

Guiding questions for the discussion¹

Group	<p>a) What worked well in 2025/2026 with a view to identify best practices as relates to the EU Youth Stakeholders Group?</p> <p>b) What areas require further reflection?</p> <p><i>(Write down 2-3, present only top 1 in plenary session per question)</i></p>
1	<p>Replies to Question a)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Making EC processes more accessible to youth. 2. Opportunities to engage directly with EC departments and processes. 3. Networking among each other and learning about each other's work and areas of possible collaboration. <p>Replies to Question b)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have the dates of the meeting, as well as the preparatory papers and the programme more in advance. 2. Youth-check consultations are not very clear, especially for the role of the national youth ministries of the Member States, if they are really needed also in these youth groups or not. 3. Teams App is not very convenient or easy to use.
2	<p>Replies to Question a)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The YSG gives a platform to different stakeholders to meet, exchange feedback and ideas. 2. Opportunity to share updates and best practices. <p>Replies to Question b)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have information about meetings more in advance (time, agenda, topics) 2. Youth organisations could be involved in defining the topics and agenda, this would ensure better participation, motivation and a more transparent process.

¹ The document presents the outcomes / key takeaways of the group discussions. It does not reflect the position of DG EAC.

	<p>3. Clarify how youth organisations can steer the group.</p> <p>4. For the in-person meetings, ensure better introduction and presentation of the present stakeholders.</p> <p>5. Monitor more on the impact of the group on finished projects/policies/strategies.</p>
3	<p>Replies to Question a)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Best practices: coming together and hearing about other organizations is working well. 2. In-person meetings and seminars remain the best form of engagement. 3. Appreciated for the Commission to have established structures for youth engagement and we appreciated being included. 4. Broad membership (NYCs, NGYOs, ministries, researchers) <p>Replies to Question b)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meeting invitations to be sent in advance (for better preparation) 2. Difficult to sometimes be involved with a volunteer structure, as our youth board are volunteers and do not always have the time to be able to contribute 3. Clarifying the function of the Stakeholders Group: shaping the Youth Check process and co-creating it; setting the agendas for the meetings is youth led; meaningful and timely participation for policy processes 4. Clarify how youth participation mechanisms are working in relation to each other: EU Youth Stakeholders Group in relation to EU Youth Dialogue, Youth Advisory Board, Youth Policy Dialogues, Youth Check 5. Clarify the roles of the different stakeholders: What is the the role of ministerial delegates in a youth check process? 6. The follow-up of the meeting could be strengthened: How is the input given during the meetings reflected/used in further decision-making?
4	<p>Replies to Question a)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opportunity for update, network, give visibility to the youth sector at European level, opportunity for co-operation. 2. It is important to maintain contact between national youth stakeholders and the EU Youth Coordinator. 3. Good to have a forum for general coordination across all youth

	<p>engagement mechanisms at the EU level.</p> <p>4. TEAMS as a COMM channel to share/disseminate the opportunities with everyone</p> <p>Replies to Question b)</p> <p>1. More time for reflecting on the subjects before the stakeholder group meeting, in order to consult, gather information and expertise. Perhaps through an annual calendar. Additionally, there should be more information on the follow-up of the meetings.</p> <p>2. Depending on the topic, to give the opportunity to bring someone else. There should also be more space for meaningful discussing, in particular in the in-person meeting</p> <p>5. More clarity on the expectations and purpose of the group, e.g. youth checks should focus on gathering input from relevant youth organisations and the participants in the youth stakeholder groups is often too wide to be relevant for the specific youth checks topic.</p>
5	<p>Replies to Question a):</p> <p>1. Mechanism is valuable, yet it needs to be more comprehensive and ensure continuity between meetings (using existing tools, along a more engaging space)</p> <p>2. Consultations are very valuable, however the framework does not align to its frame “Youth Check”.</p> <p>3. Diversity of the group is highly valued, especially when it comes to having organisations present and facilitating the engagement of experts and representatives along the process – thus ensuring a proper representation fit to the topics addressed across each meeting etc.</p> <p>Replies to Question b)</p> <p>1. Lack of Clarity prior to engagement of Delegates, ensuring that information is properly shared prior and after meetings, while ensuring better cohesion and less confusion between delegate between meetings, in preparations of meetings and during meetings.</p> <p>That also very much connects to setting up the agenda and ensuring that the youth component of setting up the agenda is a process of co-creation vs predetermination of points.</p> <p>2. Need to better connect the work of the Group with the work of DGs and possible key moments like SOTEU – Advisory Youth Council of President VdL (priorities, recommendations, etc.).</p> <p>Next phase should ensure a more coherent, continuous and engaging cooperation between DG EAC, EYSG and other DGs along with youth</p>

	<p>mainstreaming across EC policies and initiatives as foreseen of the Youth Check (need a clearer definition and framework to be used in its full potential – see recommendation 3).</p> <p>3. There is no structured way for the group to monitor implementation and follow up of input shared or overall, the ongoing EU Youth Strategy - being better aware of what happens to EYSG recommendations.</p> <p>Consultations should happen when input can still change the outcome.</p> <p>Format: Youth Check needs a clear setting and Timeframe, led by EU youth coordinator and on the other side, have certain key processes where input is collected, updates are shared and then coordinate leading to a final foreseen outcome (paper, communication etc.) - similar to what happens within the EESC Youth Test process.</p> <p>4. Ensure and invest in a process that does not compromise the youth friendliness, accessibility and inclusion of members and representatives of the group. We are here to work together; thus, we need both the tools and the support to do so meaningfully. (i.e.. Teams can be an obstacle rather a supportive mean to engage)</p>
6	<p>Replies to Question a)</p> <p>1. It is a good space for Youth Check consultations given the diverse membership.</p> <p>2. Good meeting structures with working groups & diverse members.</p> <p>3. MS Teams Channel functions as a good information hub.</p> <p>Replies to Question b)</p> <p>1. We believe members of the EU YSG should send youth representatives to the meetings.</p> <p>2. The EU YSG meetings are sometimes information heavy, so it takes a lot of time which can be used better for more interaction between members of the EUYSG.</p> <p>3. There is a need for a glossary to improve the accessibility of the EU YSG.</p> <p>4. There is a need for more clarity when meetings are convened. Meeting dates and agendas are not communicated clearly or early enough, which makes it hard for members to prepare and consult their own networks. There can be a yearly calendar of meetings with agendas shared well in advance (one month at least) for youth organizations to be able to</p>

	<p>prepare and consult their members if needed.</p> <p>5. The term "facilitating" the Youth Check is unclear. It can mean taking part in consultations, but mostly it should also mean helping to shape the process and co-create it. That is why we suggest The Commission and the EUYSG agree on a shared definition of the role.</p> <p>6. The 'youth-led' aspect of the Stakeholders Group is missing. In practice, if we want a practice to be youth-led, the youth need to be able to set the agenda, co-chair etc. We suggest clarifying how youth organizations can steer the Group's work and for the European Youth Forum to be the co-chair of the EU Youth Stakeholders Group.</p> <p>7. It is not clear how it is decided which Youth Check consultations go through the EUYSG and which through Youth Policy Dialogues, and why. That is why we suggest more transparency and consistency in how the format is chosen and for youth organizations to have a say in proposing topics.</p> <p>8. We suggest involving the EUYSG earlier in the processes and preparing space to show transparently how its input was or was not used afterwards in shaping the final results. For example, creating reports on how the input was used and affected certain policy processes to have as a follow up.</p>
7	<p>Replies to Question a)</p> <p>1. it is a step in the right direction to give youth the space to share their views;</p> <p>2. the level of practical support provided by the DG, it is a good basis for collaboration</p> <p>3. good opportunity for sharing what we are doing & for networking, especially between Youth Stakeholders Group members (maybe for the future, there should be more ways to interact)</p> <p>Replies to Question b)</p> <p>1. more clarity on the timeline of meetings (a calendar in advance, to also prepare our consultations internally)</p> <p>2. ensure youth also facilitate the meetings or are involved in setting the agenda (same also for the rest of the process, such as the Youth Check)</p> <p>3. more clarity on how the consultations are selected and the follow-up - what is the impact of the group's contribution in the end; youth should have more agency on what it</p>