for youth issues at national level and provided them with a legal framework as a means to strengthen their actions.[^36]

In terms of factors that can hinder the positive implementation of the national framework, as this is the first time a cross-sectoral approach is used in this sector, it is possible that coordination issues may emerge[^37]. However, the interviewees also highlighted that the new ministry will play a fundamental role in coordinating the several other ministries involved in youth-related policies.

[^36]: Interviewee 1
[^37]: Interviewee 1
Being an overarching framework, Better Outcomes Brighter Futures has a variegated level of clarity and specification with regards to its goals and objectives. However, complementing policy documents better specify them. Implementation could then represent an issue, above all considering that soon new elections will be held and the government may be less keen in following up the Better Outcomes Brighter Futures framework.\(^{38}\)

In this sense, the existence of an EU framework on youth is seen as good incentive for the government and a strong leverage for youth and children organisations to advocate for more and better policies and a constant implementation of the national strategy.\(^{39}\)

**Conclusions**

The “Better outcomes, Brighter futures” (BOBF) Framework would have been adopted in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy. Nevertheless, without the latter, Ireland’s national framework would probably have had a narrower scope in terms of target group (0-18 instead of 0-24) and priorities being more child-centred rather than responding to young people’s needs.

National factors played an important role in the development of the BOBF. The creation of a Ministry for both Children and young people, the existence of a previous national strategy for children and a strong tradition of dialogue with children (0-18) were among the key factors at national level that influenced the development of the framework for 2014-2020.

The cross-sectoral approach is a new feature in youth policy in Ireland introduced by BOBF. The new Ministry is playing an important coordination role to ensure that this approach is effectively implemented.

**Sources:**


**Case Study: International Volunteering Opportunities for All**

**Basic facts**

- Country / EU level: EU level
• Positive change introduced: International Volunteering Opportunities for All (IVO4ALL)
• Description of the change:
  - **Type of change**: Implementing several key objectives of the 2008 Council Recommendation on the mobility of young volunteers, namely facilitating access to cross-border voluntary activities, promoting language learning, and exchanging information and cooperation in order to assure social protection of volunteers, as well as promoting participation of young people with fewer opportunities in cross-border voluntary activities.
  - **Date when the change was introduced**: Project is running from February 2015 till July 2017.
  - **Policy field**: Basically all of the areas stated in the European Youth Strategy (education and training; employment and entrepreneurship; health and well-being; participation; volunteering; social inclusion; creativity and culture; youth and the world) through the improvements in the opportunities for the cross-border volunteering in young people with fewer opportunities.
  - **Level at which the change was introduced**: The project is running on the EU level, being implemented by a consortium of 8 partners from 5 EU member states (France, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, and United Kingdom). The outcomes of the project should influence the cross-border volunteering Europe-wide and on all levels (policies in member states, activities of volunteering organizations on regional or local levels).
  - **Beneficiaries of the change**: Youth organizations working with volunteers, young people with fewer opportunities.
  - **Other stakeholders involved**: 
    - **Expected outcomes** (target issue that the change addresses): Improved processes in volunteering of young people with fewer opportunities in terms of selection mechanisms, preparatory activities, the voluntary stay abroad, and follow-up activities after the return of the volunteers to their respective home country. Mutual learning in terms of sharing the validated mechanisms and processes with other interested European organizations. Improvement in opportunities young people with fewer opportunities have, since the volunteering mechanisms should be able to contribute to their personal and professional development.
    - **Financial information**: Project is cofunded by the Erasmus+ programme and national budgets of the member states where the project is taking place (about 2/3 of the funds coming from the Erasmus+ grant scheme).
• Preliminary evidence of the EUYS’ influence on the change:
  - **Implementation instrument which contributed to the change**: mobilisation of EU programmes and funds (financial contribution of the Erasmus+ programme); mutual learning (ministries of France, Italy, and Lithuania are cooperating on the project and their respective representatives attend peer learning meetings); knowledge building and evidence-based policy-making, monitoring of the process, and progress-reporting (national and European youth reports and indicator-based data have been taken into account during the project as well as outputs of the EU-funded AMICUS project); Structured Dialogue (in some member states, the Structured Dialogue activities are interlinked with project implementation in terms of inviting young people to the project meetings, as well as taking an advantage of the Structured Dialogue events as dissemination activities).
  - **Other elements of the EUYS which contributed to the change**: 2008 Council Recommendation on the mobility of young volunteers presented
Factors which contributed to the change

Figure 7. The cause-effect chain

Added value of the EUYS contribution, its effects and their sustainability

The IVO4ALL project would very likely not be developed, should the 2008 Council Recommendation, and the European Youth Strategy, be absent. Such an international cooperation concerning national youth volunteering scheme is seen as something rather unique and derived almost directly from these two pan-European youth policy aspects. 

On the other hand, initiatives aiming at making the national youth volunteering schemes more inclusive towards young people with fewer opportunities would very likely be taking place even in the absence of the 2008 Council Recommendation and the European Youth Strategy, since the issue of inclusivity of the national youth volunteering schemes is present irrespective of the pan-European youth policy priorities.

The international dimension of the project, the opportunity to share, and the aim to disseminate the results of the project Europe-wide after piloting the inclusion measures in three different Member States, are the main assets of the fact that the

---

40 Interview 2 and 3.
41 Interview 4 and 5.
IVO4ALL project has been supported in its development by the European Youth Strategy and the 2008 Council Recommendation.42

The IVO4ALL project is still being implemented, it is therefore premature to evaluate how the change has been received by the stakeholders, but the current state of affairs (three field trials running in three different Member States, and in each of these cooperation being developed with many external subjects, such as NGOs) suggests the IVO4ALL is running ahead as foreseen by the project developers.

The main aim of the IVO4ALL project is to increase the numbers of young people with fewer opportunities participating in cross-national volunteering within the national volunteering schemes. This should provide the young people with fewer opportunities with a chance of leaving the disadvantaged environment, gain international experience, and also support them in terms of work and educational aspirations. The most important parts are the concrete mechanisms which were described in detail above, such as specific selection procedures, specific volunteering positions and cooperation with cross-border partners, pre-sojourn activities, and post-sojourn follow-up; as well as sharing the examples of good practice and basing these good practice examples on evidence.

Dissemination of results and PR activities are, nevertheless, at the moment obviously a weak part of the project – it was rather difficult to find information on the IVO4ALL project otherwise than in direct interviews in course of conducting this case study. At the moment, only one newsletter has been issued, and no webpages are available.

Conclusions

IVO4ALL project stems from the combination of national and European priorities and brings these two together in working across borders towards a common goal: improving the national youth volunteering schemes in terms of their inclusivity. The most vital contribution of the European Youth Strategy and the 2008 Council Recommendation is the international dimension of the project which would very likely not be present otherwise.

Sources

- European Union. Not Dated. Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe. Online, available from

---

42 Interviews 2 and 3.


Case Study: Portugal

Basic facts

• Country / EU level: Portugal
• Positive change introduced (name): implementation of a transversal youth policy and creation of a White Book on Youth (Livro Branco da Juventude)

• Description of the change:
  - Type of change: policy reorientation, more cross-sectoral cooperation on youth-related policy issues.
  - Date when the change was introduced: consultations started at the end of 2011 and finalised with the resolution being adopted in March 2013.
  - Policy field: education and training; employment and entrepreneurship; health and well-being; participation; voluntary activities; social inclusion; creativity and culture; youth and the world; and Youth empowerment; road Safety prevention; environment and sustainable development; housing; intergenerational solidarity; active involvement in youth associations.
  - Level at which the change was introduced: national level
  - Beneficiaries of the change: young people, youth organisations and/or those working with young people.
  - Other stakeholders involved: Permanent Youth Observatory, Umbrella youth organisations
  - Expected outcomes: mainstreaming of youth dimension in various policy areas; better representation of young people; recognition of the value of youth work
  - Financial information: nationally funded.

• Preliminary evidence of the EUYS’ influence on the change:
  - Implementation instrument which contributed to the change: to some extent consultations and Structured Dialogue. Other elements of the EUYS which contributed to the change: Main influence from the 2001 EU White Paper on Youth.

---

44 The National Council for Youth (CNJ) and Federation of youth associations (FNAJ)
Factors which contributed to the change

Figure 8. The cause-effect chain

Added value of the E wys contribution, its effects and their sustainability

Interviewees agreed that the implementation of a transversal youth policy in Portugal would have been produced in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy, but they acknowledged that it was greatly influenced by the 2001 White Paper on Youth and the EU process of Structured Dialogue, which is one of the implementation instruments of the EU Youth Strategy.

The development of the White Book on Youth and the consultation process was financed by national funds. There was no EU-level support for it.

The EU-level cross-sectoral approach to youth policy influenced new practices in the field of youth in Portugal. It helped to institutionalise the structured dialogue as well as transversal policies concerning youth issues. For example, the IPDJ has now different initiatives (e.g. the Rotary of youth organisations) where its representatives go on field and meet youth organisations across the regions. Interviewees also noted that the consultation process for the White Book enabled youth associations to meet each other and to further collaborations. It helped reinforcing a network of youth organisations for sharing resources (e.g. human and material resources) and further collaboration on specific youth projects. In addition, the fact that the national youth strategy was created and implemented provided a strong added value for youth organisations that saw their involvement in youth policy being recognised and institutionalised. It provided them motivation to further their work.

45 http://microsites.juventude.gov.pt/Portal/RoteiroAssociativismo
46 Interviewee 3.
The EU Youth Strategy had perhaps a more direct influence on the definition of the professional status and qualification standards of a youth worker. As interviewees mentioned, the professional status of youth worker has been legally defined recently in Portugal. It should be officially published before the end of 2015 by the National Agency for Qualifications. It is an important step towards the recognition of youth work in Portugal. As it was not the focus of this case study, no other evidence was gathered on this aspect.

The process of the White Book created a clear and visible transversal Youth action plan in Portugal that did not exist previously. The fact that the government showed concrete involvement in its implementation was very well perceived by stakeholders.

However, the change was mainly perceived by those involved in the process. According to interviewees from youth organisations, the majority of youth organisations, young people and the general public are not aware of the White Book on Youth process and its publication. Measures were indeed implemented but the general public might not know that these measures were associated with the White Book on Youth. One youth organisation interviewed mentioned that in the Southern region of the country, for instance, local-level municipalities do not know about the White Book. Nevertheless, the White Book is a useful tool to motivate local municipalities in developing local youth policies. The White Book also helps youth organisations to identify what the priorities in the field of youth at national-level are and which measures are being implemented.

The impact of the White Book on Youth at local level in Portugal is thus limited. The consultation process was not sustainable. There is no clear strategy to update the youth action plan or organise new consultations with young people. Interviewees identified the lack of dissemination of the results of the consultation process and the local-level elections of 2013 which probably did not help disseminating the White Book further. The EU Youth Strategy could act as a way to inform – or recall – national stakeholders that there is an EU-level Youth Strategy and as a tool for encouraging the development of initiatives in the youth field. Without constant influence from the EU Youth Strategy, the White Book process might not have sustainable impact in Portugal.

**Conclusions**

The development and implementation of a transversal youth policy through the creation of a White Book on Youth was mainly due to an overall influence from the EU-level Open Method of Coordination in the youth field since the 2001 White Paper on Youth and the specific instrument of the structured dialogue of the EU Youth Strategy. In addition, this was much facilitated by the strong political will present at national level in 2011-2013 for implementing concrete transversal policies for youth and for involving young people in the process. It was an important first step towards the institutionalisation of the structured dialogue and the implementation of transversal youth policies in Portugal. However, with the recent elections and changes in 2015, it is not clear whether there will be new transversal policies developed on youth issues and whether other national-level consultations will be organised for identifying new priorities for youth. The EU Youth Strategy could act as a way to inform – or recall – national stakeholders that there is a European Youth Strategy and as a tool for continuing to encourage the development of transversal youth policies.

---

47 Interviewee 2 and Youth workers interviewed within the scope of the study ‘The Value of Youth Work’ (available here).
48 Interviewee 2 and Youth workers interviewed within the scope of the study ‘The Value of Youth Work’ (available here).
49 According to Interviewee 1, there was no further planning of going further in the field of youth at the moment. The Portuguese government has also changed in September 2015, which is considered as a limiting factor.
youth-related measures. Without constant influence from the EU Youth Strategy and the EU cooperation in the youth field, the White Book process might not have sustainable impact in Portugal.

Sources

- http://www.fnaj.pt/
- http://www.cnj.pt/beta/index.php/quem-somos/bolsa-de-formadores

Case Study: New Law on Volunteering, Romania

Basic facts

- **Country / EU level:** Romania
- **Positive change introduced:** Law on Volunteering 78 / 2014
- **Description of the change**
  - **Type of change:** legal development in youth policy
  - **Date when the change was introduced:** 2014
  - **Policy field:** voluntary activities
  - **Level at which the change was introduced:** national level
  - **Beneficiaries of the change:** young people involved in voluntary activities, volunteering organisations, volunteers of all ages etc.
  - **Other stakeholders involved:** Ministry of Culture, Provobis (National Resource Centre for Volunteerism), VOLUM (Federation for Supporting the Development of Volunteering in Romania), National Agency for EU programmes in education and training (managing Youth in Action / Erasmus +), Save the Children, Foundation for Civil Society Development (FDSC), The National Authority for Youth and Sports (ANST) under the Ministry of Education, which in 2013 became the Ministry of Youth and Sports (MTS), the Ministry of Labour, etc.
  - **Expected outcomes:** improved legal framework for voluntary activities, recognition of volunteering experience as professional experience and recognition of competences gained through non-formal learning in volunteering.
  - **Financial information:** non available
- **Preliminary evidence of the EUYS’ influence on the change:**
  - Implementation instrument which contributed to the change: mainly dissemination of results – the 2011 European Year on Volunteering; to a less extent: consultations and Structured Dialogue and mobilisation of funds through the Youth in Action programme.
  - Other elements of the EUYS which contributed to the change: volunteering being one of the 8 fields of action of the EU Youth Strategy,
Factors which contributed to the change

Figure 9. Cause-effect chain graph

Added value of the EUYS contribution, its effects and their sustainability

All interviewees confirmed that the change of law would have been produced in the absence of EUYS 2011, but it would have taken much longer time at a slower pace and requiring more efforts to bring together all actors and forces around this change. They admitted that it is difficult to bring to light a legislative proposal without a significant back-up, such as from EU level. The EUYS 2011 was a catalyst of several factors around the idea of a new legal framework for voluntary activities in Romania. If it had not been for EUYS 2011, there would not have been a coordination point, which created a mechanism for developing a work plan with a specific budget for national volunteering activities. On the other hand, EUYS 2011 had also kicked-off and facilitated the creation of VOLUM Federation, without whose intense advocacy and lobbying campaign, the change would probably not have occurred.

The new law was generally well-received\(^{50}\). Given the high publicity in national media, the public opinion was highly favourable to this legislative change\(^{51}\). The first to react were the volunteering organisations, which are the main beneficiaries of the improvement in the legal framework in which they operate. However, how the law was received depends on the situation of each organisation. Large organisations that already had internal regulations and volunteering contracts, received the new regulations lighter than the small organisations (with little funds) for which it is more difficult to implement the new law as they need to go through more changes (i.e. developing volunteering agreements can be a bureaucratic issue). Some public institutions (i.e. hospitals) decided not to work with volunteers anymore as it entails too much administrative work. Hence, the problems are ultimately linked to the

---

\(^{50}\) Interviews 1 and 4.

\(^{51}\) Interview 3.
limited resources\textsuperscript{52} and capacity for institutions / organisations to implement the new law.

Employers have welcomed the new law and argue that multinationals prefer young people who have volunteering experience as they can integrate more easily into the team and are able to assume responsibilities in the company\textsuperscript{53}. According to an interviewee\textsuperscript{54}, the new law has changed the labour market in Romania, giving young people a better chance of gaining professional experience, already during their studies, through volunteering.

It is difficult to evaluate the impact of the new law as it was only recently adopted last year. Moreover, there is no system in place to monitor the evolution in number of volunteers. However, according to the stakeholders interviewed, there are some visible effects already: i) volunteering has become more visible since 2011; ii) NGOs have increased the quality in their work with volunteers in order to offer them a real learning experience and motivate them to return; iii) the number of volunteers may increase as more are motivated to volunteer in order to have their activity recognised as professional experience and help them get a first job.

Following the entering into force of the new law on volunteering, there have been several recent initiatives to put the legislative changes into practice:

- Certificate attesting the competences acquired through volunteering was developed – following several consultations of VOLUM with employers and a test phase, the Certificate was launched in its e-form in October 2015 and is now being piloted for the next six months, as part of the national caravan to promote this new Certificate and its benefits.
- A virtual platform to match the need and offer of volunteering in Romania was launched in February 2015\textsuperscript{55}. The platform\textsuperscript{56} gives volunteers an overview of all projects in which they can get involved, by selecting the preferred geographical area and field of interest, and provides organisations with access to the largest community of volunteers in Romania.
- Templates for the Volunteering Contract and the Volunteer’s Tasks Description have been developed as resources for volunteering organisations\textsuperscript{57}.
- Concerning the safety and protection of volunteers, which is one of the new legal provisions that is difficult to implement by NGOs, VOLUM initiated a dialogue with the Ministry of Labour to create a simplified procedure for volunteer safety inspections.

Conclusions

The new Law on Volunteering was adopted in 2014 and was seen as a major success of advocacy and progress in transparent policy-making. This was the result of multiple enabling factors and intense efforts from many stakeholders. EYV 2011 had a big influence on driving the change by providing a favourable context to catalyse efforts and actors for initiating a public debate at national level about the need to revise the

\textsuperscript{52} There is no national volunteering scheme in Romania nor any financing from national budget for voluntary projects.

\textsuperscript{53} http://adevarul.ro/news/societate/este-oficial-voluntariatul-recunoscut-experienta-profesionala-1_53a814dc0d133766a8d3be4f/index.html

\textsuperscript{54} Interview 3

\textsuperscript{55} www.hartavoluntariatului.ro

\textsuperscript{56} Portal developed within the project “Mapping Volunteering in Romania” run by the VOLUM Federation in the period 1 July 2014 – 28 February 2016: http://www.nonguvernamental.org/voluntariat-2/federatia-volum-a-lansat-platforma-de-voluntariat-debunavoie/

\textsuperscript{57} http://federatiavolum.ro/resurse/
law on volunteering. On the other hand, EYV 2011 was an important kick-off for the creation of VOLUM Federation, without whose intense advocacy and lobbying campaign in 2012-2013, the change would probably not have occurred.

Sources:

- Adevarul (2014). It is official: volunteering will be recognised as professional experience: http://adevarul.ro/news/societate/este-oficial-voluntariatul-recunoscut-experienata-profesionala-1_53a814dc0d133766a8d3be4f/index.html
- Platform for volunteers and volunteering organisations in Romania: http://debunavoie.ro/web/
- Website of the European Volunteer Centre (CEV): http://www.cev.be/
Case Study: Slovenia

Basic facts

- **Country / EU level:** Slovenia
- **Positive change introduced:** Resolution on the 2013-2022 National Youth Programme (Resolucijo o nacionalnem programu za mladino 2013-2022)
- **Description of the change:**
  - **Type of change:** reinforcing existent priorities and more coordinated policy-making in the field of youth
  - **Date when the change was introduced:** 2013
  - **Policy field:** education and training; employment and entrepreneurship; health and well-being; participation; voluntary activities; social inclusion; creativity and culture; youth and the world
  - **Level at which the change was introduced:** national level
  - **Beneficiaries of the change:** Office for Youth (the main governmental body for youth in Slovenia), ministries (full list provided below), youth organisations: National Youth Council
  - **Expected outcomes:** better and more participatory evidence-based policies; mainstreaming of youth dimension in various policy areas; mutual learning; improved quality of opportunities for young people; better representation of young people
  - **Financial information:** national funds
- **Preliminary evidence of the EUYS’ influence on the change:**
  - **Implementation instrument which contributed to the change:** knowledge building and evidence-based policy-making; mutual learning; progress-reporting; dissemination of results; monitoring of the process; consultations and Structured Dialogue; mobilisation of EU programmes and funds
  - **Other elements of the EUYS which contributed to the change:** N/A
Factors which contributed to the change

Figure 10. The cause-effect chain

Added value of the EUYS contribution, its effects and their sustainability

Slovenia joined the European Union in 2004. Back then, as part of the Council of Europe, the Slovenian government and youth sector primarily used the guidelines of the Council, and, to some extent, the UN documents and conventions. Since the accession to the EU family, Slovenia has comfortably moved to taking advantages of European tools and frameworks. This especially helped in getting the youth organisations and their representatives heard while advocating for better legal understanding of youth work, youth organisations and provisions for the young people.

Even though the National Youth Programme 2014-2020 was considered as an important achievement amongst organisations and institutions working with youth, and in particular the Office for Youth under the Ministry of Education and the National Youth Council, some stakeholders at the ministerial levels still perceive the Programme as an additional burden. According to the interviewees, the National Youth Programme sets the agenda for youth on table of all ministries, as a horizontal policy tool, which helps youth representatives have their voices in different sector of their engagement and make a more comprehensive policy making. Nevertheless, it has been only one year of implementation and the most difficult rock to turn in Slovenia will be the mind-set that youth sector concerns everyone.

Conclusions

In Slovenia, the development of the National Programme for Youth 2013-2022 – the first national youth strategy – was the result of several influencing factors. These factors ranged from grass-root and national studies conducted from 2009 to 2011 and evidences to policies and initiatives at wider European level. In particular, the

---

58 For details on specific influences (in particular of the European tools and studies and analyses at national level) please see the descriptions in the chapters below
discussions over the sectors and issues of youth in Slovenia stemmed from the priorities specified in the EU Youth Strategy, although fields such as housing derived from national studies that identified a great problems with large amount of young people living with their parents for long time due to socio-economic factors. Furthermore, as detailed in the case study, a number of implementation instruments such as knowledge building and evidence-based policy-making, mutual learning, dissemination of results, monitoring of the process, consultation and structured dialogue, as well as mobilisation of EU programmes and funds, have influenced the practices of the ministries related to youth, and helped the further development of collaboration between essential players in the field of youth.

The National Youth Programme carefully identified and covered six most relevant youth fields for Slovenia, but most importantly it represents the first comprehensive and horizontal instrument at the national level that concerns youth. In this way, young people have the legal means of being represented in all sectors and young people through their youth organisations and representatives have the say in policy matters across all sectors.
Annex 8  Survey questionnaires
Survey questionnaire to youth organisations

### EU Youth Strategy survey - Youth organisations

Early this year the European Commission launched an interim evaluation of the implementation of the “EU Youth Strategy” for the period 2010-2014. In the context of this evaluation, ICF International is running a survey amongst youth organisations across the EU in order to collect their views on the “EU Youth Strategy”. The data collected will feed into the evaluation which will be used by the European Commission for its reflections on how it can improve cooperation at EU level on youth issues over the period 2016-2018 and beyond. The quality of the evaluation depends on the breadth and depth of data collected from a variety of stakeholders across the EU. Your effort, together with hundreds of other youth organisations across the EU, will contribute to this. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete the survey and responses will be anonymised. Please respond by the 20th of September. The final report of the evaluation should be published early 2016 on: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/more_info/evaluations/index_en.htm

We would like to thank you very much for your participation! For any further information, please contact luca.mobilio@icfi.com

The evaluation team at ICF International.

### Views on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and EU added value of the Strategy

1. **Are you aware of the existence at EU level of a Strategy for Youth?**
   - The **EU Youth Strategy is known as the renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field for the period 2010-2018, as per the Council Resolution of 27 November 2009. In the survey, both names - EU Youth Strategy and renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field - are interchangeable.**
   - □ Yes, I know it well
   - □ Yes, but I only have a basic understanding of it (e.g. its basic principles, objectives, fields of action, instruments)
   - □ I have heard of it but I don’t know what is in it
   - □ No, I am not aware of its existence

2. **Are you aware of the existence of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU?**
   - □ Yes, I know it well
   - □ Yes, but I only have a basic understanding of it (e.g. its basic principles, objectives, fields of action, instruments)
I have heard of it but I don’t know what is in it
No, I am not aware of its existence

3. **Has your organisation participated in any of the following EU activities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU level expert groups or high-level fora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues (this includes those organised within the Commission partnership with the Council of Europe in the youth field)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of the Council Youth working party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Youth Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Youth Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events and activities organised by the Council of Europe (in partnership with the European Commission) in the youth field (e.g. conferences, the European Platform on Learning Mobility, research conducted by the European Knowledge Centre on Youth Policy (EKCYP), the Pool of European Youth Researchers (PEYR) etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other EU activities in the field of youth (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other EU activities in the field of youth, please specify:**

---------------------------------------------------------------

Have you received or used any EU-funded research/studies or Eurobarometer surveys on youth issues (this includes Council of Europe research/studies)?

- Yes
No
If yes, which ones (if you remember)?

Do you use the:

The European Youth Portal (https://europa.eu/youth/)
The EU youth website (http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/youth_strategy/index_en.htm)
The EU dashboard of youth policy indicators
The Eurodesks

Relevance of EU activities your organisation participated in

Since your organisation has participated in some of the activities listed under Q3, could you rate their relevance to:

a) the national youth agenda

EU level expert groups or high-level fora
EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
Activities of the Council Youth working party
Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
EU Youth Conferences
European Youth Week
Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
Other EU activities in the field of youth

b) your organisations’ needs or areas of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Somewhat relevant</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>very I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU level expert groups or high-level fora</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of the Council Youth working party</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Youth Conferences</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Youth Week</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other EU activities in the field of youth</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your rating(s) in the open field below.
Effectiveness of EU activities your organisation participated in

From questions 5 to 7 we would like to hear your views on the results of the EU activities your organisation participated in.

5. **Has participation in these activities led to any of the following effects in your organisation?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Yes - at national or local level</th>
<th>Yes - at EU level / cross-national level</th>
<th>Yes - at both EU level / cross-national &amp; national or local levels</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking with other youth organisations</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking with policy-makers</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking with academic researchers</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking with other categories of stakeholders</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-building, learning</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new activities or initiatives</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of new partnerships</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes in your organisation’s practices

Other type of effect (please specify)

Other type of effect, please specify:

Please elaborate on your choices:

Please give one or two examples of such effects at the level of your organisation:

Which EU level activity(ies) contributed to this (these) effect(s):

- Networking with: other youth organisations
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
  - Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  - Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
- Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
- The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
- Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
- Other EU activities in the field of youth

- **Networking with: policy-makers**
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
  - Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  - Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
  - Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
  - The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
  - Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
  - Other EU activities in the field of youth

- **Networking with: academic researchers**
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
  - Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  - Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
  - Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
  - The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme

Other EU activities in the field of youth

- Networking with: other categories of stakeholders
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
  - Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  - Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
  - Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
  - The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
  - Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
  - Other EU activities in the field of youth

- Knowledge-building, learning
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
  - Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  - Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
  - Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
  - The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
  - Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
Other EU activities in the field of youth

- **Development of new activities or initiatives**
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
  - Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  - Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
  - Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
  - The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
  - Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
  - Other EU activities in the field of youth

- **Creation of new partnerships**
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
  - Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  - Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
  - Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
  - The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
  - Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
  - Other EU activities in the field of youth
- **Changes in your organisation’s practices**
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
  - Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  - Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
  - Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
  - The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
  - Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
  - Other EU activities in the field of youth

- **Other type of effect (as you specified above)**
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
  - Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  - Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
  - Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
  - The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
  - Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
  - Other EU activities in the field of youth

**How useful was (were) this (these) effect(s) to the work of your organisation?**
- Very useful
Could those effects have been produced in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy or your participation to the EU activity(ies)?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

Why?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Why not?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Based on what you know, to what extent do you agree with the following statements?

The EU Youth Strategy has:

- Contributed to improvements in the youth policy agenda, or policy making, at EU, national or local level(s)
- Improved stakeholders’ knowledge of the situation of youth at EU, national or local level
- Increased attention to the impact of initiatives in different policy areas (employment, health, etc.) on youth (mainstreamed: this means that when a new policy or dimension is developed, a youth dimension or impact(s) on youth are considered and integrated)
encouraged stakeholders to consider youth issues from a cross-sectoral perspective (this means that when a specific youth issue is addressed, it is considered from various angles. E.g. when aiming to improve the social inclusion of NEET youth, health and housing aspects can also be considered)

- led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of volunteering
- led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of youth work
- improved the participation of youth stakeholders in setting the policy agenda/ in policy-making

Please elaborate on your choices:

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Please give one or two examples of such effects on the national or local youth agenda:

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Which EU level activity(ies) contributed to this (these) effect(s):

- contributed to improvements in the youth policy agenda, or policy making, at EU, national or local level(s)
  - EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  - EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  - Activities of the Council Youth working party
  - Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  - EU Youth Conferences
  - European Youth Week
Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
Other EU activities in the field of youth

- increased attention to the impact of initiatives in different policy areas (employment, health, etc.) on youth
  EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  Activities of the Council Youth working party
  Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  EU Youth Conferences
  European Youth Week
  Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
  Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
  The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
  Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
  Other EU activities in the field of youth

- encouraged stakeholders to consider youth issues from a cross-sectoral perspective
  EU level expert groups or high-level fora
  EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
  Activities of the Council Youth working party
  Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
  EU Youth Conferences
  European Youth Week
  Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
  Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
- Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
- The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
- Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
- Other EU activities in the field of youth

- **led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of volunteering**
- EU level expert groups or high-level fora
- EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
- Activities of the Council Youth working party
- Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
- EU Youth Conferences
- European Youth Week
- Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
- Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
- Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
- The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
- Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
- Other EU activities in the field of youth

- **led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of youth work**
- EU level expert groups or high-level fora
- EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
- Activities of the Council Youth working party
- Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
- EU Youth Conferences
- European Youth Week
- Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
- Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
- Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
- The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme

Other EU activities in the field of youth

- improved the participation of youth stakeholders in setting the policy agenda/ in policy-making
- EU level expert groups or high-level fora
- EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
- Activities of the Council Youth working party
- Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
- EU Youth Conferences
- European Youth Week
- Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
- Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
- Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
- The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
- Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
- Other EU activities in the field of youth

Could those effects have been produced in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy or your participation to the EU activity(ies)?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

Why?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Why not?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
7. According to what you know, has the EU Youth Strategy had any of these other effects?

- The quantity and quality of opportunities (to volunteer, to participate in youth work, to participate in policy-making, or to gain experience in employment, education or training etc.) for young people have improved
- The needs and interests of young people in youth organisations’ activities are taken into account in a better manner
- The representation and participation of young people in public life has improved
- Other effects (please specify)
- I don't know

Other effects, please specify:

________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

8. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the reasonableness of costs (e.g. in terms of human resources, time spent, other resources needed) of the participation of your organisation to the EU level activities, in relation to results/effects produced?

The costs of participation to the following EU activities were reasonable in relation to results/effects produced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I somewhat agree</th>
<th>I disagree</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU level expert groups or high-level fora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice’ exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of the Council Youth working party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
EU Youth Conferences
European Youth Week
Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy
Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
Other EU activities in the field of youth

Please specify why you disagree, what the problems were, and also, what could be done to improve the situation.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Continued relevance

9. Have you heard of:

The EU youth portal
The Eurodesks
The Youthpass
EU Youth Conferences
European Youth Weeks
Structured dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Erasmus+ programme

EU-funded studies on youth issues (such as the EU Study on the “value of youth work in the EU” or the 2013 Eurobarometer survey on ‘European Youth: Participation in Democratic Life’ (No 375) or the 2013 EACEA Report on youth social exclusion and lessons from youth work)

Please rate the usefulness for young people of the tool(s)/activity(ies) you have heard of.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool/Activity</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EU youth portal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eurodesks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Youthpass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Youth Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Youth Weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Erasmus+ programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-funded studies on youth issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you suggest any other tools/activities which could be supported at EU level that would help young people?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

10. Could you rank (from 1 to 6) the following policy areas which you think the EU should focus its efforts on when addressing youth issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education and training</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment and entrepreneurship</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health and well-being</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creativity and culture</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social inclusion</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
youth and the world

According to you, are there any other policy areas in relation to youth which the EU should also be involved in?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

11. Could you rank (from 1 to 5) the following types of initiatives for young people which you think the EU should promote:
   - non-formal learning
   - participation in the public sphere
   - voluntary activities
   - youth work
   - mobility

According to you are there any other initiatives for young people which the EU should promote or support?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Respondent information

12. Through which channel did you receive the survey?
   - National Agency
   - European Youth Forum
   - National Youth Council
   - European Youth Portal
   - Social media
13. Name of your organisation:
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

14. Country where you are based:
☐ Austria ☐ Belgium ☐ Bulgaria
☐ Croatia ☐ Cyprus ☐ Czech Republic
☐ Denmark ☐ Estonia ☐ Finland
☐ France ☐ Germany ☐ Greece
☐ Hungary ☐ Ireland ☐ Italy
☐ Latvia ☐ Lithuania ☐ Luxembourg
☐ Malta ☐ Netherlands ☐ Poland
☐ Portugal ☐ Romania ☐ Slovakia
☐ Slovenia ☐ Spain ☐ Sweden
☐ United Kingdom

15. At which of the following levels is your organisation active:
☐ National level
☐ Regional level
☐ Local level
☐ European level
☐ International level (beyond European)

16. Which of the following are your organisation’s core area(s) of activity?
☐ Education and training (non-formal learning, lifelong learning, skills development)
☐ Employment and entrepreneurship (e.g. facilitate transitions from school to work)
☐ Health and well-being (e.g. promotion of healthy life styles through sport, physical activity etc.)
☐ Participation (dialogue with politicians, democratic participation in elections, e-participation etc.)
Voluntary activities
Social inclusion (e.g. combating discrimination, preventing social exclusion and poverty)
Creativity and culture (e.g. access to culture, developing intercultural skills, capacity for innovation)
Youth and the world (cooperation with regions outside of Europe, youth participation at global level)
Other (please specify)

Other, please specify: ________________________________________________________________

Is your organisation involved in activities related to cross-border volunteering (within the EU)?
By cross-border volunteering, we mean activities related to volunteering which involve hosting or sending volunteers in a country other than of their residence.

Yes
No, my organisation is only involved in volunteering activities at a national and/or local level
I don’t know

What type of cross-border activities does your organisation take part in?
Hosting volunteers from another EU country / sending volunteers to another EU country
Conducting information about volunteering in another EU country
Work on the recognition of volunteering experience conducted in another EU country
Other (please specify)

Other, please specify: ________________________________________________________________

Were any of those cross-border activities initiated following EU support?

Yes
No
I don’t know

Closing question

17. Please share any other feedback in relation to the EU Youth Strategy that could help us with the evaluation.
Your input, with the input of hundreds of youth organisation across the EU, is a key source of information for this evaluation. Thank you very much for having taken part in this survey!
Please do not hesitate to share this survey with other organisations whose opinions would be relevant for the purpose of this evaluation.
The final report of the evaluation should be published early 2016 on http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/more_info/evaluations/index_en.htm
Please press on 'Submit' below.
Survey questionnaire for young Europeans

The EU Youth Strategy 2010-2018 - What young people think!

Are you between the age of 15 and 30? Tell us what you think!

Can you help us by filling in the survey questions below?

We want to know if you’ve heard of the EU Youth Strategy 2010-2018, what you think about it, and what your ideas are that would make it better for young people.

The survey will only take 15 minutes of your time to complete. We are asking hundreds of young Europeans (aged 15-30) about this so this is your chance to make your voice heard!

Please make sure you complete the survey by the 20th of September.

Thank you very much for your help!

ICF International on behalf of the European Commission

We, ICF International, are a consultancy which has been asked by the European Commission to evaluate the EU Youth Strategy for the period 2010-2014. If you need any further information, please contact luca.mobilio@icfi.com
Young people today are facing a range of challenges - in choosing their education, finding work, participating in society, staying healthy, achieving their ambitions and dreams and staying safe.

The EU Youth Strategy sets the framework for European cooperation in the youth field for the period 2010-2018, and it aims to:
- provide more and equal opportunities for young people in education and the job market;
- encourage young people to actively participate in society.

The Strategy supports actions in eight priority areas of activity:
- education and training;
- employment and entrepreneurship;
- participation;
- voluntary activities;
- social inclusion;
- health and well-being;
- creativity and culture; and
- youth and the world.

You can find out more about the EU Youth Strategy on the European Commission’s website

Now it’s over to you...

**Areas of activity which are important to you**

1. Please let us know how relevant the following areas of activity are to your own interests and needs by ranking them from 1 to 8 (1=most relevant; 8=least relevant):

   - Education and training (learning opportunities outside school, lifelong learning, skills development)
   - Employment and entrepreneurship
   - Health and well-being (e.g. encouraging a healthy life style through sport, physical activity etc.)
   - Participation in civil society (e.g. helping young people to engage with politicians, preparing for taking part in elections etc.)
   - Voluntary activities
Social inclusion (e.g. combating discrimination, preventing social exclusion and poverty)
Creativity and culture (e.g. access to culture, developing intercultural skills, capacity for innovation)
Youth and the world (cooperation with regions outside of Europe, youth participation at global level)

Your views on some European activities in the field of youth

The Youth Strategy supports a range of areas of activity (see question 1), but how relevant do you think these are to you? Tell us more about your views on these areas of activity in the questions below:

2. Did you know that the EU undertakes activities to support young people?
   - Yes
   - No

Have you heard of any of the below EU supported activities:

- EU Youth Conferences
- European Youth Weeks
- The Structured Dialogue’ with young people or ‘Ideas Lab’
- EU or multilateral seminars or conferences on youth issues
- The Youth Guarantee
- The Erasmus+ programme
- The Youth in Action programme
- Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011
- Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011
- Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field

Your views on some European tools in the field of youth

3. Have you heard of any of the below EU supported tools:
   - Yes
   - No
The EU youth portal (https://europa.eu/youth/splash_en)

The European Youth Facebook page

The Eurodesks (please feel free to have a look at your national Eurodesk under this link http://eurodesk.org/partners#3/35.94/-3.04)

The Youthpass (https://www.youthpass.eu/)

Please tell us how useful you found the following tool(s), on a scale from 1 to 5 (1=very useful; 5=not useful at all):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EU youth portal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The European Youth Facebook page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eurodesks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Youthpass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you tell us more about the usefulness (or lack of) some of the tools in the text box below?
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Your involvement in activities organised at EU level

We are interested to find out about your involvement in activities for young people that are organised at the EU level.

4. Have you taken part in any of the EU level activities listed below?

   Yes    | No
   EU Youth Conferences    |   |
   European Youth Weeks    |   |

Please tell us which and when:
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Please tell us which and when:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Structured Dialogue’ with young people or ‘Ideas Lab’</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU or multilateral seminars or conferences on youth issues</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Youth Guarantee</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Erasmus+ programme</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Youth in Action programme</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field

Please tell us which and when:

What have been the most interesting aspects for you of taking part in those EU level activities, also in comparison to similar activities in your own country / region / locality? Please tell us about these below:

Would you be interested in attending EU level activities for young people rather than activities in your own country / region / locality?

- Yes
- No

Other than the activities described above, what EU level activities would you suggest to the EU that you think would help you in your educational / job opportunities and / civic involvement, or other needs? Please state, telling us why:

Your views on the situation for young people in your country

The EU Youth Strategy has been implemented across the Member States over a number of years to improve the situation for young people. We would like to hear your views and opinions on the following statements in relation to any changes in the situation of young people in your country.

5. For the statements below about the evolution, over the past 5 years, of the situation of young people, youth organisations/youth workers and policy in the area of youth, please state whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or do not know.

In comparison with 5 years ago, more is being done for...
...young people's education

...young people's access to work

...young people's access to social services (welfare, health, counselling)

...taking into account the needs and interests of young people in policy

...young people's involvement in civil society organisations

...young people to influence democratic decision-making processes

In your opinion, have there been other noticeable changes in the past 5 years in the situation of young people that you would like to tell us about (positive or negative)?

What still needs to be done?

6. In your opinion, looking forward, what still needs to be done? To what extent is there a need in your country (at national, regional or local level) to:

Develop policies and actions specifically targeted at young people (e.g. non-formal learning, participation, mobility)

Develop policies and actions specifically targeted at regional/national voluntary activities

Develop policies and actions specifically targeted at cross-border voluntary activities
Integrate your concerns better when it comes to your education and training, employment, ideas to set up a business, access to social services and support (e.g. welfare, health)

Support and develop youth work

Support the consultation of youth organisations and young people in policy-making and other democratic participation processes

Other (please specify below)

Other, please specify:

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Which are the 3 top priorities you would like to see included in the EU youth strategy in the future?

a) Priority 1

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

b) Priority 2

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

c) Priority 3

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Tell us why these are important to you?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Closing questions
7. Are there any other issues you would like to raise or share with us in relation to the EU Youth Strategy?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Information about you

8. Please tell us your country of residence:

- Austria
- Croatia
- Denmark
- France
- Hungary
- Latvia
- Malta
- Portugal
- Slovenia
- United Kingdom
- Belgium
- Cyprus
- Estonia
- Germany
- Ireland
- Lithuania
- Netherlands
- Romania
- Spain
- Other (non-EU country)
- Bulgaria
- Czech Republic
- Finland
- Greece
- Italy
- Luxembourg
- Poland
- Slovakia
- Sweden

Which age group do you belong to?

- 15-18
- 18-25
- 25-30

Are you member of a youth organisation?

- Yes
- No

Through which channel did you receive the survey?

- National Agency
- European Youth Forum
- National Youth Council
- European Youth Portal
- Social media
- Other (please specify)
Other, please specify: _____________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for completing the survey!

Please press on 'Submit' below.
Annex 9  Results of survey of European youth organisations

Characteristics of the sample

In total, 250 Youth Organisations filled the survey.

As represented in Figure 11 which presents the geographical representation of youth organisations which participated in the survey (Q14):

No responses were received from youth organisations from Estonia, Finland and the Netherlands.

France, Hungary and Poland are slightly underrepresented, in terms of total responses against the size of the youth population in country (according to Eurostat data).

Portugal and Croatia are, on the contrary, overrepresented.

There are two respondents from non-EU countries: Armenia and Macedonia.

*Figure 11. Geographical distribution of surveyed Youth organisations*[^59]

Respondents were also asked to provide more details on their core fields of activity (Q16) and at which level (local, regional, national or EU level) their activities took place mainly (Q15).

As illustrated in Figure 12 below, a fourth of respondents (26%, N=250) are active at local level. About a fifth of the respondents are active either at regional, national or European levels.

[^59]: N=250
Respondents were then asked to indicate one or more fields in which they conduct their core activities (Q16). More than a fifth of Youth Organisations (N=250) were active in more than four fields, as illustrated under Figure 13 below.

Figure 13. Number of Youth Organisations by number of fields of activity

As illustrated under the figure below:

“Education and training” is the most common area of activity among respondents (72%, N=250).

Voluntary activities are conducted by more than half of respondents (53%, N=250)

16% (N=250) of surveyed Youth Organisations are active in other fields and were asked to provide more details, answers to this question will be processed at a later stage.

---

60 N=250
61 N=250
Organisations which indicated they conducted Voluntary activities (Q16) were then asked whether they were involved in activities related to cross-border volunteering (within the EU) (Q16.b). More than half of respondents (N=250) are involved in EU cross-border volunteering, as illustrated under the figure below.

Among those that are involved in EU cross-border volunteering (N=74), the majority host/send volunteers to another EU country (88%) (Q16.c), as illustrated in the following figure.

---

62 N=250
63 By cross-border volunteering, we mean activities related to volunteering which involve hosting or sending volunteers in a country other than of their residence.
64 N=129
Figure 16. Type of cross-border volunteering activities of respondents

What type of cross-border volunteering activities does your organisation take part in?

- Hosting volunteers from another EU country / sending volunteers to another EU country: 88%
- Conducting information about volunteering in another EU country: 39%
- Work on the recognition of volunteering experience conducted in another EU country: 20%
- Other: 15%

Interestingly, among those that are involved in EU cross-border volunteering, 70% (N=74) stated that these cross-border activities were initiated following EU support (Q16.e).

Figure 17. Cross-border volunteering activities conducted by respondents

Were any of those cross-border activities initiated following EU support?

- Yes: 70%
- No: 22%
- I don’t know: 5%

Awareness regarding the EU Youth Strategy and the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU

Youth organisations (N=250) that participated in the survey were asked whether they were aware of the existence of the EU Youth Strategy (Q1) and of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU (Q2).

As shown in the figure below:

- Only 19% of youth organisations surveyed knew the EU Youth Strategy well, and 14% knew the Council Recommendation well.

---

65 N=74
66 N=74
67 25% replied they had heard of the EU Youth Strategy but did not know its content whilst 29% replied they had heard of the Council Recommendation but did not know its content.
• 19% of youth organisations surveyed were not aware of the existence of the EU Youth Strategy, 28% were not aware of the existence of the Council Recommendation.

• Most survey respondents replied they had a basic understanding of the EU Youth Strategy (36%) and of the Council Recommendation (30%).

• The Youth Strategy is slightly more known than the Recommendation.

*Figure 18. Knowledge of the Youth Strategy and the Council Recommendation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you aware of the existence at EU level of a Strategy for Youth?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you aware of the existence of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Yes, I know it well
- Yes, but I only have a basic understanding of it (e.g. its basic principles, objectives, fields of action, instruments)
- I have heard of it but I don’t know what is in it
- No, I am not aware of its existence

**Activities Youth organisations have been involved in**

Youth organisations that affirmed to have at least heard about the Strategy (N=202) were asked whether their organisation had participated in any EU activities listed in the survey (Q.3a to Q.3l), as presented in Figure 19. They were able to select several of those activities.

23% (N=202) of youth organisations surveyed reported not to have taken part in any of the listed activities. The remaining 157 took part in at least one of the activities listed in Figure 11.

17% (N=157) took part in other EU activities in the youth field. These respondents were then asked to provide more details on the activities they were involved in, 28 respondents did so:

- Almost half participated in International Youth Exchanges activities in the framework of the Youth in action, Erasmus+, or EVS programmes.
- About a fifth participated in seminars or conferences on youth issues, e.g. Take Five for Europe (2010 – Germany), Empowering the Young for the Common Good, Die situation junger Menschen in Europa (2014 – Germany), Darstellung von Mobilitäshindernisse für junge menschen (Deutschland) und gestaltungsempfehlungen (2015 – Germany).
- The remaining participated to activities aimed at creating job opportunities for young people or on NEETs’ issues or to activities organised by the European Youth Forum. One respondent took part in European campaigns (No hate speech campaign (Council of Europe), Information Right Now! Campaign (EC)). Finally, on last respondent participated in the Rural Youth Entrepreneurs programme, partly funded by the ERDF.

*Figure 19. Participation in EU activities by youth organisations (N=202)*

---

*68 N=250*
**Figure 19. Activities youth organisations have been involved in**

Has your organisation participated in any of the following EU activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ or the ‘Erasmus+’ funding...</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Youth Week</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Youth Conferences</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events and activities organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU level expert groups or high-level fora</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of the Council Youth working party</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other EU activities in the field of youth</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EU tools in the field of youth which youth organisations have used**

Youth organisations that affirmed to have participated to at least one EU activity (N=157 - (Q.3a to Q.3l)) were asked whether they had received or used any EU-funded research/studies or Eurobarometer surveys on youth issues (including Council of Europe research/studies) (Q.3n). 70% (N=150) of youth organisations that responded did not receive or use any, and about a third (30%, N=150) did. Those respondents were asked which ones they received or used (Q.30). Answers to this question will be processed at a later stage.

Youth organisations that have participated to at least one EU activity (N=157) were then asked about the frequency of their use of the following EU tools in the field of youth (Q.3.p – Q.3.s):

- The European Youth Portal (https://europa.eu/youth/)
- The EU youth website (http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/youth_strategy/index_en.htm)
- The EU dashboard of youth policy indicators
- The Eurodesks.

As illustrated in Figure 20 below:

---

69 N=202
70 The percentage is calculated on the total respondent to this question (N=150).
71 The percentages presented in the tables are calculated on the total respondent to each individual question. These slightly differ among each other. The European Youth portal
• Most respondents used the tools listed on an occasional basis, rather than on a regular one.

• Among the available EU tools the most used are the Youth Portal\textsuperscript{72} and the youth Website\textsuperscript{73}, whose occasional or regular use is above 80% (N=157).

\textit{Figure 20. Frequency of use of some EU tools by Youth organisations}\textsuperscript{74}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{frequency_of_use.png}
\caption{How regularly do you use the following EU tools:}
\end{figure}

\textit{Effectiveness}

\textbf{Views on (first-level) effects that participation to these activities have had at EU, national and local level}

Those respondents that have participated to at least one EU activity (Q.3a to Q.3l) (N=157) were then asked to give their opinion on the effects that participation to these activities have had at EU, national and local level (Q5.a- Q5.j). They were presented with different types of 'first-level' effects, as illustrated under Figure 21, and asked to indicate whether the EU activities they participated in contributed to any of those effects, and if so, at which level – national/local, EU/cross-national.

\textsuperscript{72} \url{https://europa.eu/youth/}

\textsuperscript{73} \url{http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/youth_strategy/index_en.htm}

\textsuperscript{74} N=157
**Figure 21. Youth organisations’ views on the contribution of those activities to some results**

As illustrated above:

- The majority of youth organisations agreed that participation to EU activities contributed to all of the effects listed in Figure 21 above, with the exception of ‘networking with academic researchers’.

- Youth organisations considered that effects to which EU activities contributed to mostly are:
  - Networking with other youth organisations (94%, N=154)
  - Knowledge-building, learning (90%, N=155)
  - Development of new activities or initiatives (84%, N=152)
  - Creation of new partnerships (84%, N=153)

- Those activities contributed to effects at all levels – EU/cross-national, national/local. While for almost all effects, the EU or cross-national dimensions seem to be very relevant, dialogue with policymakers and academic researchers has been affected more at national level.

---

75 Networking with other youth organisations (N=154); Networking with policy-makers (N=154); Networking with academic researchers (N=151); Networking with other categories of stakeholder (N=154); Knowledge-building, learning (N=155); Development of new activities or initiatives (N=152); Creation of new partnerships (N=153); Changes in your organisation’s practices (N=151); other type of effect (N=118).

76 Notice that the total number of respondents varies across the different options available (i.e. effects). However, with the exception of the last option “Other type of effect” that has a lower number of respondents (N=118), the other options remain comparable as the number of respondents presents limited variations (151<N>155).
Views on usefulness of those effects to the work of youth organisations

Respondents were then asked how useful those effect(s) were to the work of their organisation (Q5.v). As illustrated in Figure 22 below, more than 90% of respondents (N=124) considered these effects ‘useful’ or ‘very useful’ for the work of their organisation.77

Figure 22. Youth organisations’ views on the usefulness of those effects to their work

| How useful were these effects to the work of your organisation? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very useful | Useful | Not very useful | I don’t know |
| 35% | 57% | 6% | 2% |

EU activities’ relative contribution to the effects identified

Respondents which had identified at least one effect of the EU Strategy (or of EU activities available under it) (Q.5)78 were then asked to link this effect to one or more EU activity/ies which had contributed to it (Q5.m to Q5.u). Youth Organisations’ rated each activity’s contribution to the different effects similarly across effects, i.e. survey respondents considered that the activities that contributed the most to each effect were the same. Figure 23 below presents the reported contribution of different activities to each effect.

Respondents were also asked to motivate their answers (Q5.k).

The most interesting findings are presented here below.

- “Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ or the ‘Erasmus+’ funding programmes” were considered by survey respondents to have been the types of activities which contributed the most to all of the effects listed in Figure 21 (Q5.a- Q5.j), without any substantial variations across the effects
- This is followed by “EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues”. One respondent to the open question Q5.k stated that “La mise en réseau est essentielle sur certains dispositifs jeunesse de l’UE. De plus, au niveau du territoire, ces travaux et échanges donnent du crédit à notre action.”79
- The activities considered by survey respondents as having contributed the least to the listed effects are those, which took part within the EU-China Year of Youth 2011. This could also be due to the fact that few survey respondents actually participated in those activities80.

77 The percentage is calculated on the total respondent to this question (N=124).

78 Networking with other youth organisations (N=154); Networking with policy-makers (N=154); Networking with academic researchers (N=151); Networking with other categories of stakeholder (N=154); Knowledge-building, learning (N=155); Development of new activities or initiatives (N=152); Creation of new partnerships (N=153); Changes in your organisation’s practices (N=151); Other type of effect (N=118).

79 “Networking is an essential part of some EU Youth initiatives. In addition, at local level, these works and exchanges give credit to our action”

80 The analysis of the responses against the participation of Youth organisations to individual activities shows a positive correlation between effectiveness and participation is noticeable. However, some activities (e.g. Other EU activities; EU Youth conference) with a lower rate of
In terms of the contribution of different activities to specific effects:

- Activities part of the Structured dialogue have been considered by survey respondents as the second activity to have contributed the most to the effect ‘enhancing networking with policymakers’ (after “Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ or the ‘Erasmus+’ funding programmes”)

- EU Youth Conferences have been considered as having contributed more than the activities under the Structured Dialogue to the following effects: “networking with academic researchers”, “creation of new partnerships” and “Changes in their organisations”.

Respondents were then asked to provide few examples of such effects (Q5.l).

One youth Polish organisation active in several fields\(^{81}\) reported to have been able to join the European Youth Forum which allowed them to exchange experiences with organisations from other countries (e.g. via the Day Secretariats of the Organisation in Brussels). This reportedly contributed to strengthening their internal organisation, expanding their networks and the development of new project proposals.

An Austrian organisation\(^{82}\) that was mainly involved in Erasmus+ programme started to develop also EVS projects as results of its participation to EU activities. While an Irish one\(^{83}\) reported to have finally managed to fill an application for a youth exchange project thanks to the network developed in occasion of their participation to EU events.

In terms of good practice sharing and implementation, after participating to the “Emerging Leaders Conference” in Brussels, a Croatian youth organisation\(^{84}\) started a similar project in their local community. And an Italian one implemented individual counselling for vocational guidance for young people after attending a training in Croatia on “occupational therapy”.

Thanks to the participation to activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme, a Romanian youth organisation\(^{85}\) managed to attract more young volunteers, involving more young people in non-profit activities.

Participation to EU youth activities pushed a Spanish youth organisation\(^{86}\) to upgrade their internal structure to include an “international relations” manager.

---

81 Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities
82 Involved in Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion
83 Active in Education and training; Health and well-being; Participation
84 Active in Education and training; Participation
85 Involved in Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world
86 Education and training; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world
Figure 23. Youth organisations’ views on the contribution of EU level activity(ies) contributed to this (these) effect(s)

Which EU level activity(ies) contributed to this (these) effect(s):

- Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
- EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
- Other EU activities in the field of youth
- Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
- EU Youth Conferences
- European Youth Week
- Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field
Extent to which these effects would have happened in the absence of those EU activities

Survey respondents were then asked whether those effects would have been produced in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy or of their participation to the EU activity (ies) (Q5.w). As illustrated in Figure 24 below, most respondents did not know (51%, N=123). 36% (N=123) considered that those effects would *not* have occurred without EU Youth Strategy (or their participation to the EU activities) and only a small percentage (13%, N=123) of respondents considered that those effects would have occurred without the EU Youth Strategy.

**Figure 24. Youth organisations’ views on whether those effects would have been produced in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy (and EU activities within it)**

While the absolute percentage of respondents that considered that those effects would have occurred without the EU Youth Strategy is quite small, this is higher in Bulgaria. Two out of five youth organisations (40%) considered the EYS uninfluential with regards to the above mentioned effects.

Two respondents highlighted also the influence of the EYS on the Structured dialogue and their participation to public life (BE and PL). According to the Belgian youth organisation in particular stated that “since the Structured Dialogue is obviously part of the EU Youth Strategy, it sounds like it would not have been there without the Youth Strategy.”

Finally three youth organisations highlighted the importance of having a common legal framework at European level that allows “to frame research, partnerships and discussions” (UK). It provides stability for organisations to plan ahead and develop long-term projects (BE). It can compensate for the lack of a national youth strategy (EL).

---

87 The percentage is calculated on the total respondent to this question (N=123).
88 N=123
89 Engaged in Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Voluntary activities; Creativity and culture; Health and well-being; Participation; Social inclusion; Youth and the world
90 Out of the remaining three respondents, two selected the “I don’t know” option and only one reported a positive influence of the strategy.
91 Education and training
92 Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Voluntary activities
93 Education and training; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world
94 Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world
95 Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world
Two youth organisations (PT\textsuperscript{96}, RO\textsuperscript{97}) reported their difficulties in accessing funds available under the Erasmus+ and YIA programmes. The reported reasons for this are a lack of transparency in the selection process (PT) and a lack of support once the funding has been awarded (RO). Due to these difficulties, these youth organisation sought partnerships with private companies whose support may go beyond the financial one (e.g. including also administrative support).

A German youth organisation reported to already have access to an international network and therefore the EYS did not bring any additional advantage in this sense. However, several youth organisations reported that they would not have had the means to take part to EU activities and to develop such international initiatives without:

- the EU financial support (AT, BG, HR, CZ, PT),
- the network created through activities developed under the EYS (AT\textsuperscript{98}, BE\textsuperscript{99}, ES\textsuperscript{100}, FR\textsuperscript{101}, IT\textsuperscript{102}, PT\textsuperscript{103}, RO\textsuperscript{104}, SL\textsuperscript{105}, SE\textsuperscript{106} Macedonia\textsuperscript{107}).
- The knowledge acquired through their participation to EU events (EU conferences and peer learning activities in particular) (BE\textsuperscript{108}, HR\textsuperscript{109}, PT\textsuperscript{110}, SL\textsuperscript{111}, Macedonia\textsuperscript{112})

**Views on the EUYS contribution to other effects**

Youth organisations surveyed were then asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements on the contribution of the EU Youth Strategy to a series of effects at EU, national or local level\textsuperscript{113} (Q6.a to Q6.g). Figure 25 illustrates respondents’ degree of agreement with each of those statements\textsuperscript{114}.

\textsuperscript{96} Active in Education and training; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture
\textsuperscript{97} Active in Education and training, Employment and entrepreneurship; Voluntary activities; Youth and the world
\textsuperscript{98} Two Youth organisations active in Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Voluntary activities; Creativity and culture; Participation; Social inclusion
\textsuperscript{99} Active in Engaged in Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Voluntary activities;
\textsuperscript{100} Engaged in Education and training; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world
\textsuperscript{101} Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture
\textsuperscript{102} Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world
\textsuperscript{103} Three Youth organisations active in Education and training; Health and well-being; Voluntary activities; Creativity and culture
\textsuperscript{104} Education and training; Health and well-being; Voluntary activities
\textsuperscript{105} Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Health and well-being; Voluntary activities
\textsuperscript{106} Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture
\textsuperscript{107} Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Youth and the world
\textsuperscript{108} Education and training; Health and well-being; Voluntary activities
\textsuperscript{109} Education and training; Health and well-being; Participation
\textsuperscript{110} Creativity and culture
\textsuperscript{111} Education and training; Health and well-being; Voluntary activities; Creativity and culture
\textsuperscript{112} Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Youth and the world
\textsuperscript{113} The statements are: The EU Youth Strategy has: (1) contributed to improvements in the youth policy agenda, or policy making, at EU, national or local level(s), (2) improved stakeholders’ knowledge of the situation of youth at EU, national or local level, (3) increased attention to the impact of initiatives in different policy areas (employment, health, etc.) on youth (mainstreamed: this means that when a new policy or dimension is developed, a youth dimension or impact(s) on youth are considered and integrated), (4) encouraged stakeholders to consider youth issues from a cross-sectoral perspective (this means that when a specific youth issue is addressed, it is considered from various angles. E.g. when aiming to improve the
Respondents were then asked to justify their answers (Q6.h). Respondents which identified the existence of at least one of such effects were asked to provide some examples to better illustrate their answer (Q6.i).

While four respondents (BG\textsuperscript{116}, DE\textsuperscript{117}, SK\textsuperscript{118}) affirmed that the EYS increased awareness on the recognition of the value of Youth work and volunteering activities, three (PL\textsuperscript{119}, SK\textsuperscript{120}, UK\textsuperscript{121}) reported that concrete effects in this field are negligible.

Respondents were also asked to provide few examples of the abovementioned effects.

social inclusion of NEET youth, health and housing aspects can also be considered), (5) led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of volunteering led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of youth work, (6) improved the participation of youth stakeholders in setting the policy agenda/ in policy-making.

\textsuperscript{114} Contributed to improvements in the youth policy agenda, or policy making, at EU, national or local level(s) (N=155); Improved stakeholders’ knowledge of the situation of youth at EU, national or local level (N=154); Increased attention to the impact of initiatives in different policy areas on youth (N=155); Encouraged stakeholders to consider youth issues from a cross-sectoral perspective (N=155); Led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of volunteering (N=152); Led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of youth work (N=154); Improved the participation of youth stakeholders in setting the policy agenda/ in policy-making (N=153)

\textsuperscript{115} Contributed to improvements in the youth policy agenda, or policy making, at EU, national or local level(s) (N=155); Improved stakeholders’ knowledge of the situation of youth at EU, national or local level (N=154); Increased attention to the impact of initiatives in different policy areas on youth (N=155); Encouraged stakeholders to consider youth issues from a cross-sectoral perspective (N=155); Led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of volunteering (N=152); Led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of youth work (N=154); Improved the participation of youth stakeholders in setting the policy agenda/ in policy-making (N=153)

\textsuperscript{116} Education and training; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion

\textsuperscript{117} Employment and entrepreneurship; Social inclusion

\textsuperscript{118} Education and training; Health and well-being; Creativity and culture

\textsuperscript{119} Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities

\textsuperscript{120} Education and training; Health and well-being; Voluntary activities; Creativity and culture

\textsuperscript{121} Education and training; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world
Always in relation to youth work, in Greece a (virtual) network of youth workers was created in order to share good practices. While in Romania, volunteering is now, by law, considered as work experience.

Some initiatives related to the structured dialogue and youth participation have been developed. In Greece, it was hosted the Greek Presidency youth event (Thessaloniki, 2014) with the involvement of local volunteers and YNGOs. In Portugal it was developed a White Book about Youth by the Municipality Youth Councils.

Again in Portugal the development of a National Strategy for Development Education was mentioned as example of effect of the EUYS.

**Extent to which these other effects would have happened in the absence of the EUYS**

Survey respondents were then asked whether those effects would have been produced in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy or of their participation to the EU activity (ies) (Q6.p).

Most respondents did not know (64%, N=130). 28% (N=130) considered that those effects would not have occurred without EU Youth Strategy (or their participation to the EU activities) and only a small percentage (8%, N=130) of respondents considered that those effects would have occurred without the EU Youth Strategy.

Survey respondents were then asked to justify their choice (Q6.q – Q6.r).

Out of twenty-three responses to this question, fifteen highlighted that EU support was necessary in order to achieve the abovementioned results. In particular, the EU added value is defined as:

- **Financial support** (ES\(^{123}\), \(\mathrm{PT}\(^{124}\), Macedonia\(^{125}\))
- The existence of a **common legal framework** that gives space to national and local differences and ensure long term stability to youth action (AT\(^{126}\), BE\(^{127}\), DE\(^{128}\), EL\(^{129}\), IT\(^{130}\), LV\(^{131}\), UK\(^{132}\))
- The “EU brand” that empowered youth actions and messages launched by youth organisations (BG\(^{133}\), CZ\(^{134}\)).

---

\(^{122}\) The percentage is calculated on the total respondent to this question (N=130).

\(^{123}\) Education and training; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world

\(^{124}\) Three youth organisations active in Education and training; Creativity and culture; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Health and well-being

\(^{125}\) Education and training; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Youth and the world

\(^{126}\) Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Youth and the world

\(^{127}\) Two Belgian youth organisations engaged in Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Youth and the world

\(^{128}\) Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Social inclusion

\(^{129}\) Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation

\(^{130}\) Education and training

\(^{131}\) Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Health and well-being; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world

\(^{132}\) Education and training; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world

\(^{133}\) Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities; Youth and the world

\(^{134}\) Participation; Voluntary activities; Youth and the world
Figure 26. Contribution of the EU Youth Strategy to these effects

Could those effects have been produced in the absence of the EU Youth Strategy or your participation to the EU activities?

EU activities’ relative contribution to the outcomes identified

Respondents that identified at least one outcome of the EU Strategy or of EU activities in Q6 where then asked to link the outcome to specific EU activities (Q6j.1 to Q6o.12).

Youth Organisations’ rated each activity’s contribution to the different outcome similarly across effects, i.e. a specific activity is considered to have had the same level of contribution to all effects.

The reported contribution of different activities to each outcome are presented under the figure below.

The most interesting findings are presented here below:

- “Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ or the ‘Erasmus+’ funding programmes” is the activity which contributed the most to the outcomes listed (Q6.a to Q6.g)
- This is followed by “EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues”
- The “EU Youth conferences” is considered the second most effective activity to have contributed to improvements in the youth policy agenda, or policy making, at EU, national or local level(s)
- The least effective activities are those related to the EU-China Year of Youth 2011 (only 2% of the effects were attributed to this type of activity).

The analysis of the responses against the participation of Youth organisations to individual activities shows a positive correlation between effectiveness and participation is noticeable. However, some activities (e.g. Other EU activities; EU Youth conference) with a lower rate of participation are considered to have contributed more to the listed effects than other activities where participation was higher.

---

N=130

Contributed to improvements in the youth policy agenda, or policy making, at EU, national or local level(s) (N=155); Improved stakeholders’ knowledge of the situation of youth at EU, national or local level (N=154); Increased attention to the impact of initiatives in different policy areas on youth (N=155); Encouraged stakeholders to consider youth issues from a cross-sectoral perspective (N=155); Led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of volunteering (N=152); Led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of youth work (N=154); Improved the participation of youth stakeholders in setting the policy agenda/ in policy-making (N=153)
Figure 27. Youth organisations’ views on the contribution of EU level activity(ies) contributed to this (these) outcome(s)

- Contributed to improvements in the youth policy agenda, or policy making, at EU, national or local level(s)
- Increased attention to the impact of initiatives in different policy areas (employment, health, etc.) on youth
- Encouraged stakeholders to consider youth issues from a cross-sectoral perspective
- Led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of volunteering
- Led to an improvement in the recognition of the value of youth work
- Improved the participation of youth stakeholders in setting the policy agenda/in policy-making

Which EU level activity(ies) contributed to this (these) outcome(s):

- Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme
- EU Youth Conferences
- EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues
- Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people
- Other EU activities in the field of youth
- European Youth Week
- EU level expert groups or high-level fora
Views on further effects

The survey participants were then asked whether, based on their knowledge, the EU Youth Strategy had any other effects, amongst those presented in the questionnaire (Q.7). Figure 28 illustrates this.

Survey respondents were then asked what other effects the EU Youth strategy has led to (Q7.a). However from the few responses collected no trend emerged.

Figure 28. Further effects of the strategy

According to what you know, has the EU Youth Strategy had any of these other effects?

- The quantity and quality of opportunities for young people have improved: 59%
- The needs and interests of young people in youth organisations’ activities are taken into account in a better manner: 54%
- The representation and participation of young people in public life has improved: 44%
- Other effects: 3%
- I don’t know: 21%

Relevance

Respondents that participated to specific activities were asked to rate the degree of relevance of the activities they participated in (Q4), according to:

- the national agenda
- the work of their organisation.

Figure 29 and Figure 30 present the degree of relevance respectively at national level and Youth Organisation level in relation to the respondent’s participation to that activity.

---

137 Other effects listed in the questionnaire were: (1) The quantity and quality of opportunities (to volunteer, to participate in youth work, to participate in policy-making, or to gain experience in employment, education or training etc.) for young people have improved, (2) The needs and interests of young people in youth organisations’ activities are taken into account in a better manner, (3) The representation and participation of young people in public life has improved.

138 The percentage is calculated on the total respondent to this question (N=143). A small correction was needed as 5 respondents (3%) indicated an effect and then also choose the “I don’t know” option. These answers were disregarded in the “I don’t know” option counting.

139 N=143

140 This question was only shown to respondents that have actually participated to individual activities, therefore it is presented against the participation rate represented by the red line and the values indicated on vertical right axis.

141 The percentages are calculated on the total number of respondents to each sub-question. EU level expert groups or high-level fora (N=22); EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues (N=83); Activities of the Council Youth working party (N=14); Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people (N=73); EU Youth Conferences (N=53); European Youth Week (N=66); Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011 (N=57); Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011 (N=7); Events and activities organised by the Council of...
Europe (in partnership with the European Commission) in the youth field (N=45); The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy (N=28); Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme (N=108); Other EU activities in the field of youth (N=35). The percentages are calculated on the total number of respondents to each sub-question. EU level expert groups or high-level fora (N=22); EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues (N=83); Activities of the Council Youth working party (N=14); Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people (N=73); EU Youth Conferences (N=53); European Youth Week (N=66); Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011 (N=57); Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011 (N=7); Events and activities organised by the Council of Europe (in partnership with the European Commission) in the youth field (N=45); The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy (N=28); Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme (N=108); Other EU activities in the field of youth (N=35).
Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011

- Relevant: 33%
- Somewhat relevant: 40%
- Not very relevant: 16%
- I don't know: 11%

EU Youth Conferences

- Relevant: 40%
- Somewhat relevant: 38%
- Not very relevant: 11%
- I don't know: 11%

Other EU activities in the field of youth (please specify)

- Relevant: 40%
- Somewhat relevant: 40%
- Not very relevant: 9%
- I don't know: 11%

Events and activities organised by the Council of Europe (in partnership with the European Commission) in the youth... and other activities funded under the 'Youth in action' funding

- Relevant: 40%
- Somewhat relevant: 42%
- Not very relevant: 9%
- I don't know: 9%

European Youth Week

- Relevant: 41%
- Somewhat relevant: 42%
- Not very relevant: 11%
- I don't know: 6%

EU level expert groups or high-level fora

- Relevant: 41%
- Somewhat relevant: 41%
- Not very relevant: 9%
- I don't know: 9%

Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people

- Relevant: 41%
- Somewhat relevant: 36%
- Not very relevant: 16%
- I don't know: 7%

Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011

- Relevant: 43%
- Somewhat relevant: 29%
- Not very relevant: 24%
- I don't know: 4%

The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy

- Relevant: 46%
- Somewhat relevant: 29%
- Not very relevant: 21%
- I don't know: 8%

EU level or multilateral peer-learning or 'good practice exchange' activities, or seminars or conferences on youth...

- Relevant: 55%
- Somewhat relevant: 35%
- Not very relevant: 38%
- I don't know: 9%

Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the 'Youth in action' funding...

- Relevant: 57%
- Somewhat relevant: 23%
- Not very relevant: 7%
- I don't know: 12%

Activities of the Council Youth working party

- Relevant: 64%
- Somewhat relevant: 36%
- Not very relevant: 0%
- I don't know: 0%
Respondents were then asked to explain their ratings (Q4.aa).

Multilateral peer-learning activities have been reported by respondents as opportunities to exchange good practices, increase knowledge on youth issues and develop new connections with potential partners. Three respondents (AT\textsuperscript{145}, EL\textsuperscript{146}, FR\textsuperscript{147}) reported that limited resources – time, human and financial – sometimes hindered their participation to these events. Four respondents (BG\textsuperscript{148}, DE\textsuperscript{149}, FR\textsuperscript{150},

\textsuperscript{144} The percentages are calculated on the total number of respondents to each option. EU level expert groups or high-level fora (N=21); EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues (N=83); Activities of the Council Youth working party (N=14); Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people (N=72); EU Youth Conferences (N=54); European Youth Week (N=65); Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011 (N=55); Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011 (N=7); Events and activities organised by the Council of Europe (in partnership with the European Commission) in the youth field (N=45); The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy (N=29); Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme (N=109); Other EU activities in the field of youth funded under the EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues (N=35).

\textsuperscript{145} Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion

\textsuperscript{146} Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion

\textsuperscript{147} Education and training; Health and well-being; Creativity and culture

\textsuperscript{148} Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Voluntary activities; Creativity and culture

\textsuperscript{149} Education and training; Participation; Creativity and culture

\textsuperscript{150} Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion
PT\textsuperscript{151}) reported difficulties in accessing EU funded programmes. This is mostly due to the administrative burden linked to the application process, the lack of sufficient information on those opportunities and reduction of funding opportunity.

While Structured dialogue is considered relevant or somewhat relevant by the majority of organisations that took part in it (86%, N=72), three respondents in BG and HR highlighted some lack of transparency and the risk of monopolisation of the instrument by a few Youth Organisations.

**Efficiency**

Youth Organisations were then asked to what extent they agreed with a series of statements about the reasonableness of costs (e.g. in terms of human resources, time spent, other resources needed) of their participation to the EU level activities, in relation to results/effects produced (Q8).

Figure 31 presents this for EU activities respondents participated in\textsuperscript{152}.

The majority of respondents agreed that the cost of participation to all EU activities was reasonable in relation to results/effects produced. The costs of peer-learning activities and activities funded by the Erasmus+ and Youth in Action programmes were considered the most reasonable in relation to results/effects achieved. On the other hand, the costs of (1) 2015 reporting exercise, (2) other activities and (3) the activities organised during 2011 EU-China Youth year were considered less reasonable in view of results/effects achieved.\textsuperscript{153}

It is important to acknowledge that as the efficiency of specific activities was tested with Youth organisations that took part to those, the level of participation deeply impact the comparability between activities.

Respondents that disagreed with one or more statements were then asked to motivate their choice and to explain problems and possible solutions (Q.8m).

Half of the sixteen collected answers pointed at a lack of sufficient funding to take part in EU activities (N=4, DE\textsuperscript{154}, LT\textsuperscript{155}, SL\textsuperscript{156}, UK\textsuperscript{157}), to co-fund Youth in Action/ Erasmus+ funded programmes.
projects (DE\textsuperscript{158}, HR\textsuperscript{159}) and to fulfill monitoring obligation connected to the use of EU funds (DE\textsuperscript{160}, FR\textsuperscript{161}).

Four respondents reported that the Structured dialogue could be improved as “only few youth organisations are engaged” (HR\textsuperscript{162}), and related activities were reported as “too costly and abstract and less productive compared to EU peer learning events” (BG\textsuperscript{163}).

Finally, two German youth organisations\textsuperscript{164} reported that the EYS is too abstract to be relevant at local level. In order to engage local entities, specific initiatives should be developed without mentioning what type.

\textsuperscript{158} Employment and entrepreneurship; Social inclusion
\textsuperscript{159} Education and training, Participation, Creativity and culture, Youth and the world
\textsuperscript{160} Employment and entrepreneurship; Social inclusion
\textsuperscript{161} Two organisations engaged in Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture, Health and well-being
\textsuperscript{162} Two organisations engaged in Participation; Voluntary activities; Spirituality
\textsuperscript{163} Two organisations engaged in Participation; Employment and entrepreneurship; Voluntary activities; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world
\textsuperscript{164} Two organisations engaged in Education and training; Voluntary activities; Participation; Social inclusion
**Figure 31. The costs of participation to the following EU activities were reasonable in relation to results/effects produced**

Were the costs of participation to the following EU activities reasonable in relation to results/effects produced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I somewhat agree</th>
<th>I disagree</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other EU activities in the field of youth</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Youth Conferences</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU level expert groups or high-level fora</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Youth Week</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of the Council Youth working party</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme...</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Views from youth organisation respondents which have not heard of the EUYS**

Respondents (N=93) which had never heard of the EUYS (19%, N=250) of youth organisations surveyed), or those which have not taken part to any EU activities (23%, N=202), were asked, under question 9, whether they had heard of a list of activities or tools which exist at EU level in the youth field. As illustrated under Figure

---

165 The percentages are calculated on the total number of respondents to each option. EU level expert groups or high-level fora (N=20); EU level or multilateral peer-learning or ‘good practice exchange’ activities, or seminars or conferences on youth issues (N=81); Activities of the Council Youth working party (N=12); Consultations part of the Structured Dialogue with young people (N=66); EU Youth Conferences (N=50); European Youth Week (N=65); Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011 (N=51); Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011 (N=6); Events and activities organised by the Council of Europe (in partnership with the European Commission) in the youth field (N=45); The reporting exercise for the 2015 National reports about the progress in the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy (N=27); Other activities which supported policy reform in the youth field funded under the ‘Youth in action’ funding programme or the current (2014-2020) ‘Erasmus+’ funding programme (N=106); Other EU activities in the field of youth (N=32). This question was only shown to respondents that have actually participated to individual activities, therefore it is presented against the participation rate shown by the red line and the values indicated on vertical right axis.
32, whilst almost all of these respondents are well aware of the Erasmus+ programme (90%, N=93) and 61% knew of the Youth pass, they were less aware of the other EU tools/activities.\textsuperscript{166} Less than half of those respondents knew about the existence of:

- the EU youth portal
- the Eurodesks
- the EU Youth conferences
- the European Youth Weeks

Less than a third of those respondents knew about the existence of the structured dialogue or of EU funded studies on youth issues.

*Figure 32. Awareness of EU tools/activities*\textsuperscript{167}

Respondents who knew about those activities or tools were then asked to rate their usefulness for young people (Q9.j to Q9.q).\textsuperscript{168}

*Figure 33* presents the level of usefulness of those tools/activities rated by youth organisation in relation to the level of awareness of the same tool/activities.

The Erasmus+ programme was rated the most useful activity for young people among those listed (95%, N=79). While this may be due to the general awareness and good reputation the programme enjoys, it has to be noted that also EU-funded studies, known by a far lower number of respondents (18%, N=90), are considered to be greatly useful for young people (88%, N=16).

\textsuperscript{166} The percentages are calculated on the total number of respondents to each option. The EU youth portal (N=90); The Eurodesks (N=89); The Youthpass (N=90); EU Youth Conferences (N=90); European Youth Weeks (N=89); Structured dialogue (N=88); The Erasmus+ programme (N=90); EU-funded studies on youth issues (N=90)

\textsuperscript{167} The percentages are calculated on the total number of respondents to each option. The EU youth portal (N=90); The Eurodesks (N=89); The Youthpass (N=90); EU Youth Conferences (N=90); European Youth Weeks (N=89); Structured dialogue (N=88); The Erasmus+ programme (N=90); EU-funded studies on youth issues (N=90)

\textsuperscript{168} The percentages are calculated on the total number of respondents to each option. The EU youth portal (N=38); The Eurodesks (N=36); The Youthpass (N=55); EU Youth Conferences (N=36); European Youth Weeks (N=35); Structured dialogue (N=25); The Erasmus+ programme (N=79); EU-funded studies on youth issues (N=16)
Respondent were also asked what other tools/activities could be supported at EU level that would help young people (Q9.r). Twenty-seven youth organisations responded to this question.

The need for better communication was highlighted by four Youth organisations (ES\textsuperscript{170}, FR\textsuperscript{171}, HR\textsuperscript{172}, SL\textsuperscript{173}), although only one of them was aware of the existence of the Youth Portal (HR\textsuperscript{174}). This could be addressed by a more intensive use of social media, and by developing a website that could act as a one shop point for youth exchanges, training courses and internships across Europe.

Three responses focus on Erasmus+ programme asking for more accessible information (DE\textsuperscript{175}) and its extension to upper secondary level students (HR\textsuperscript{176}). Finally, one youth organisation (EL\textsuperscript{177}) remarked that more opportunities for internships abroad would be required given that due to the new Erasmus+ merged programme it is difficult to be selected for a placement for those people that may have spent a semester as Erasmus student in the past.

Three respondents (BE\textsuperscript{178}) suggested that more could be done to improve networking among young people by organising more EU level events (e.g. conferences) (DE\textsuperscript{179}) or by providing more small funding opportunities for these type of activities (DK\textsuperscript{180}).

\textsuperscript{169} The percentages are calculated on the total number of respondents to each option. The EU youth portal (N=38); The Eurodesks (N=36); The Youthpass (N=55); EU Youth Conferences (N=36); European Youth Weeks (N=35); Structured dialogue (N=25); The Erasmus+ programme (N=79); EU-funded studies on youth issues (N=16)

\textsuperscript{170} Employment and entrepreneurship; Health and well-being; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture; Youth and the world

\textsuperscript{171} Education and training

\textsuperscript{172} Education and training; Health and well-being; Creativity and culture

\textsuperscript{173} Education and training

\textsuperscript{174} Education and training; Health and well-being; Creativity and culture

\textsuperscript{175} Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Creativity and culture

\textsuperscript{176} Education and training; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion

\textsuperscript{177} Education and training; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion

\textsuperscript{178} Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Social inclusion; Youth and the world

\textsuperscript{179} Education and training; Participation

\textsuperscript{180} Education and training; Participation
Two respondents highlighted that there should be a stronger focus on young people with disabilities (SE, UK).

Three respondents urged for a deeper involvement of local entities and organisations (AT, DE, PT) by encouraging more projects and initiatives at local level (PT) and involving local entities in the implementation of the youth strategy at national level (DE).

Respondents which had never heard of the EUYS (19% (N=250) of youth organisations surveyed), or those which have not taken part to any EU activities (23%, N=202), were then asked to rank (from 1 to 6) six policy areas the EU should focus its future efforts on when addressing youth issues (Q10).

In order to analyse the data, the ranking was converted using the following criteria:

- Position 1 and 2: Important need
- Position 3 and 4: Medium need
- Position 5 and 6: Low need.

Figure 34 shows the results of this clustering exercise. Four main policy areas are considered by respondents (N=89), as an important or medium need:

- Education and training (75%)
- Employment and entrepreneurship (70%)
- Social inclusion (68%)
- Health and well-being (67%)

Respondents were then asked whether the EU should also be involved in any other policy areas in relation to youth (Q10.g). Although eighteen responses were collected, no specific trend or strong agreement among respondents emerged.

A number of areas already covered by the strategy were indicated (e.g. participation, entrepreneurship, volunteering, education) showing either an incomplete knowledge of the EYS or a need for a stronger action in those areas.

In terms of new policy areas, the following were proposed: sport, immigration, human rights, environment and sustainability, creation of public space for youth, research.

---

180 Education and training; Health and well-being; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Youth and the world
181 Employment and entrepreneurship; Social inclusion
182 Social inclusion
183 Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Health and well-being; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Creativity and culture
184 Local youth welfare
185 Education and training; Employment and entrepreneurship; Participation; Voluntary activities; Social inclusion; Youth and the world
186 N=89
Respondents were then asked to rank (from 1 to 5) different types of initiatives for young people which they thought the EU should promote (Q11.a to Q11.e). As illustrated by Figure 36, non-formal learning and Youth work were ranked the highest.

Respondent were also asked what other initiatives could be promoted by the EU that would help young people (Q11.f). Thirteen answers were collected but once again no trend emerged. Responses include environmental initiatives, local activities and twinning between cities.

---

Footnotes:

187 N=89
188 N=90
189 N=90
Final feedback

Youth organisations were finally asked to share any other feedback that could be useful for the evaluation (Q17). Fifty-eight answers were collected.

Seven youth organisations (DE$^{190}$, ES$^{191}$, IT$^{192}$, LT$^{193}$, PT$^{194}$) called for a better communication of EU messages. In particular, small youth organisation are rarely reached by initiatives linked to the EYS and are not usually aware of the EU action in the youth field.

Also a simplification of EU procedures seems to be quite high in respondents’ agenda (AT$^{195}$, BG$^{196}$, HR$^{197}$, FR$^{198}$, RO$^{199}$, SK$^{200}$, SL$^{201}$) in particular in relation to Erasmus+ programme application procedure and evaluation obligation are felt as an excessive burden.

Three respondents (HR$^{202}$, LV$^{203}$, SE$^{204}$) consider important to allocate more financial resources either to reach policy goal or to support the work of youth organisations.

Three respondents (BG$^{205}$, EL$^{206}$, ES$^{207}$) also feel that more needs to be done on the implementation side, following the actions of Member states more closely, issuing recommendations and sharing best practices.

While youth unemployment is still considered a major issue by some respondents (AT$^{208}$, DK$^{209}$, HR$^{210}$), one youth organisation (FR$^{211}$) shared the doubt that too much focus on it can draw away resources from other areas as citizenship and culture.
Testing effects of the over-representation of some countries on overall responses

Some small countries (PT and HR) were over-represented in responses received to the survey to youth organisations.

ICF checked whether the over-representation in responses from those countries created a bias in the overall pool of responses.

In order to check this, a set of key questions from the survey were picked and responses from HR and PT were checked against trends which emerged from (1) the remaining response pool (ie. excluding responses from PT and HR) and (2) the entire response pool.

This check showed that responses from youth organisations from those over-represented countries reflected the overall trends in responses from the other countries.

Here below is the breakdown of answers to this key set of questions - per response group: (1) entire response group, (2) responses from HR and PT only, (3) responses from countries barring HR and PT.

• Knowledge of the EU Youth Strategy (Q1)\textsuperscript{212}

Youth organisations (N=250) that participated in the survey were asked whether they were aware of the existence of the EU Youth Strategy (Q1).

The figure below shows how that the distribution of responses from youth organisations in HR and PT compare to that from the entire pool of respondents, and to the distribution of all other responses, barring those from HR and PT.

The figure shows that the distribution of responses from youth organisations in PT or HR does not differ from that of those from youth organisations from other countries.

\textsuperscript{212} N=250
Relevance of EU activities to the national youth agenda (Q4.b to Q4.e)

Unlike question 1, presented above, question 4b to 4e were not compulsory. Number of respondents to questions on the relevance of each of the EU activities are indicated under “n” in the Figure below. The ‘n’ figure should be considered when looking at differences in trends, presented in the figure below.

This figure shows that views from PT or HR organisations on the relevance of the different EU activities to the national youth agenda did not diverge substantially from those from other countries or the entire response group. Some variations exist but they are not substantial.
Figure 37. Youth organisations’ views on the relevance of EU activities to the national youth agenda (Q4.b to 4.e)
Effectiveness of EU activities (Q5.a-i)\(^{214}\)

Respondents which participated to at least one EU activity (Q.3a to Q.3l) (N=157) were asked to give their opinion on the effects that participation to these activities have had at EU, national and local level (Q5.a- Q5.j). They were presented with different types of ‘effects, as e.g. Networking with youth organisations, Networking with policy-makers, Networking with researchers, Networking with other stakeholders, Knowledge-building, the launch of new activities, the creation of new partnerships; changes in the organisation’s practices etc.

Answers to question to Q5 were not compulsory. Number of respondents to each sub-question (per effect listed) are indicated under “n” in the Figure below. The ‘n’ figure should be considered when looking at differences in trends, presented in the figure below.

This figures shows that views from PT and HR organisations on the contribution of the different EU activities to the effects listed did not diverge substantially from those from other countries or from the entire response group. Some variations exist but they are not substantial.

\(^{214}\) N=73
Figure 38. Youth organisations’ views on the contribution of EU activities (they participated in) to a list of effects (Q5.a-i)
Annex 10 Results of survey of Young Europeans

Characteristics of the participants sample

In total, 719 young people filled in the online survey. The most represented age group is 18-25 (53%), followed by 25-30 (33%) and 15-18 (14%).

About half of the respondents (49%, N=719) are individuals that are members of a youth organisation. Interestingly 65% of the youngest respondents (15-18) are members of a youth organisation – it is the biggest proportion of youth organisation memberships (65%), followed by 47% of respondents of age group 18-25 and 46% age group 25-30.

In terms of country distribution, participants to the survey come from all across Europe, the top-5 countries being: Poland, Italy, Germany, France and Spain, as illustrated in Figure 39. There is no indication on the geographical location of the 23 respondents who ticked the option ‘Other – non EU countries’.

Figure 39. Geographical distribution of survey respondents

Relevance of areas of activity

The Youth Strategy supports a range of areas of activity. Respondents were presented a list of areas of activity and asked to rank them by order of importance from 1 to 8 (1=most relevant; 8=least relevant).

A large number of respondents (N=296 out of 718 answers) misunderstood the ranking system to this question, meaning:

- While the question asked to rank the areas of activity (e.g. education, employment, etc.) from 1 to 8 by order of importance, a great number of respondents understood the question differently – i.e. to rate each area separately from each other. In other words, many respondents gave the same score (e.g. 1 ‘very important’) to each area (e.g. education, employment), instead of establishing a ranking.
- some inversed the ranking scale (1 became the least relevant and 8 the most relevant).

The dataset was cleaned and only respondents (N=422) who ranked the areas of activity from 1 ‘most relevant’ to 8 ‘least relevant’ were kept. For the analysis, results...
were aggregated by categories of ratings: answers for rankings ‘1 to 3’, ‘4 to 6’ and ‘7 to 8’ were respectively summed up. Results show that the most important and relevant area of activity for the interest and needs of young people is Education. 77% (N=422) of respondents considered Education is a very relevant area and attributed a score of ‘1 to 3’ to it, followed by the area of Employment – 47% of respondents rated it ‘1 to 3’. Other areas appear to be of medium interest to participants with a majority of participants (above 40%) rating them from ‘4 to 6’. Areas of least interest to participants are ‘youth and the world’ and ‘Voluntary activities’ with about 35% rating them as ‘7 to 8’.

How relevant the following areas of activity are to your own interests and needs? (1=most relevant; 8=least relevant, N=422)

Views on European activities in the field of youth

The Youth Strategy supports a range of areas of activity. Respondents were presented a list of those and asked whether they knew them (multiple choice, question n°2). The great majority of respondents (83%, N=713) knows that the EU undertakes activities to support young people. Only 17% (N=713) of respondents did not know that the EU undertook activities to support young people.

As illustrated in Figure 40, activities mostly heard of by the survey respondents are:

- the Erasmus+ programme (96%, N=700),
- the Youth in Action programme (61%, N=699) and
- the EU Youth Conferences (51%, N=698).

Less than half of the survey respondents had heard of the following activities:

- European Youth Weeks (44%, N=701)
- EU or multilateral seminars or conferences on youth issues (37%, N=713).

They were however known better than EU activities outside of the EUYS, e.g. the Youth Guarantee (33%, N=702) and events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field (29%, N=698).

The most unknown activities under the EUYS were the ones organised within:
- the ‘EU-China year of Youth 2011’ (94%, N=705),
- the ‘European Year of Volunteering 2011’ (76%, N=707) and
- the Structured Dialogue with young people or ‘Ideas Lab’ (73%, N=702)\(^{215}\).

*Figure 40. Knowledge of EU supported activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you heard of the below EU supported activities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus+ programme (N=700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Action programme (N=699)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Youth Conferences (N=698)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Youth Weeks (N=701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU/multilateral seminars/conferences on youth issues (N=713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Youth Guarantee (N=702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field (N=698)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Structured Dialogue’ with young people or ‘Ideas Lab’ (N=702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of the European Year of Volunteering 2011 (N=707)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of the EU-China Year of Youth 2011 (N=705)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

\[ N=\% \]

**Views on European tools in the field of youth**

Survey participants were asked whether they had heard of EU supported tools in the field of youth, listed in the questionnaire (multiple choice question, question nº3a-d). As illustrated in Figure 41, a little over half of survey respondents had heard of the Youthpass (52%, N=710). Among those who know about the Youthpass, 60% (N=371) are members of a Youth organisation. Less than half of survey respondents had heard of the EU Youth portal (47%, N=707), the Eurodesks (43%, N=711), the Facebook page (40%, N=710).

\(^{215}\) This could be due to the wording of the question which grouped the two activities “the Structured Dialogue with young people” and ‘Ideas Lab’ rather than distinguishing them. The ‘Ideas Lab’ was an initiative from the European Commission to create a space where young people across Europe to generate new ideas and solutions on a wide range of topics. These ideas were then to be rated online by other young people, before sending the ideas to policy and decision-makers for evaluation, feedback, and perhaps take-up. [https://europa.eu/youth/ideas_en](https://europa.eu/youth/ideas_en) Assumingly the ‘Ideas Lab’ would have been well known than Structured Dialogue-related activities.
Survey participants were asked to rate how useful each EU supported tool was (multiple choice question, question nº3e-h). As illustrated in Figure 42, respondents had mixed opinions about the usefulness of the tools they knew about (N between 280 and 332 depending on the tool at stake). Asked to rate the usefulness of tools on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=very useful; 5=not useful at all), a bit more than half of respondents (between 52%-57% depending on the tool) find the tools ‘very useful’ to ‘useful’, and a bit less than half (between 39%-40%) found their usefulness limited or did not find them useful. Therefore, no specific tool seems to be more or less useful than another.

Respondents were then asked the following open-ended question “can you tell us more about the usefulness (or lack of) some of the tools in the text box below?” (open-ended, question nº3i). Respondents who answered the open question (N=173) can be divided between those who are satisfied with the tools and those which are not:

- About half of the respondents find the tools very useful: they are able to find the information they are looking for and be kept updated of EU news or events in the field of Youth. In particular, various respondents mention that the Eurodesk(s) and the Youthportal helped them find information about volunteering opportunities abroad. About a quarter of respondents also describe the Youthpass as being a very useful tool to add to their CV. In a very few cases, respondents mentioned that it helped them find a job or enter university.

- The other half of respondents seem very unhappy about the tools. A major concern expressed is the fact that the tools are not well-known by youth people – i.e. they are not sufficiently advertised. Those respondents considered that the tools are not user-friendly and that information is not sufficiently up-to-date. These concerns referred mainly to the Eurodesks and Youth Portal. About a quarter of respondents mention that the Youthpass could potentially be a useful tool, however, it is not yet well-known by employers or institutions and when it is known, it might not be sufficiently recognised.

Note that respondents who answered the open question nº3i (N=173) provided answers without automatically specifying which tool there were referring to.
Figure 42. Usefulness of the tools

How useful you found the following tools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>1 (very useful)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (not useful at all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youthpass (N=710)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurodesks (N=707)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Youth Facebook page (N=704)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU youth portal (N=711)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involvement in activities organised at EU-level

Survey participants were asked whether they had taken part in any of the EU level activities listed in the questionnaire (multiple choice, question nº4a-j). Most respondents did not take part in the EU level activities. Very few respondents attended EU-level activities.

Table 4. Have you taken part in the below EU-level activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Erasmus+ programme</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Youth in Action programme</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Youth Weeks</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Structured Dialogue’ with young people or 'Ideas Lab'</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Youth Guarantee</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Youth Conferences</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU or multilateral seminars or conferences on youth issues</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events organised by the Council of Europe in the youth field</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the European Year of Volunteering 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities organised during the EU-China Year of Youth 2011</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 4, the activities with the greater number of participants were:

- the Erasmus+ programme (247 respondents took part out of 677)
- the Youth in Action programme (144 respondents took part out of 412)
- The Structured Dialogue’ with young people or 'Ideas Lab' (52 took part out of 183).
The total number of respondents (N) is comprised between 41 and 677, depending on the activity (out of a total 719 respondents). Indeed, as this survey question was not compulsory, a large number of respondents did not provide any answers to some of the sub-questions (n°4a-j) – many provided a blank answer.

Asked about which activities they attended and when (open-ended, question n°4a1-j1), amongst responses received to this non-compulsory question the following were mentioned:

- European Youth weeks (N=45) in different countries and cities between 2011 and 2015 – e.g. Brussels, Cyprus, Strasbourg, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Slovenia, Vilnius, Bulgaria, Toulouse;
- Structured Dialogue events between 2012 and 2015 in different countries and cities (N=46), e.g. Cyprus, Croatia, Berlin, Bulgaria, France, Dublin, Brussels, Estonia, Lithuania; Structured Dialogue Political Participation 2014-15; Structured Dialogue and Youth Empowerment seminar organised by Bulgarian National Youth Forum and National conferences.
- EU or multilateral seminars (N=24) or conferences on youth issues (N=23), such as: Vloom volunteering Workshop; World Youth Alliance conference (Zagreb, 2014); Young Europe Rethinking Democracy (2014-2015); PL-CZ-SK Evaluation Seminar (Warsaw 2015); EDIW Seminar (Madrid 2015).
- Intra-EU mobility schemes (N=216), e.g. youth exchanges, EVS, training exchanges or staff exchanges between 2012 and 2015 (Italy, Croatia, Latvia, Portugal, Turkey, Spain, etc) and the great majority mentioned their participation to an Erasmus exchange with a university.
- ‘Youth in Action Programme’ funded activities (N=114) such as Youth exchanges; the EVS; the Leonardo da Vinci mobility scheme; participation to the European Youth Parliament; to ‘Get your voice heard 2013’, etc.
- European Year of Volunteering activities (N=12), such as the International day of volunteering, 2011; Cyprus HYHO training, etc.
- Only one respondent mentioned having participated in the EU-China Youth Forum for Participation, Shenzhen, China.
- Council of Europe events, (N=20) such as ‘Young immigrants and political participation’ (ACCESS); ‘World forum for democracy 2012’; ‘No Hate Speech Movement’; ‘Europaseminar in Strasbourg 2007’; ‘European Youthwork convention’.

Asked about the most interesting aspects for having taken part in those EU level activities, also in comparison to similar activities in their own country / region / locality (open-ended, question n°4k, N=249), respondents mostly referred to personal benefits in terms of:

- Meeting new people and cultures, opening one’s mind (e.g. getting to know other cultures and languages, learning to live in different conditions)
- Exchanging ideas on similar problems (e.g. youth unemployment, youth disinterest for social issues) with people from different countries and comparing countries’ situations.

Note that for many answers, the name of the event, date and localisation was not always provided. For many answers, it was impossible to understand which was the event/activity attended.
In some cases, respondents refer to having developed certain skills such as:

- ‘Learning by doing’, non-formal learning
- Improving transversal skills (communication and language skills).

Survey participants were finally asked to give their suggestions on EU level activities they would suggest to the EU that to help young people address their educational / job opportunities and / civic involvement, or other needs, and also explain why (open-ended, question n°4m, N=387). Interestingly, various similar suggestions emerged from participants answers. The most cited ones were namely:

- improving the dissemination of the EU programs and opportunities for young people;
- Promoting access to work and job security for the youth overall;
- Extending the number of EU opportunities for the youth (e.g. language training, job related training, summer courses, cultural exchanges) across the EU;
- Ensuring a more equal access to volunteering activities across the EU, ensuring access to specific grants. Many participants have the feeling that volunteering activities are reserved to privileged youth;
- Extending the age limit for participation in the initiatives (education, Erasmus+, volunteering) among the 25-35 years group;
- Ensuring better access to higher education (via loan systems, scholarships) for disadvantage youth;
- Facilitating the mobility of youth from an administrative perspective.

Other suggestions less cited were for instance:

- Fostering learning about the EU at school
- Creating a youth online Forum/youth EU network where young people can debate and share their experiences and meet (e.g. while being studying abroad).
- Developing EU-level initiatives in other languages than English.

Fostering youth entrepreneurship across the EU.

**Views on national-level actions taken to improve the situation of young people in comparison to 5 years ago**

The EU Youth Strategy has been implemented across the Member States over a number of years to improve the situation for young people.

Asked about their views and opinions on actions taken to improve the situation of young people in their country (multiple choice, question n°5a-e), the great majority of respondents considered that, in comparison to 5 years ago, more was being done in the following fields of action:

- education - 71% ‘agree or strongly agree’ (N=707)
- involvement in civil society organisations – 61% ‘agree or strongly agree’ (N=707).

Most respondents disagreed that more was being been done to:

- take young people’s needs and interests into account in policy (50% disagree vs. 35% ‘agree or strongly agree’, N=705).

Views on actions taken to improve the situation of young people in comparison to 5 years ago in the following fields of action are mixed:
Regarding young people’s ‘Access to work’, 46% ‘agree or strongly agree’ vs. 44% (N=704).

Regarding ‘Access to social services’ respondents agree slightly more than they disagree (46% vs. 36%, N=708)

Regarding ‘influence democratic decision-making processes’, 47% disagree vs. 40% ‘agree or strongly agree’ (N=705).

Results are illustrated in Figure 43.

Figure 43. Views on actions taken to improve the situation of young people in comparison to 5 years ago

In comparison with 5 years ago, more is being done for...

Finally, participants were asked to give their opinion on ‘whether there have there been other noticeable changes in the past 5 years in the situation of young people that they would like to tell us about (positive or negative)’ (open-ended, question no 5f, N=235). The great majority of participants observed negative changes on the situation of young people. In particular, they notice that:

- Young people are not sufficiently involved in the decision making process and when they are, their concerns are not translated into actions;
- Youth precariousness and social exclusion has increased – e.g. youth unemployment, unpaid internships, and precarious job conditions);
- Difficult to access higher education – lack of financial opportunities to access education (e.g. scholarships, loan systems, transport subsidies) whereas it is asked from youth to obtain more and more higher degrees;
- Not enough promotion of EU programmes for the youth which constrains its access. There is an increased gap between the informed young citizens and the uniformed.

Some positive changes were observed by participants, although to a less extent. These were:

- The increased number of volunteering opportunities for young people;
- The increased opportunities to share youth voices in local-level politics (e.g. in France);
- The increased youth mobility opportunities (e.g. Erasmus+, etc.)
• More initiatives to fight against early leaving

**Views on what still needs to be done for young people at national-level**

Asked what still needed to be done in the field of youth (multiple choice, question n°6a-f), respondents were asked to rate pre-defined needs, listed in the survey questionnaire.

The majority of respondents considered that four out of those six pre-defined needs listed in the questionnaire were important ones at national-level.

- 73% of respondents (N=702) consider that supporting and developing youth work is an important need in their country;
- 66% of respondents (N=704) considered that improving the integration of youth concerns in different fields of action is an important need in their country;
- 65% of respondents (N=712) considered that the development of policies/actions specifically targeted at young people was an important need in their country and;
- 62% of respondents (N=702) considered supporting the consultation of youth organisations and young people in policy-making is an important need in their country.

41% of respondents considered that supporting the consultation of youth organisations and young people in policy-making was an important need in their country, thus indicating that this need was better addressed at national level, in comparison to the other needs listed.

41% of respondents considered that supporting the development of policies and actions specifically targeted at regional/national voluntary activities was a medium-level need (neither important nor a low one), thus indicating that this need was better addressed at national level, in comparison to the other needs listed.

Very few respondents (less than 17%) considered there is a low need in a particular area.

Participants were then asked to mention the ‘top 3 priorities participants they would like to see included in the EU youth strategy in the future’ (open-ended, question 6h-j, N=between 363 and 420 for questions 6h, 6i and 6j). The top 3 priorities most often mentioned were, by order of importance:

- Improve the access to employment for the youth and job stability;
- Improve the access and opportunities for Education and training for the youth (including non-formal learning activities);
- Increase cross-border volunteering opportunities.

Other areas of interest that were mentioned by participants were:

- Support active citizenship and youth participation in the decision-making process;
- Support youth work and youth associations;
- Support youth entrepreneurship;
- Improve access to health for the youth;
- Improve access to information on EU-related programmes.
When asked why the top 3 priorities are important to them (open-ended, question n°6k), participants mentioned various reasons. The most often mentioned reasons where:

- Youth is the future of the EU and therefore investing in youth is investing the future of Europe;
- Young people aspire to financial and social stability and to have better life prospects. Young people struggle more and more to find a job after their studies and because working conditions are often very precarious;
- Investing in education is investing in future citizens;
- Disadvantaged young people do not have an equal access education and/or financial stability while studying – some participants mentioned to struggle in their life for affording their education.
- Support for cross-border volunteering opportunities would enable youth to gain cross-cultural experiences, broaden their horizons and acquire transversal skills.

Finally, when asked whether they would like to raise or share any other issues in relation to the EU Youth Strategy (open-ended, question n°7, N=130), participants reiterated their overall concerns about youth unemployment and lack of decent job opportunities; ensure better dissemination of EU-level activities, policies and programmes; and better access to education and training opportunities.

*Figure 44. Views on what still needs to be done for young people at national-level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent is there a need in your country to</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support and develop youth work (N=702)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate your concerns better when it comes to your education and training, employment, access to social services, etc. (N=704)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop policies/actions specifically targeted at young people (e.g. non-formal learning, participation, voluntary activities, youth work, mobility) (N=712)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the consultation of youth organisations and young people in policy-making (N=702)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop policies/actions specifically targeted at cross-border voluntary activities (N=698)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop policies/actions specifically targeted at regional/national voluntary activities (N=703)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Context
1.1. Background
1.1.1. EU Youth Strategy
a) From the White Paper to the renewed framework

Following EU programmes for youth in place since 1988, youth policy was developed on the basis of a 2001 Commission White Paper and complemented by the European Youth Pact in 2005.

The framework for European co-operation in the field of youth established by the Council in June 2002 included the four priority themes for cooperation proposed in the White Paper:

Encouraging young people's participation in the exercise of active citizenship and civil society
Enhancing the information addressed to young people
Promoting voluntary activities among young people
Encouraging greater understanding and knowledge of youth.

The White Paper on Youth also proposed a mainstreaming perspective for “taking better account of the ‘youth’ dimension in other policy initiatives”. At the end of 2004, Heads of State and Government from France, Germany, Sweden and Spain decided to launch the idea of a European Pact for Youth in the context of the Lisbon Strategy revision. The aim of this Pact, endorsed by the European Council in March 2005, was to improve education, training, mobility, employment and social inclusion of young people, while helping to achieve a work-life balance. The European Youth Pact was then integrated in the Youth Cooperation Framework through a November 2005 Council resolution.

This same Council resolution called on the Commission and Member States to evaluate the framework for European cooperation in the youth field in 2009\textsuperscript{219}.

The 2007 Commission Communication "Promoting young people's full participation in education, employment and society" was another milestone of the former cooperation framework. It stressed again the need for a cross-cutting approach to youth issues; it also included proposals to reinforce the partnership between EU institutions and youth representatives and to prepare every three years an EU report on youth.

Other tools have been progressively developed in order to support the Youth cooperation framework, such as structured dialogue with young people (set up in 2005), cooperation with the Council of Europe on knowledge, peer learning exercises, reinforcement of links between policy cooperation and youth programmes.

At the end of this first cycle of the open method of coordination, an Impact Assessment\textsuperscript{220} was conducted. The Impact Assessment outlined that as a result of changing challenges, young people in Europe suffer from a lack of opportunities to participate in different aspects of society and are exposed to risks such as marginalisation or health problems. The former framework was not equipped to tackle all these challenges.

The Impact Assessment identified a need for more opportunities for young people in education and employment, better access to social services and civic opportunities and to foster solidarity, in particular through volunteering. To step up efficiency, it proposed a transversal dimension. It also suggested mobilising youth organisations and young people. To these purposes, it called for developing tools such as coordination mechanisms, structured dialogue with young people and knowledge-based policy making; and for an effort to better implement them. The Impact assessment called for monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of a new strategy to be done mainly by triennial joint progress reports and a dashboard of indicators.

b) The EU Youth Strategy in a broader context

As the open method of coordination cycle expired in 2009, the Commission made proposals, based on the Impact Assessment, for its renewal in a Communication, ‘EU Youth Strategy: Investing and Empowering’\textsuperscript{221}. In 2009, the Council endorsed a renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018)\textsuperscript{222}, on this basis.


\textsuperscript{221} COM (2009) 200 of 27.04.2009

\textsuperscript{222} http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1390996863108&uri=CELEX:32009G1219%2801%29
The framework (or "EU Youth Strategy") advocates a cross-sectoral approach to implement youth policy addressing eight fields of action. In view of this, the Council emphasized the need to link it to the Europe 2020 Strategy (the overall Strategy for growth and jobs adopted in June 2010) on several occasions. Flagship initiatives launched under the Europe 2020 Strategy indeed included Youth on the Move, whose aim was to help better equip young people for the job market and to improve their education and training level.

The implementation of the renewed framework has been strongly impacted by the way in which the crisis unfolded since then. The priorities chosen by the trio presidencies were "employment", "social inclusion" and "participation", much in line with other EU initiatives, such as the youth employment package\(^\text{223}\).

The EU Youth Report 2012 confirmed the robustness and relevance of the Strategy and its overall objectives, provided specific assessments on progress in the eight fields of action and its instruments for implementation, and gave indications on future priorities. It stressed that emphasis should continue to be placed on employment and entrepreneurship, increasing access to work, along with developing the innovative and creative capacities of young people; it should also increasingly focus on social inclusion, health and well-being.

Acknowledging the need to address the challenges young people are facing following the crisis, the Council adopted an EU Work Plan for Youth\(^\text{224}\) (2014-2015) in May 2014. This plan contributes to the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy, giving further impetus and prominence to EU level work in this field.

The Work Plan defines three priorities:

- development of youth work and non-formal and informal learning and their contribution to addressing the effects of the crisis on young people,
- enhanced cross-sectorial cooperation within the framework of EU strategies,
- and empowerment with a special focus on access to rights, autonomy, participation and active citizenship within and outside the EU.

1.1.2. Recommendation on Mobility of Young Volunteers

The European Voluntary Service has been an integral part of EU youth programmes since 1996 and now is funded under Erasmus+. The Mobility Recommendations of 2001 and 2006\(^\text{225}\) also reached out to young volunteers. In this way a process of steadily enhancing the mobility of young volunteers in Europe has been launched.

The White Paper on Youth in 2001, in which volunteering was one of the four main priorities, was followed by Council Resolutions on voluntary activities of young people. In a 2004 Resolution\(^\text{226}\) (which was based on a Commission Communication\(^\text{227}\)), Member...
States agreed to develop, facilitate, recognise and promote voluntary activities for young people.

In 2007 the Commission presented an analytical report\textsuperscript{228}, evaluating the Member States’ implementation of the objectives for voluntary activities of young people. It concluded that, whilst some progress had been achieved, a further joint effort at EU level was required to make further progress. The Commission proposed in its Communication "Promoting Young People’s Full Potential in Education, Employment and Society" in September 2007\textsuperscript{229} to launch a consultation and impact assessment for a new EU initiative to promote and recognise cross-border voluntary activities of young people through an enhanced interoperability of Member States’ volunteering schemes.

The Impact Assessment for the Council Recommendation\textsuperscript{230} identified little cross-border mobility of young volunteers in the EU due to a lack of opportunities. It argued that enhanced mobility of young volunteers would also benefit non-formal learning, employability, competitiveness, social inclusion and citizenship. The proposed initiative therefore should intend to improve knowledge about opportunities, increase exchange opportunities, assure a reasonable level of quality, promote skills and competences acquired, target youth workers to support young cross-border volunteers and encourage young people with fewer opportunities to volunteer abroad.

To get the appropriate impact, the proposed legal form was, for the first time ever in the youth field, a Council Recommendation according to Article 149 (4) of the Treaty, as it would involve Member States to a greater extent than a Commission Recommendation. The Impact Assessment concluded that the best option would be to improve the interoperability of existing volunteering schemes and to open them up for young volunteers from other Member States.

A broad consultation with stakeholders preceded the proposed initiative and opinions were issued by the European Parliament\textsuperscript{231}, the Economic and Social Committee\textsuperscript{232} and the Committee of the Regions\textsuperscript{233}. To ensure monitoring and evaluation the Impact Assessment referred, like for the EU Youth Strategy, to triennial reports.

The Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU was adopted in 2008, and is still the only Recommendation in the youth field.

1.1.3. Links between the two policy initiatives

Volunteering is one of the eight fields of action of the EU Youth Strategy, under which the implementation of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU is expressly mentioned and its progress is addressed in the EU Youth Reports.

1.2. Objectives

1.2.1. EU Youth Strategy

The renewed framework’s two \textbf{general objectives} for 2010-2018 are to:

\textsuperscript{228} Commission staff working paper SEC1084(2007) of 5 September 2007
\textsuperscript{229} COM(2007)498 of 5 September 2007
\textsuperscript{230} COM (2008) 424 final, of 3 July 2007
\textsuperscript{231} REGI/6/50546, 2007/2149, of 21 April 2008
\textsuperscript{232} SOC 243, of 13 December 2006
\textsuperscript{233} ECOS-IV-017, of 6-7 February 2008
(i) create more and equal opportunities for all young people in education and in the labour market, and
(ii) promote the active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity of all young people.

The **specific objectives** are to develop initiatives to be taken in eight fields of action through a dual approach:

To take specific initiatives in the youth field - i.e. policies and actions specifically targeted at young people in areas such as non-formal learning, participation, voluntary activities, youth work, mobility and information.

To develop mainstreaming - i.e. initiatives pursuing a cross-sectoral approach where due account is taken of youth issues when formulating, implementing and evaluating policies and actions in other policy fields which have a significant impact on young people.

The **operational objectives** are to:

- promote knowledge building and evidence-based policy-making,
- develop mutual learning,
- develop regular progress reporting,
- enhance dissemination of results,
- carry out monitoring of the process,
- develop Structured Dialogue with young people,
- mobilise EU programmes and funds.

The operational objectives are explained in greater detail in the chapter on “Implementation” below.

1.2.2. Recommendation on Mobility of Young Volunteers

The **general objective** of the Council recommendation is to promote the mobility of young volunteers across Europe, by enhancing the conditions for cooperation between the organisers of voluntary activities in different countries, whether civil society or public authorities, so that every young person shall have the opportunity to volunteer in Europe if she or he wishes to do so.

The **specific objectives** are to:

- Improve the level of knowledge of voluntary activities within their national territories and transfer this information to the European Commission for further dissemination.
- Make information on opportunities for voluntary activities abroad easily accessible to young people and to those active in youth work and in youth organisations.
- Make information available to all the relevant actors on the rights and opportunities that arise from existing provisions at European and national level on cross-border voluntary activities.
- Promote the exchange of information on the opportunities for voluntary activities in other Member States and the simplification of the procedures to be followed with the aim of making it easier for young volunteers of a Member State to take part in voluntary activities in other Member States.
Adopt, where appropriate, a flexible approach to developing opportunities for cross-border voluntary activities in Europe.

Increase awareness of the importance of intercultural competences and language learning among young people in order to reduce barriers to their cross-border mobility.

Encourage organisers of voluntary activities to develop self-assessment tools, taking into account the EVS experience, in order to ensure the quality of the cross-border voluntary activities they are taking part in.

Encourage organisers in both sending and receiving Member States to cooperate in providing assurances about the protection of young volunteers and service recipients. This should include sufficient information about the voluntary activity, its organisers and the volunteer, so as to enable both parties to make an informed decision about the activity's suitability and meet any legal requirements.

Examine further relevant social protection provisions through the appropriate existing EU fora with a view to making full use of the possibilities under EU and national legislation.

Promote the appropriate recognition of learning outcomes of voluntary activities, in line with Community provisions and within the respective national systems or frameworks for qualifications, where existing.

Promote the use of instruments at EU level that can facilitate cross-border voluntary activities by ensuring the transparency of qualifications, such as Europass, Youthpass and the European Qualifications Framework.

Give particular attention to young people with fewer opportunities in order to enhance their access to voluntary activities and especially to cross-border voluntary activities.

Operational objectives are mentioned by way of example to allow Member States flexibility in developing opportunities for cross-border voluntary activities, such as

Supporting the development of the hosting capacity for cross-border volunteers.

Supporting the creation of contact points for young European volunteers, in connection, if feasible, with National Agencies of the Youth in Action Programme [now Erasmus+].

Promoting the use of existing European mechanisms that can help youth mobility, such as mobility cards.

Promoting the cross-border mobility of those active in youth work and in youth organisations.

Supporting the development of information and training, for those active in youth work, youth organisations, local authorities and civic services, on the cross-border voluntary activities of young people.

The Commission supports Member States in their tasks by:

Encouraging and organising, in liaison with Member States, the exchange of information and experiences about cooperation between the organisers of voluntary activities in different countries, whether representatives of civil society or public authorities.

Developing a European Youth Volunteer Portal on voluntary activities based on national youth volunteering portals, databases or specific websites, where they exist.

The operational objectives are explained in detail in the chapter on “Implementation”.
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1.3. Description

1.3.1 EU Youth Strategy

In 2009, the Council endorsed the Resolution on a renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-18), referred to as EU Youth Strategy, with the objectives listed above.

The purpose of this Strategy is to establish a framework under which EU Member States can cooperate on youth related issues. In full respect of the Member States’ competences for youth policy and the voluntary nature of the cooperation, the Strategy is implemented through a dual approach (as described under 1.2.1).

The 9-year time frame of the EU Youth Strategy is divided into three 3-year work cycles. For each of these cycles, a number of priorities for European cooperation are adopted by the Council, in cooperation with the representatives of the two Presidency trios covering the cycle in question. The first thematic priority was “youth employment” (2010 - mid-2011), the next one “youth participation in democratic life” (mid-2011 - 2012), followed by “social inclusion of young people with fewer opportunities” (2013 - mid-2014) and “youth empowerment” (mid-2014 - 2015).

At the end of each three-year cycle an EU Youth Report is established, which evaluates progress made towards the overall objectives of the framework and the specific priorities of the each work cycle, and identifies good practice. The EU Youth Report also contains statistics about the situation of young people in the European Union. Two EU Youth Reports have already been adopted, one informing the future renewed framework for cooperation in 2009, and the other one evaluating the first cycle of the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy in 2012.

By reinforcing cooperation and sharing good practices, the renewed framework’s two overall objectives are to create more and equal opportunities for all young people in education and on the labour market, and to promote active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity of all young people. Cross-sectoral cooperation is the underlying principle and youth work is supposed to support all fields of action.

It foresees youth-related aims and possible initiatives to be taken in eight fields of action: education and training; employment and entrepreneurship; social inclusion; health and well-being; participation; culture and creativity; volunteering and youth and the world.

---

234 See also intervention logic table in annex 1
- **Education & training**, aiming at equal access for young people to high quality education and training at all levels and opportunities for lifelong learning. As a complement to formal education, non-formal learning for young people should be promoted and recognised, and better links between formal education and non-formal learning developed. Young people’s transition between education and training and the labour market should be facilitated and supported, and early school leaving reduced.

- **Employment & entrepreneurship**, targeting young people’s integration into the labour market, either as employees or entrepreneurs, and transition from education and training, or from unemployment or inactivity to the labour market. This field was the overall thematic priority of the first Trio Presidency after the entry into force of the renewed framework. During this period, the Council adopted resolutions on the active inclusion of young people and the role of youth work in promoting employability of young people. The first cycle of the Structured Dialogue (see description below) also focused on youth employment. Young people also recommended concrete actions, which fed into a Council Resolution\(^\text{237}\) highlighting the need for access to labour market information, non-formal learning, a quality framework for internships, focus on flexicurity and equal access to mobility. The recommendations and the best practices from Member States inspired subsequent initiatives, such as a Council Recommendation on validation of non-formal and informal learning, and in the wider context of the Youth Opportunities Initiative.

- **Health & well-being**, promoting the support of the health and well-being of young people with a focus on the promotion of mental and sexual health, sport, physical activity and healthy life styles, as well as the prevention and treatment of injury, eating disorders, addictions and substance abuse.

- **Participation**, encouraging support of young people’s participation in representative democracy and civil society at all levels and in society. Many activities have been carried out, including the development of structures for involving young people in decision-making and review of the quality of participatory mechanisms. The Council confirmed its dedication to this field by making "youth participation in democratic life" the overall priority of the second Trio Presidency in the youth field (mid 2011-12). The Council also adopted a Resolution on new and effective forms of participation of all young people in democratic life in Europe\(^\text{238}\). Youth empowerment, very linked to participation, is the priority of the current trio Presidency.

- **Voluntary activities**, striving for support and better recognition of young people’s voluntary activities for their value as an important form of non-formal learning. Obstacles to voluntary activities should be removed and the cross-border mobility of young people promoted. Member States and the Commission have worked together to implement the Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU to create new opportunities for cross-border youth volunteering alongside of the European Voluntary Service.

---


- **Social inclusion**, with the aim to prevent social exclusion and poverty of young people and the transmission of such problems between generations and to strengthen mutual solidarity between society and young people. Equal opportunities for all should be promoted and all forms of discrimination combated. This field was the priority topic of the EU trio Presidencies for 2013-mid 2014. This is reflected in Council Conclusions, such as those on the contribution of quality youth work to the development, well-being and social inclusion of young people of May 2013.239

- **Creativity & culture** addresses young people’s creativity and capacity for innovation through better quality access to and participation in culture and cultural expressions from an early age on. It also promotes personal development, enhanced learning capabilities, intercultural skills, understanding and respect for cultural diversity and the development of new and flexible skills for future job opportunities.

- **Youth & the world** targets young people’s participation in and contribution to global processes of policy-making, implementation and follow-up and young people’s cooperation with regions outside of Europe.

1.3.2 Recommendation on Mobility of Young Volunteers

The Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU240 recommends that Member States promote the mobility of young volunteers across the EU by enhancing the conditions for cooperation between the organisers of voluntary activities in different countries, whether civil society or public authorities, so that every young person shall have the opportunity to volunteer if he or she decides to do so.

For that purpose, Member States agreed on action lines that can be regrouped in five categories: raise awareness about cross-border volunteering, develop opportunities for cross-border volunteering, assure quality through the development of self-assessment tools, recognise learning outcomes of voluntary activities through instruments such as Europass and Youthpass, promote cross-border mobility of youth workers and young people in youth organisations and pay particular attention to young people with fewer opportunities.

Member States report back to the Commission about the measures they are taking to implement the Recommendation in the framework of the EU Youth Strategy's 3-year reporting cycle, the results of which are published in the EU Youth Report.

1.4. Implementation

1.4.1. EU Youth Strategy

Essential for the effective implementation of the renewed framework of cooperation were and still are the **implementation instruments**. The Council agreed on seven implementation instruments, listed in the Resolution. These instruments should be used both to implement specific initiatives in the youth field and support mainstreaming of a

239 8575/13 of 22 April 2013

youth perspective in other policy-fields. As for mainstreaming, instruments should be used as a basis for dialogue with and support to other policy fields.

Here follows a detailed description of the seven implementation instruments, which are mainly financed by the Commission through the former Youth in Action and the current Erasmus+ Programmes. The 2014 work programme of the Erasmus+ programme mentioned the expenditure planned for support to policy reform in the youth field under Key action 3\textsuperscript{241}, which is partly used to support implementation of the EU Youth Strategy; under this programme, the expenditure for the implementation tools of the EU Youth Strategy was around € 1,900,000 in 2014.

Knowledge building and evidence-based policy-making

This instrument aims to ensure that youth policy should be evidence-based. Key documents in this context are the annexes to the EU Youth Report, which contain data and statistics on the situation of young people in the EU, covering all the eight fields of action of the EU Youth Strategy and describe relevant policy initiatives and projects at EU level and in Member States\textsuperscript{242}.

The Commission contributes to the development of an evidence base through commissioning external public opinion surveys and studies on specific topics of key interest to policy development in the youth field, including:

- Study on "Youth participation in democratic life"\textsuperscript{243};
- Eurobarometer Survey on "European Youth: Participation in Democratic Life"\textsuperscript{244}.
- Study on "The value of Youth Work in the EU"\textsuperscript{245}

Under the Erasmus+ programme, the planned expenditure for studies was € 200,000 in 2014.

The Commission also produces evidence through its Eurydice and Policy Support Unit of the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), such as the report "Youth Social Exclusion and Lessons from Youth Work"\textsuperscript{246} or the report "Political Participation and EU Citizenship"\textsuperscript{247}.

In addition, a number of research projects targeting youth have been funded under the Seventh Research Framework Programme. As part of its research policy, the Commission has also published a policy review with results of youth research in the field of social sciences and humanities\textsuperscript{248}.

Finally, the Commission supports the production of research, good practices and country-specific information under its partnership with the Council of Europe in the field of youth. This partnership includes the European Knowledge Centre on Youth Policy (EKCYP)\textsuperscript{249}.

\textsuperscript{241} http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/more_info/awp/docs/c_2014_3581_en.pdf
\textsuperscript{242} "Results of the first cycle of the OMC in the youth field (2010-2012)" and "the status of the situation of young people in the EU", SEC (2012)256 and 257 of 10.09.2012.
\textsuperscript{243} LSE enterprise, 2013
\textsuperscript{244} Flash Eurobarometer Survey 375, TNS, 2013
\textsuperscript{245} ICF-GHK, 2014
\textsuperscript{246} EACEA, 2012
\textsuperscript{247} EACEA, 2013
\textsuperscript{248} http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/pdf/policy-review-youth_en.pdf
\textsuperscript{249} http://youth-partnership-eu.coe.int/youth-partnership/ekcyp/index
which has developed country-specific information and a collection of good practice examples and a Pool of European Youth Researchers (PEYR). This pool is available for specific research tasks upon a call for tender or as experts at events. In the context of the partnership, actors in the youth field active in policy, research and practice are brought together at events organised under the partnership, such as the conferences on "The Current Crisis and Youth – Impact and Ways Forward"\(^{250}\) and "Youth in 2020 – Future of Youth Policies"\(^{251}\).

Under the Erasmus+ programme, the expenditure for the cooperation with the Council of Europe was €500,000 in 2014.

**Mutual Learning**

Mutual learning aims to provide Member States the opportunity to identify and learn from good practices. Mutual learning is encouraged through peer learning, organised at the occasion of e.g. conferences and seminars, high level fora and expert groups.

Peer learning activities are organised by the Commission and the Member States. Timing, mandate, outputs, geographical coverage and stakeholder involvement depend on the specific goals and circumstances of a specific peer learning activity.

Currently the Commission facilitates four expert groups: "mobility of young volunteers across the EU", "indicators in the youth field", "contribution of youth work to address the challenges young people are facing, in particular the transition from education to employment" and "youth work quality systems in EU Member States". A peer-learning group on "creative and innovative potential of young people has been finalised in June 2014, with a report and recommendations\(^{252}\). The expenditure for these expert groups is in average between €100,000 and €150,000 per year\(^{253}\).

Showcasing good practices is also frequently a part of the studies launched by the Commission, and nine brochures dealing specifically with good practices supported by the programme have been issued over the last years\(^{254}\). Several Member States have been involved in peer learning activities on specific issues of shared interest in smaller settings, for example around cross-sectoral youth policy or e-participation. In addition, new discussion forums are planned for the European Youth Portal which will enable organisations engaged in cross-border volunteering and National Working Groups administering the Structured Dialogue to communicate and share best practices with each other.

Some peer-learning activities are also organised under the partnership between the Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of youth.

**Progress-reporting**

The main tool for progress reporting is the aforementioned tri-annual EU Youth Report.

As explained above, at the end of each 3-year cycle an EU Youth Report is established. The 2012 EU Youth Report provided a political evaluation of the first cycle of the


\(^{253}\) Based on an average expenditure per participant and per meeting of €550.

\(^{254}\) The brochures are available in the Commission's website on youth – Library section: [http://ec.europa.eu/youth/library/index_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/youth/library/index_en.htm)
implementation of the EU Youth Strategy\textsuperscript{255}. This joint Council-Commission report confirmed the robustness and relevance of the Strategy and its overall objectives. It also provided specific assessments on progress in the eight fields of action and its instruments for implementation and gave indications on future priorities.

The EU Youth report is based on National Youth Reports\textsuperscript{256}, which provide information on how the EU Youth Strategy has been implemented at the national level during a cycle, thus providing essential background information. The reports are based on a questionnaire developed by the Commission, covering all eight fields of action. The Commission is currently collecting information from Member States and other services on their policy activities via questionnaires which will feed in the 2015 Youth Report\textsuperscript{257}.

**Dissemination of results**

Dissemination aims at enhancing visibility and impact of activities under the EU Youth Strategy.

The dissemination of results achieved in the EU youth policy cooperation takes various forms, from publications to the use of Internet. Publications include the EU Youth Reports, studies, Eurobarometer surveys and leaflets on topics of interest to young people.

The European Youth Portal\textsuperscript{258} (EYP) providing information and opportunities addressing young people in the eight fields of action, was re-launched in May 2013. A new Volunteering Platform has been added to the EYP in 2014. The information on the European Youth Portal is managed by the Eurodesk network, which furthermore provides information through complementary, offline, activities\textsuperscript{259}.

The EU youth website is another dissemination tool\textsuperscript{260}, which mainly targets policymakers, youth representatives, researchers, youth workers and other youth policy stakeholders.

**Monitoring of the process**

Monitoring aims to promote the delivery of results through the open method of coordination, and the ownership of the method at both national and EU level.

The Member States and the Commission work closely together in steering, implementing, taking forward and regularly evaluating the process and its outcomes. A dashboard of youth policy indicators was developed in cooperation between the Commission, Member States, experts and stakeholders in 2011. This dashboard presents 41 indicators covering all eight fields of action of the EU Youth Strategy\textsuperscript{261}. It is developed further in an expert group.

This work complements other tools for monitoring and progress reporting, including the joint Council - Commission EU Youth Report, monitoring of work in the expert groups,


\textsuperscript{256} http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/national_reports_2012.htm

\textsuperscript{257} See questionnaire sent to Member States in annex 3

\textsuperscript{258} http://europa.eu/youth

\textsuperscript{259} http://eurodesk.eu

\textsuperscript{260} http://ec.europa.eu/youth/index_en.htm

the Council youth working party, regular meetings of the Directors-General for Youth and opinion polls.

Consultations and Structured Dialogue with young people and youth organisations

This work aims to pursue and develop a forum for continuous joint reflection on the priorities, implementation and follow-up of European cooperation in the youth field.

The Structured Dialogue involves consultations with young people and youth organisations at all levels in Member States at EU youth conferences organised by the Presidency countries, and at the European Youth Week. The thematic priorities of the Structured Dialogue are aligned with the overall objectives of European cooperation in the youth field and the priorities set for each of its 18 months' work cycles.

At European level the European Youth Forum plays a key role in the daily coordination of the Structured Dialogue, chairing its European Steering Committee and providing its secretariat. At the level of Member States, National Working Groups have been set up to run the participatory process within the Member States. The composition of these groups is a matter for the Member States, but they involve, inter alia, representatives of Ministries for Youth Affairs, National Youth Councils, local and regional youth councils, youth organisations, and those active in youth work, young people and youth researchers. During the second and third cycles of the Structured Dialogue, international non-governmental youth organisations have been invited on an ad-hoc basis to contribute to the youth consultations conducted as an integral part of Structured Dialogue.

All Member States established National Working Groups for Structured Dialogue with young people and the Structured Dialogue has thus become an integral part of policymaking in the youth field. The consultations during the first trio Presidency (2010-mid 11) resulted in joint recommendations between youth policy-makers and young people on the most pressing youth employment issue. In 2011-2012, the second cycle of the Structured Dialogue dealt with youth participation, which was followed by social inclusion as theme of the third cycle (2013-mid 2014). The current theme is youth empowerment (Mid 2014-2015). An increasing number of youth leaders and young people are directly involved in the process.

Under the Erasmus+ programme, the expenditure for the structured dialogue at EU level was in € 1,033,473 in 2014.

Mobilisation of EU programmes and funds

Mobilisation aims to an effective use of available EU funds and programmes. The Erasmus+ Programme (and its predecessor for youth, ‘Youth in Action’) supports the EU Youth Strategy in various ways. In line with the EU Youth Strategy, the Erasmus+ Programme promotes citizenship and solidarity among young people. It places the emphasis on youth work, volunteering and civic activities with the aim to support young people in acquiring skills and competences through non-formal learning.

Apart from this programme, the EU Youth Strategy also invites Member States to make use of other funds such as the Structural Funds, and programmes such as Lifelong Learning (now replaced by Erasmus+) Culture and Media (now replaced by Creative Europe), Progress, Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs and Competitiveness and Innovation programmes, as well as the other appropriate EU Programmes and Funds.

In 2011, the Commission proposed the Youth Opportunities Initiative (YOI) calling upon Member States to take more action to address the high youth unemployment rates, including better use of European Social Funds and more possibilities for mobility.
addition, the European Council agreed in February 2013 to set up a Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) of € 6 billion, open to all regions (NUTS level 2) with levels of youth unemployment above 25% to support measures set out in the Youth Employment Package, in particular the Youth Guarantee.

1.4.2. Recommendation on Mobility of Youth Volunteers

The Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers does not specify implementation instruments, but mentions concrete examples of possible approaches and instruments that Member States can choose to use to realise the five actions of the Recommendation. These concrete examples are:

Support of the development of the hosting capacity for cross-border volunteers,

Creation of contact points for young European volunteers,

Promotion of the use of existing European mechanisms that can help youth mobility (i.e. mobility cards),

Support of the development of information and training.

To facilitate the implementation of the Recommendation, the Commission encouraged and organised, in liaison with the Member States, the exchange of information and experience about cooperation between organisers of voluntary activities in an Expert Group and developed an online Youth Volunteering Platform.

The expert group's mandate specifies the group's tasks as facilitating the implementation of the Recommendation by identifying ways and means of cooperation, and through the exchange of information and best practices.

The expert group met nine times since 2009 and its achievements include a mapping of good practices, the development of a multilateral pilot project of youth cross-border volunteering, the creation of a network of providers of cross-border volunteering and reports on specific aspects of cross-border volunteering by sub-working-groups. The expert group also provided inputs to EU activities related to its remit, including the development of the EU Youth Volunteering Platform, the European Year of Volunteering 2011, Erasmus+ and the Council Recommendation on the validation of non-formal and informal learning. The Expert Group also triggered conferences and seminars in Member States, such as a kick-off cross-border youth volunteering conference in Prague in 2009, the Central European cross-border volunteering conference in Prague in 2011, a high-level seminar on cross-border volunteering in Berlin in 2011, and the meeting of volunteering providers in Berlin in 2012.

The recently developed Youth Volunteering Platform, which is part of the EU Youth Portal, informs about opportunities for volunteering in EU but also third countries262.

Task specification for the assignment

The purpose of the assignment is to provide an independent interim evaluation on the implementation of:

the EU Youth Strategy, and within it,

the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU.

262 http://europa.eu/youth/vp/opportunity_list
The Commission considers that a thorough external evaluation of the EU Youth Strategy and the Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers is timely, halfway through the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy. For the Recommendation there is no end-date, but an evaluation of the implementation 5 years after its adoption would be useful to show room for improvements in the future implementation. The evaluation will complement the triennial reporting process including a Commission’s evaluation of the Member States’ reports as well as gathering and analysis of statistical information, with a view to providing independent insights that can be used as input to the future EU youth cooperation after 2018.

**Objectives of the evaluation**

As regards the Renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018), the "EU Youth Strategy", the objectives of the evaluation will be to evaluate the relevance, coherence, EU added-value, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the Strategy, considering its objectives and priorities, its implementation instruments and its governance tools (including the process of cooperation and decision-making).

As regards the Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU, the objective of the evaluation will be to evaluate the relevance, coherence, EU added-value, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU, considering its objectives and the activities taken at EU and national levels to implement it.

**Evaluation questions**

N.B.: the implementation of the Council recommendation adopted in 2008 has been integrated as one of the objectives of the EU Youth Strategy adopted in 2009, and the need for a common evaluation of the two initiatives is therefore strong (same policy field, overlapping objectives, same stakeholders to interview). The evaluation questions presented below are however listed separately for the two initiatives to be evaluated, in order to allow detailed analysis for both initiatives, which have their own proper logic.

**EU Youth Strategy**

*Relevance, coherence and added value*

To what extent are the objectives of the EU Youth Strategy relevant to the needs and problems of young people today and to activities of youth policy makers? To what extent are they relevant to and coherent with broader EU policy aims, notably those of the Europe 2020 strategy?

To what extent are the activities implemented under the eight fields of action of the EU Youth Strategy relevant and coherent driving forces in support of creating more and equal opportunities for young people in education and the labour market and to promote active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity?

To what extent are the instruments for the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy across the EU relevant and coherent tools in meeting the general objectives of the EU Youth Strategy?

To what extent does action at EU level add value in addressing the objectives of the EU Youth Strategy, beyond what individual MS could achieve on their own?

**Effectiveness**

To what extent has the EU Youth Strategy proven to be an effective strategic framework in the sense of turning the objectives, fields of action and action lines into concrete and
sustainable achievements at European and national levels? What are the actual effects achieved, at EU and Member State level? To what extent has it influenced Member States' youth policies? Have there been any unintended/unexpected effects? What has contributed/stayed in the way to the achievement of objectives?

To what extent have the implementation instruments proven to be effective in implementing the EU Youth Strategy? To what extent have they supported the mainstreaming of youth issues into other policy fields?

**Efficiency**

To what extent have the instruments, structures, processes and other activities put in place at EU and national level in the context of the EU Youth Strategy proved efficient, non-burdensome and cost-effective for their implementation?

**Sustainability**

Are the implementing tools regarded as sustainable and thus apt to continue facilitating the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy?

**Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers**

**Relevance, coherence and added value**

To what extent are the objectives of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers relevant to the needs and problems of young people today? To what extent are they relevant to and coherent with broader EU policy aims, notably those of the EU Youth Strategy?

To what extent are the action lines of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU relevant and coherent driving forces in support of promoting cross-border volunteering of young people?

To what extent are the instruments for the implementation of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU relevant and coherent tools in meeting the general objectives of the EU Youth Strategy?

To what extent does action at EU level add value in addressing the objectives of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers, beyond what individual MS could achieve on their own?

**Effectiveness**

To what extent has the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers proven to be an effective strategic framework in the sense of turning the objectives and action lines into concrete and sustainable achievements at European and national levels? What are the actual effects achieved, at EU and Member State level? What has contributed/stayed in the way to the achievements? To what extent has it influenced Member States' policies on youth cross-border volunteering? Have there been any unintended effects?

To what extent have the implementation instruments proven to be effective in implementing the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU?

**Efficiency**
To what extent have the instruments, structures, processes and other activities put in place at EU and national level in the context of the Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers proved efficient, non-burdensome and cost-effective for their implementation?

Sustainability

Are the implementing tools regarded as sustainable and thus apt to continue facilitating the implementation of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers?

Other tasks under the assignment

Evaluation follow-up

The Contractor should:

Provide a one-page statement about the validity of the evaluation results, i.e. to what extent it has been possible to provide reliable statements on all essential aspects of the EU intervention examined. Issues to be referred to may include scoping of the evaluation exercise, availability of data, unexpected problems encountered in the evaluation process, proportionality between budget and objectives of the assignment, etc.

Make a proposal for the dissemination of the evaluation results, on the basis of the draft Dissemination Plan annexed to these Terms of Reference.

Reporting and deliverables

General reporting requirements

Each report (except the final version of the Final Report) should have an introductory page providing an overview and orientation of the report. It should describe what parts of the document, on the one hand, have been carried over from previous reports or been recycled from other documents, and on the other hand, represent progress of the evaluation work with reference to the work plan.

All reports must be drafted in English and submitted according to the timetable below to the responsible body. Electronic files must be provided in Microsoft ® Word for Windows format or equivalent. Additionally, besides Word, the Final Report must be delivered in Adobe ® Acrobat pdf format or equivalent, and in 5 hard copies.

The Commission will comment on all reports within maximum 30 calendar days. In the absence of observations from the Commission within the deadline the report will be considered as being approved.

Within maximum 14 calendar days of receiving the Commission’s observations the Contractor will submit the report in definitive form, taking full account of these observations, either by following them precisely or by explaining clearly why they could not be followed. Should the Commission still not consider the report acceptable, the Contractor will be invited to amend the report insofar as such amendments do not interfere with the independence of the evaluator in respect of their findings, conclusions or recommendations.

Inception Report

The inception report must describe in detail how the methodology proposed by the Contractor is going to be implemented in the light of an examination of the quality and appropriateness of existing data. It should include the Contractor's understanding of the intervention logic, as well as the quantitative and qualitative indicators that he/she will use in addressing each of the evaluation questions. A detailed work plan including the allocation of experts per task per number of working-days should also be provided.
It shall not exceed 30 pages, annexes excluded.

**Interim Report**

The report is to be produced after the desk and field research has been completed, and should include preliminary conclusions. The report must as a minimum provide:

An overview of the status of the evaluation project;

A description of problems encountered and solutions found;

A structured summary of initial findings (at least 3 pages) and results of the data gathering;

An assessment of the data, whether it meets expectations and will provide a sound basis for responding to the evaluation questions;

A conclusion whether any changes are required to the work plan, or any other solutions should be sought in order to ensure that the required results of the evaluation are achieved. If any such issues are to be identified, they must be discussed in the meeting with the Steering Group dedicated to this report;

A proposal for the final structure of the Final Report, as well as a structure of the Executive Summary.

It shall not exceed 45 pages, annexes excluded.

**Draft Final Report**

This document should deliver the results of all tasks covered by these Terms of Reference, and must be clear enough for any potential reader to understand.

The report must comply with the Commission Visual identity263.

It should contain:

**Main report:** The main report must be limited to 80 pages and present, in full, the results of the analyses, conclusions and recommendations arising from the evaluation. It must also contain a description of the subject evaluated, the context of the evaluation, and the methodology used (including an analysis of its strengths and weaknesses).

**Annexes:** These must collate the technical details of the evaluation, and must include the Terms of Reference, questionnaire templates, interview guides, any additional tables or graphics, and references and sources.

**Final Report**

The Final Report follows in principle the same format as the draft Final Report. In addition to the contents described above (main report and annexes), it should contain:

**Executive summary:** It sets out, in no more than 6 pages, a summary of the evaluation’s main conclusions, the main evidence supporting them and the recommendations arising from them.

**Summary:** A 200 words abstract of the main evaluation conclusions and recommendations, in bullet points format.

---

The contractor should provide the Executive summary and the Summary in English, but also in French and German; translations should be made by a professional translation agency, once it has been approved by the responsible body.

The Final Report must take into account the observations and comments of the Commission on the draft final report insofar as these do not interfere with the independence of the Contractor in respect of the conclusions they have reached and the recommendations made.

The final version of each separate deliverable (except the 200 words abstract) must respect the Commission's visual identity (see above);

contain specific identifiers, provided by the Contracting Authority, which shall be incorporated on the cover page;

The contracting authority will publish the Final Report, the Executive Summary and the annexes on the World-Wide Web.\textsuperscript{264}

\textbf{Graphic requirements of the final deliverables}

All studies produced for the European Commission and Executive Agencies shall conform to the corporate visual identity of the European Commission by applying the graphic rules set out in the European Commission's Visual Identity Manual, including its logo.\textsuperscript{265}

The Commission is committed to making online information as accessible as possible to the largest possible number of users including those with visual, auditory, cognitive or physical disabilities, and those not having the latest technologies. The Commission supports the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 of the W3C.

For full details on Commission policy on accessibility for information providers, see: http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/standards/accessibility/index_en.htm

Pdf versions of studies destined for online publication should respect W3C guidelines for accessible pdf documents. See: http://www.w3.org/WAI/

\textbf{Organisation, timetable and budget}

\textbf{Organisation}

The contract will be managed by Unit D1 of the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture.

A Steering Group will be involved in the management of the evaluation. The responsibilities of the Steering Group will include:

Providing the external evaluator with access to information;

Supporting and monitoring the work of the external evaluator;

Assessing the quality of the reports submitted by the external evaluator, while ensuring that the Contractor's independence is not compromised.

\textbf{Meetings}

\textsuperscript{264} On the site http://ec.europa.eu/comm/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/index_en.htm

\textsuperscript{265} The Visual Identity Manual of the European Commission is available upon request. Requests should be made to the following e-mail address: comm-visual-identity@ec.europa.eu
It is expected that the contractor participate to up to maximum five meetings in Brussels. The evaluation team leader and other relevant experts must participate in these meetings. For these meetings, minutes should be drafted by the contractor within 5 working days, to be agreed among the participants and approved and signed by the chair person, who will be appointed from DG EAC’s evaluation support function. The last foreseen meeting is an oral presentation (including the provision of PowerPoint presentation to the Commission) to be made by the contractor in Brussels.

**Timetable**

The indicative starting date is February 2015. The contract will start after both parties have signed it. The period of execution of the contract is 11 months.

**The final report should be available by January 2016.**

The following outline work plan and indicative timetable are envisaged:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline (from starting date)</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Kick-off**  
T0  | The project is kicked off at a meeting in Brussels |
| **Inception Report**  
T0 + 1 month  | Contractor prepares *inception report* and presents to Steering Group in Brussels |
| **Interim Report**  
T0 + 5 months  | Desk and field research completed. Contractor presents *interim report* to Steering Group in Brussels |
| **Draft Final Report**  
T0 + 9 months  | Contractor presents a *draft final report*, including an executive summary, to Steering Group in Brussels |
| **Final Report**  
T0 + 10 months  | Taking account of the Commission’s comments contractor sends *final report and summary* to Steering Group in Brussels. Contractor submits complete set of final report, executive summary in 3 languages, PPP and makes a presentation of the final report to stakeholders in Brussels |

**Budget**

The maximum budget for the evaluation of the action, covering all the results to be achieved by the contractor as listed in sections 2 and 3 above, is **EUR 200.000**.

**References**

**Basic documents**

(for an overview of documents with weblinks see annex 2)

Commission's website on youth

EU YOUTH STRATEGY

Council Resolution of 27 November 2009 on a renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018), 2009/C 311/01

http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/eu-youth-strategy_en.htm

Commission Staff Working Document accompanying document to the Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions


Commission staff working document on EU indicators in the field of youth SEC(2011) 401 final


COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION ON THE MOBILITY OF YOUNG VOLUNTEERS

Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the European Union

http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:42008X0610(01)

Impact Assessment for the Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU – Commission Staff Working Document Impact Assessment accompanying the

STUDIES
Flash Eurobarometer survey 319a - Youth on the move, 2011

Flash Eurobarometer survey 375 - European Youth: Participation in democratic life, 2013

Youth Participation in Democratic Life, commissioned by the Commission and carried out by the London School of Economics (LSE), 2013

Working with young people: The value of youth work in the EU (ICF-GHK, 2014)

Other Documents and information to be provided after contract signature (not exhaustive)

The COM will give the evaluators access to all additional information necessary to carry out the evaluation at the time of the kick-off meeting, and particularly:

EU Youth Strategy
Reports of meetings of the various Expert Groups, Structured dialogue documents, etc.

References that the EU Youth Strategy and Council Recommendation incited action of Member States (upon reception by MS of national reports for the EU Youth report 2015, in February 2015)

Council Recommendation on the mobility of young volunteers
Mandate of the Expert Group on Mobility of Young Volunteers
Reports of meetings of the Expert Group on Mobility of Young Volunteers
Newsletter about achievements of the Expert Group on Mobility of Young Volunteers

Requirements
Methodology
The contractor will have a free choice as to the methods used to gather and analyse information and for making the assessment, but must take account of the following:

The evaluation must be based on recognised evaluation techniques.

The choice and a detailed description of the methodology must form part of the offer submitted. There should be a clear link between the evaluation questions addressed and the corresponding methodology proposed. The evaluation questions can be further elaborated, e.g. by providing operational sub-questions under each question.

Considerable emphasis should be placed on the analysis phase of the evaluation. In addressing the evaluation questions, quantitative indicators should be sought and used as

---

See annex 3 for questionnaire sent to Member States
far as possible. The contractor must support findings and recommendations by explaining the degree to which these are based on opinion, analysis and objectively verifiable evidence. Where opinion is the main source, the degree of consensus and the steps taken to test the opinion should be given.

In carrying out the analysis, the evaluator should test the assumptions made in the impact assessments supporting respectively the EU Youth Strategy and the Recommendation of the Mobility of Young Volunteers and assess the extent to which the expectations have been met. This assessment should be explicitly reflected in the evaluation report.

For the design of the cost-effectiveness assessment, the tenderer should use the results of the "Study on Cost-Effectiveness of Education and Culture Spending Programmes" (Ecorys, 2013) as a basis for their proposal. The tenderer should specify which of the approaches described in the mentioned study they will use or, alternatively, what design they propose for such an assessment.

It is expected that interviews of key stakeholders shall be part of the evaluation methods.

Quality assurance
The Contractor shall, as a minimum, apply the quality assurance procedures described in the Quality Plan included in their bid for Framework Contract EAC/22/2013. The offer should describe how the Quality Plan will be applied during the implementation of this specific contract.

Resources
The Contractor shall ensure that experts are adequately supported and equipped. In particular, sufficient administrative, secretarial and interpreting resources, as well as junior experts, must be available to enable senior experts to concentrate on their core evaluation tasks.

For each of the main team members (team leader, quality assurance expert, report writer and other senior experts), the offer should include, preferably in their respective CVs, a list of evaluations in which they have participated, the dates of each project and their specific role in it.

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/index_en.htm#crossHeader

Main stakeholders are trio-Presidencies of the evaluation period, other Member States (representatives from the Ministries in charge of youth, members of Expert Groups and Peer-learning Groups, etc.), the European Youth Forum, other civil society organisations, other DGs of the Commission. Interview partners are to be agreed with the Commission. A balance (geographical, gender, professional rank...) should be aimed at, as much as possible, in the selection of persons to be interviewed.
### ANNEX 1 – EU YOUTH STRATEGY'S INTERVENTION LOGIC TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General objectives</th>
<th>Specific objectives</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>&quot;Governance&quot;</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Intermediate outcomes</th>
<th>Final outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) to create more and equal opportunities for all young people in education and in the labour market,</td>
<td>To develop initiatives to be taken in eight fields of action* through a dual approach:</td>
<td>Knowledge building and evidence-based policy-making</td>
<td>Council (both at ministerial and Youth Working party level) and EU presidencies</td>
<td>• Council policy documents</td>
<td>• EU, MS and stakeholders reporting policy learning, positive influence, adoption of good practice approaches and principles, specific new tools or approaches adopted</td>
<td>• Opportunities in education and in the labour market increased for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) to promote the active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity of all young people.</td>
<td>1. <strong>To take specific initiatives in the youth field</strong> - i.e. policies and actions specifically targeted at young people in areas such as non-formal learning, participation, voluntary activities, youth work, mobility and information.</td>
<td>Mutual Learning</td>
<td>Member States</td>
<td>• Joint EU Youth Reports</td>
<td>• MS taking account of the strategic objectives or the tools of the EU Youth Strategy when shaping youth and other policies</td>
<td>• Youth active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>To develop mainstreaming</strong> - i.e. initiatives pursuing a cross-sectoral approach where due account is taken of youth issues when formulating, implementing and evaluating policies and actions in other policy fields which have a significant impact on young people.</td>
<td>Progress-reporting</td>
<td>OMC expert groups</td>
<td>• EU Dashboard of youth indicators</td>
<td>• New/improved dialogue between youth stakeholders at MS &amp; EU level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissemination of results</td>
<td>Structured dialogue with young people</td>
<td>• Outputs of OMC Expert groups (reports, exchange of good practices)</td>
<td>• Mainstreaming of youth into other EU &amp; MS policy areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring of the process</td>
<td>Partnership with the Council of Europe in the field of youth</td>
<td>• Outputs of structured dialogue (EU Youth conferences joint conclusions, Steering Committee meetings…)</td>
<td>• Better knowledge of the situation of youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultations and Structured Dialogue with young people and youth organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td>• EU Youth Portal</td>
<td>• Higher profile for youth and youth stakeholders and greater advocacy capacity for the sector at EU / MS levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilisation of EU programmes and funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Studies and surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding (inc Youth chapter of the Erasmus+ programme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 8 fields of action are: Education & training, Employment & Entrepreneurship, Health & Well-being, Participation, Voluntary activities (including the implementation of the Council recommendation on the mobility of young volunteers), Social Inclusion, Youth & the World, Creativity & Culture*
ANNEX 2 - OVERVIEW OF MAIN DOCUMENTS LINKED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EU YOUTH STRATEGY AND THE RECOMMENDATION ON THE MOBILITY OF YOUNG VOLUNTEERS

Knowledge building and evidence-based policy-making

EU YOUTH STRATEGY

Assessing practices for using indicators in fields related to youth, 2011

Flash Eurobarometer 319a - Youth on the move, Analytical report, 2011

Youth participation in democratic life, London School of Economics for Executive Agency for Culture, Education and Audiovisual and European Commission, 2013


Working with young people: The value of youth work in the EU, GHK for Executive Agency for Culture, Education and Audiovisual and European Commission, 2014

Reports produced by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency:
- Youth social exclusion and lessons from youth work, 2013
- Political participation and EU Citizenship: Perceptions and behaviours of young people, Evidence from Eurobarometer Surveys, 2013

Policy Brief on Youth Entrepreneurship - Entrepreneurial Activities in Europe, OECD and European Commission, 2012
http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Youth%20entrepreneurship%20policy%20brief%20EN_FINAL.pdf

Research on youth entrepreneurship, a study planned for 2015, focusing on young entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurship and green jobs. The study has been requested by the Council.
Shell Jugendstudie, Germany, 2010
http://www.shell.de/aboutshell/our-commitment/shell-youth-study.html

EU-CoE youth partnership
http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership

Evaluation of the Partnership grant agreements 2007-2011-12, conducted in 2013

Project compendia, Eastern Partnership Youth Window and the Western Balkans Youth Window, of the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2007-2013

RECOMMENDATION ON THE MOBILITY OF YOUNG VOLUNTEERS
Volunteering in the European Union, GHK for the Educational, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency and European Commission, 2010

Recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU, Report, European Parliament, Committee on Culture and Education, Rapporteur: Marco Scurria, 2011

EU Policies and Volunteering: Recognising and promoting crossborder voluntary activities in the EU, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions; COM(2011) 568 final

Recognising and Promoting Cross-border Voluntary Activities in the EU, Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee, Rapporteur: Pavel Trantina, 2011

Mutual Learning
EU YOUTH STRATEGY
Youth conferences of the EU Presidencies
Developing the creative and innovative potential of young people through non-formal learning in ways that are relevant to employability, Report, Expert Group, Dr. John Bamber (Centre for Effective Services, Ireland) with the assistance of the European Commission and expert group members


Defining the specific contribution of youth work and non-formal and informal learning to address the challenges young people are facing, in particular the transition from education to employment, Expert Group, first meetings in October and November 2014, next meetings in January 2015

1st European Youth Work Convention, 2010

http://www.eutrio.be/1st-european-youth-work-convention and

Building Tomorrow’s Europe – Perspectives for young people, conference on youth work and youth policy in Europe, 07.-08.05.2013 in Bonn, Germany, celebration of 25th anniversary of JUGEND für Europa, Germany’s National Agency for the EU

https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/veranstaltungen/building-europe/

Think European – Act Local, Conference for the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy, 7-8 May 2013, Bonn

https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/veranstaltungen/europaeisch-denken-lokal-handeln/


https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/veranstaltungen/platformlearningmobility/


https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/veranstaltungen/10-forum/
https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/veranstaltungen/11-forum/
https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/veranstaltungen/12-forum/

A new youth policy for Europe: towards the empowerment and inclusion for all young people - European Peer Learning on youth policy 2011-2013

- A new youth policy for Europe: towards the empowerment and inclusion for all young people – European Peer Learning on Youth Policy 2011-2013 – Documentation

https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/downloads/4-20-3495/MKP_NewYouthPolicy_Screen.pdf

- Opening Seminar of the European Peer Learning on Youth policy: Designing Youth Policy in Europe – what is the role of the regions and municipalities? Documentation

Inter CITY – European Peer Learning on Local Youth Policy, European Conference 10-12 October 2012, Leipzig- Documentation

https://www.jugendfuereuropa.de/ueber-jfe/publikationen/intercity-european-peer-learning-on-local-youth-policy.3446/

2nd Inter CITY Conference, 2013, Helsinki

3rd Inter CITY Conference, 9-11 November, 2014, s-Hertogenbosch, the Netherlands:
Launch of a European network of Local Departments for Youth Work – InterCityYouth-


https://www.salto-youth.net/tools/european-training-calendar/training/intercity-iii-european-peer-learning-of-local-departments-for-youth-work.4489/

Research-based analysis of the Youth in Action Programme, Research-based Analysis of Youth in Action network (RAY), 2013
http://www.researchyouth.net/documents/ray_summary_overview.pdf

Good Practice Series, case study documents, European Youth Card Association (EYCA)
http://www.eyca.org/youth-mobility/GPS

YouthPart project, best practices on e-participation and set of guidelines and tools, International Youth Service of the Federal Republic of Germany (IJAB), funded by the German Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth,

http://youthpart.info

Youth Guarantee
Youth Guarantee: Making it Happen conference calls on Member States to do more for delivery,

http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1036&eventsId=978&furtherEvents=yes

Working and learning seminar on Practical support for the design and implementation of Youth Guarantee Schemes, 2013
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1036&eventsId=931&furtherEvents=yes

RECOMMENDATION ON THE MOBILITY OF YOUNG VOLUNTEERS

Expert Group on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the European Union: European: Commission will provide the achievements paper, meeting reports and mapping exercise

CZ seminar on youth volunteering with Visegrad and Eastern Partnership countries: Commission will provide agenda, mission report and contacts

EU kick-off conference for the implementation of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU in Prague 2009: Commission will provide report and contacts
Czech conference “Voluntarily across the Border - cross-border volunteering in Central Europe”, 2011: Commission will provide report and contacts

Cooperation with United Nations Volunteers: Commission can provide information and contacts

http://www.unv.org/

**Progress-reporting**

**EU YOUTH STRATEGY**


Commission Staff Working Document accompanying document to the Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions ”Youth - Investing and Empowering”, EU Youth Report, SEC (2009) 549 final, of 27 April 2009


**RECOMMENDATION ON THE MOBILITY OF YOUNG VOLUNTEERS**

The Recommendation is covered by the EU Youth Reports (see above).

**Dissemination of results**

**EU YOUTH STRATEGY**

EU Youth Portal

http://europa.eu.youth

DG EAC Youth Website

http://ec.europa.eu/youth/index_en.htm

Publications


Young citizens of Europe, Youth in Action Programme, European good practice projects, 2013

Young people and entrepreneurship, Youth in Action Programme, European good practice projects, 2013

Youth Employment, Youth in Action Programme, European good practice projects, 2012

Youth Volunteering, Youth in Action Programme, European good practice projects, 2011

EU-Council of Europe youth partnership
http://pjp-eu.coe.int/web/youth-partnership/publications

National Agencies and SALTO Resource Centres
https://www.salto-youth.net/tools/european-training-calendar/help/national-agencies/

In early 2015 Eurodesk will launch its new "Last Minute Opportunities" service, similar to the European Youth Portal's EVS opportunities database, but focused on non-EVS volunteering opportunities. It is planned that the EYP and the Eurodesk platforms will share their information with each other to enable both platforms to show EVS and non-EVS volunteering opportunities. Ask Commission for information.

RECOMMENDATION ON THE MOBILITY OF YOUNG VOLUNTEERS

The European Youth Portal fully integrated the "Database of EVS accredited organisations" in February 2014, then launched the "Database of volunteering opportunities" in October 2014.
http://europa.eu/youth/evs_database
http://europa.eu/youth/vp/opportunity_list

European Year of Volunteering 2011

Voluntary activities 2011-12, Information sheets on voluntary activities, drafted by the national EKCYP-correspondents
http://pjp-eu.coe.int/web/youth-partnership/voluntary-activities1
International voluntary service, T-Kit for trainers and young people interested and/or involved in international voluntary service activities and projects, EU-CoE youth partnership


Coyote, magazine, EU-CoE youth partnership


**Monitoring of the process**

**EU YOUTH STRATEGY**
Commission Staff Working Document On EU indicators in the field of youth, SEC(2011) 401 final

Dashboard of Youth indicators
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/employment_social_policy_equity/you/th/indicators

**Consultations and Structured Dialogue**

**EU YOUTH STRATEGY**
Presentation of Structured Dialogue


Structured Dialogue Projects


Overview of the Structured Dialogue between young people and EU institutions on youth employment, Information from the Presidency, 27 April 2011


Resolution of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the structured dialogue with young people on youth employment, OJ C 164, 2.6.2011

Resolution of the Council and of the representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the overview of the structured dialogue with young people on youth participation in democratic life in Europe, OJ C380/01, 11.12.2012

Resolution of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the overview of the structured dialogue process including social inclusion of young people, OJ C183/1, 14.6.2014

Online Participation Platform for Structured Dialogue European Youth Portal

Structured Dialogue Stakeholders Network, Yammer (social media tool of the European Commission): ask Commission for demonstration of this network on Yammer

Implementation plans of the Structured Dialogue for each cycle (to be provided by Commission after contract signature)

European Youth Week: http://www.youthweek.eu/
(more information to be provided by Commission after contract signature)

**RECOMMENDATION ON THE MOBILITY OF YOUNG VOLUNTEERS**
Cross-border volunteering has not yet been a topic of the Structured Dialogue.

**Mobilisation of EU programmes and funds**

Erasmus+ - Youth Chapter
http://ec.europa.eu/youth/index_en.htm

Youth in Action (former programme 2007-2013)

Structural Funds
Increased support for young entrepreneurs via the European progress microfinance facility
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=836
European Social Fund (ESF)
EU measures to tackle youth unemployment, factsheet
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1036

Youth Employment Initiative (YEI)
The Youth Employment Initiative
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1829&furtherNews=yes

Eastern Partnership Youth Window
ENPI Regional East Action Programme, 2012, part III, concerning the allocation of 29 Mio € to the Eastern Partnership Youth Window

Annex 5 – Action Fiche for ENPI Regional East Action Programme 2011, part II; concerning the allocation of 5.5 Mio € to the Eastern Partnership Youth Programme:

An evaluation of the Eastern Partnership Youth Window should be available early 2015.
1st Eastern Partnership Youth Forum, Lithuanian EU-Presidency, 2013
http://www.youthforum2013.eu/

RECOMMENDATION ON THE MOBILITY OF YOUNG VOLUNTEERS
European policy experimentation in the fields of education and training and youth: transnational cooperation for the implementation of innovative policies under the leadership of high-level public authorities (one priority themes encouraging the development and internationalisation of young people’s volunteering)
https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/actions/key-action-3-support-for-policy-reform/prospective-initiatives_en

Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Working together for Europe’s young people, A call to action on youth unemployment COM(2013)447 final
Other elements

a) Council conclusions or resolutions in the youth field, 2010-2014

**Italian Presidency of the EU**
Council conclusions on promoting access by young people to rights in order to foster their autonomy and their participation in civil society

**Greek Presidency of the EU**
Council Conclusions on promoting youth entrepreneurship to foster social inclusion of all young people
Council Resolution on the overview of the structured dialogue process including social inclusion of young people
Council Resolution on a EU Work plan for youth for 2014-2015

**Lithuanian Presidency of the EU**
Council conclusions of 25-26 November 2013 on enhancing the social inclusion of young people who are not in employment, education or training (NEETs)

**Irish Presidency of the EU**
Council conclusions of 16-17 May 2013 on the contribution of quality youth work to the development, well-being and social inclusion of young people
Council conclusions of 16-17 May 2013 on maximising the potential of youth policy in addressing the goals of the Europe 2020 Strategy

**Cypriot Presidency of the EU**
Council conclusions of 27 November 2012 on the participation and social inclusion of young people with emphasis on those with a migrant background
Council Resolution of 27 November 2012 on the overview of the structured dialogue with young people on youth participation in democratic life in Europe

**Danish Presidency of the EU**
Council conclusions of 11 May 2012 on fostering the creative and innovative potential of young people

**Polish Presidency of the EU**
Council conclusions of November 2011 on the eastern dimension of youth participation and mobility

**Hungarian Presidency of the EU**
Council resolution of May 2011 on encouraging new and effective forms of participation of all young people in democratic life in Europe

Council Resolution of May 2011 on the structured dialogue with young people on youth employment

**Belgian Presidency of the EU**
Council conclusions of 19 November 2010 on access of young people to culture
Council conclusions of 19 November 2010 on the European and International Policy Agendas on Children, Youth and Children’s Rights
Council Resolution on youth work

**Spanish Presidency of the EU**
Council resolution on the active inclusion of young people: combating unemployment and poverty
b) Recent examples of National Youth Strategies inspired by the EU Youth Strategy

FRENCH PRIORITE JEUNESSE

CZECH YOUTH CONCEPT 2020:
(Link in Czech, English version available on request)

c) Complementary information on youth inclusion

Inclusion strategy under Youth in Action
https://www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17-1294/InclusionStrategyYiA.pdf

Inclusion and Diversity strategy under Erasmus+ (for the Erasmus+ youth chapter)
In development, will be available from 2015. Commission to provide information.

d) Complementary information on youth mobility

Youth mobility – underpinning the whole of the EU Youth Strategy
ERYICA (European Youth Information and Counselling Agency) – "Youth on the Move: InfoMobility" project funded by the Youth in Action programme to investigate the particular information needs of mobile young people and set quality standards and design training for the delivery of such information across all themes of the EU Youth Strategy.
http://eryica.org/page/youth-move-infomobility-yomim

e) Information on cooperation with China in the youth field

2011 EU-China Year of Youth: new horizons for cooperation and dialogue
EU-China High level People-to-People Dialogue
http://ec.europa.eu/education/international-cooperation/china_en.htm
EU-China High level People-to-People Dialogue September 2014, youth session

EU-China High level People-to-People Dialogue September 2014: Follow-up Action Plan, *European Commission will provide report*

EU-China Joint Seminar on Youth Entrepreneurship, November 2013: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/events/2014/eu-china-seminar_en.htm

EU-China Policy and Expert Seminar on Mobility and Youth Social Inclusion, December 2014, *European Commission will provide report*
HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

Free publications:
• one copy:
  via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu);
• more than one copy or posters/maps:
  from the European Union’s representations
  (http://ec.europa.eu/represent_en.htm);
  from the delegations in non-EU countries
  (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index_en.htm);
  by contacting the Europe Direct service
  (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm) or calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11
  (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (*).

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels
may charge you).

Priced publications:
• via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu).

Priced subscriptions:
• via one of the sales agents of the Publications Office of the European Union