



**Youth
Goals**

EUYPD9

MID-TERM REPORT

**Good Practices and
Consultation Processes:
Main Report**

by Ondřej Bárta & Dan Moxon,
People Dialogue and Change
June 2022

**Engaging together for
a sustainable and
inclusive Europe**

Under the Trio Presidency
France - Czech Republic -
Sweden

Contents

Introduction	3
1. National Consultation Planning.....	5
1.1. Aims of National EUYD9 Processes	5
Conclusions on Aims	8
1.2. Activities within National EUYD9 Processes	8
Conclusions on Activities.....	10
1.3. Outreach within National EUYD9 Processes.....	11
Conclusions on Outreach	13
2. Good Practices	14
2.1. Types of Good Practice Examples	15
2.1.1. Summary of Good Practices in Information and Education.....	17
2.1.2. Summary of Good Practices in Action and Empowerment.....	17
2.1.3. Summary of Good Practices in Governance	18
2.1.4. Summary of Good Practices in Mobility and Solidarity	18
2.1.5. Summary of Good Practices in Access to Infrastructure	19
2.2. Success Factors of The Good Practice Examples	19
General Conclusions	24
Annexes	26

Introduction

This is a mid-term report of the 9th Cycle of the European Union Youth Dialogue (EUYD) overseen jointly by the Trio Presidency of France, the Czech Republic, and Sweden. This mid-term report was first outlined in the 9th Cycle EUYD Toolkit prepared and presented under the French Presidency of the Council of the European Union. Overall, the implementation of the European Youth Goals #10 and #3 will be reflected as results of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD in different areas and on local, regional, national and European levels, with the overarching title “**Engaging together for a sustainable and inclusive Europe**”. The two chosen European Youth Goals aim at “Achieving a society in which all young people are environmentally active, educated and able to make a difference in their everyday lives” and “Enabling and ensuring the inclusion of all young people in society”. The TRIO considers **intergenerational dialogue** to be a tool that facilitates not only the involvement of young people in decision-making and policymaking and thus strengthens their participation in democratic processes, but also meaningful and facilitated sharing of views between young people and other generations.

The 9th Cycle EUYD Toolkit paved the way for the National Working Groups (NWGs) to collect data on (1) plans they created for the 9th Cycle of the EUYD (i.e., what types of activities are planned to take place during the 9th Cycle of the EUYD, what aims these activities will have apart from contributing to the EU Youth Dialogue processes, and what approaches are taken to reaching young people with fewer opportunities), **and on (2) good practice examples they identified in the five key domains of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD, namely: (a) Information and Education, (b) Action and Empowerment, (c) Governance, (d) Mobility and Solidarity, and (e) Access to Infrastructure.** The 9th Cycle EUYD Toolkit also provided the NWGs with a template through which the data should be reported back to the EUYD Steering Group on 3rd June 2022.

All in all, 26 National Working Groups (NWGs) from 24 EU Member States submitted the mid-term reporting data, namely:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| • Austria (AT) | • Germany (DE) |
| • Belgium | • Greece (GR) |
| (German-speaking community, BE-DE) | • Hungary (HU) |
| • Belgium | • Ireland (IE) |
| (French-speaking community BE-FR) | • Italy (IT) |
| • Belgium | • Latvia (LV) |
| (Dutch-speaking community BE-NL) | • Luxembourg (LU) |
| • Bulgaria (BG) | • Malta (MT) |
| • Croatia (HR) | • Netherlands (NL) |
| • Cyprus (CY) | • Portugal (PT) |
| • Czech Republic (CZ) | • Slovakia (SK) |
| • Denmark (DK) | • Slovenia (SI) |
| • Estonia (EE) | • Spain (ES) |
| • Finland (FI) | • Sweden (SE) |
| • France (FR) | |

Note: Country abbreviations are listed as they are used throughout this report to refer to the NWG origin.

This mid-term report presents analyses of the data provided by the NWGs above in the mid-term reporting exercise. The analyses took place in June 2022, they summarise and provide insights into the two main topics of the mid-term reporting, namely planning of the national consultations, and the good practice examples in the key areas of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD.

The report aims at supporting the next steps in the 9th Cycle EUYD, most notably the EU Youth Conference taking place in Prague in July 2022 (EUYC Prague). Within the framework of the EUYC Prague, the report is to be disseminated and presented, and serve as a basis for further debates of the EUYC Prague participants. The main aims of this report can hence be summarised as follows:

- **Support the NWGs in reflecting on their national consultation planning.** This is done by summarising and providing insights into the national consultations across the EU Member States during the 9th Cycle EUYD.
- **Support the NWGs as well as the EUYC Prague participants and further actors in the field in designing and implementing effective practices to engage young people in intergenerational dialogue to support an inclusive and sustainable Europe.** This is done by summarising and providing insights on the good practice examples within the 9th Cycle EUYD content domains, namely:
 - (a) Information and Education, (b) Action and Empowerment, (c) Governance, (d) Mobility and Solidarity, and (e) Access to Infrastructure.
- **Support the EUYC Prague participants in reaching the best possible conference outcomes and engage in wider debates in the areas of sustainability, inclusion, and intergenerational dialogue, after returning back to their countries of residence.** This is done by providing a sound and clear basis for the EUYC Prague deliberations as well as for further use on the national, regional, and local levels.

1. National Consultation Planning

Almost all of the 26 NWGs which submitted the mid-term report provided information on the (a) aims, (b) activities, and (c) outreach strategies they implement or plan to implement in order to directly support the 9th Cycle of the EUYD. This chapter provides summaries and insights into all three of these domains. The only exception is the Irish NWG where no consultative activities were listed.

1.1. Aims of National EUYD9 Processes

The NWGs were asked to identify the aims of activities they planned to implement as part of 9th Cycle EUYD. When analysing the data provided by the NWGs, there are **several important dichotomies** which can help us understand what aims NWGS have on the national levels in connection with the 9th Cycle of the EUYD. These dichotomies represent opposite extremes and rarely occur on their own, but they can easily be used to understand how aims can be constructed by NWGS. NWGS typically leaned toward one half of the dichotomy or the other. The dichotomies are as follows:

- **Ad hoc VERSUS systematic aims**
- **Organisation aims VERSUS those going beyond this scope**
- **EUYD-focused aims VERSUS those going beyond this scope**
- **General aims VERSUS concrete aims**
- **Policy aims VERSUS practice-oriented aims**

First, some NWGs focus on ad hoc aims while others are more systematic in their aims. **Ad hoc aims** focus on the proceedings of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD, but do not go beyond this scope. Examples of ad hoc aims can be as follows:

- *“Exploring views of young people on sustainability and inclusion.” (AT)*
- *“To gather the perspectives of young people from different backgrounds and locations across the country on the topics of the 9th cycle of the Dialogue” (BG)*

In case of **systematic aims**, some NWGs strive to accommodate the 9th Cycle EUYD processes into other national, regional, or local proceedings that are under way at the moment, or which will occur in the future. Examples of such systematic aims can be as follows:

- *“Results related to the subtheme #1 Information and education: A policy paper will be published on environmental education in 2022. Results related to the subtheme #2 Action and Empowerment and #3 Governance: They will feed into the policy paper of the Cycle 8 of the EU Youth Dialogue, published in January 2022. Results related to the subtheme #4 Mobility and Solidarity: They will feed the “international mobility” project of the Forum des Jeunes and potentially build a policy paper. Results related to the subtheme #5 Access to infrastructure: They will complement the “Give your voice to the climate” Forum des Jeunes project and strengthen the political advocacy carried out.” (BE-FR)*
- *“The results of the consultations will be used for the National Youth Strategy context and for the new Strategic Planning of the Cyprus Youth Council. It is also foreseen, that amid the Presidential Elections, consultation findings can be used in order to affect the agendas of candidates in order to design youth-friendly plans and policies corresponding to Youth Goals #10 (sustainability) and #3 (inclusion). Furthermore, at a local level, we will initiate discussions and consultations with Municipal/Community Youth Councils in order to discuss possible ways of effective implementation of the consultation findings to foster sustainability and inclusion in local governments.” (CY)*

Second, aims can also be either focusing on one organisation, or they can go beyond, and include also other stakeholders and players in the field. **Organisation aims** hence refer to such planned outcomes which are limited to the functioning of one or few organisations involved in the NWG or closely connected to it, as is the case in the following examples:

- *“For the National Youth Council, the conclusions of the consultation sessions are extremely important and will influence the planning and execution of our activities and integrated into our policy documents and in our policy agendas and recommendations.”* (PT)
- *“The results of the interviews will be used to inform the general work conducted by the Danish Youth Council and by the Danish EU Youth Delegates. This will help the organisation and Youth Delegates to expand their knowledge base and foster an even better inform advocacy and project work.”* (DK)

Aims that go beyond the scope of an organisation plan for including additional actors or stakeholders in the planned impacts, as can be seen from the following examples:

- *“The involvement of young ambassadors and various organisations then broadens the scope and enables the involvement of young people from regions, including rural areas, and young people with fewer opportunities.”* (CZ)
- *“In addition, we plan to establish close connections/collaborations with other civil society stakeholders - such as local organisations from civic society - related to youth goals #3 and #10, who will provide an array of helpful extra impact tools.”* (ES)

Third, aims can also either focus only on the EUYD-related processes or go beyond this scope. The **EUYD-focused aims** are showcased in the following examples:

- *“We will also hold an irregular meeting with the National Working Group discussing how to improve the implementation of the EU Youth Dialogue on the local and regional level.”* (DE)
- *“Conducting the consultation will help raise awareness on the EU Youth Delegate programme, and may result in larger interest in the programme, as well as further applications for becoming a Youth Delegate for the 10th cycle.”* (DK)

Some NWGs also include aims that go beyond the scope of the EUYD-related processes, such as:

- *“We are using the results of our activities to design new innovative initiatives for young people in order to fulfil all their dreams and ambitions and unleash skills, great enough to face up even the greatest challenges.”* (GR)
- *“The European Youth Delegates and the UN Youth Delegate of Hungary are working closely together to help young people making their voice heard! They attend to festivals, conferences so as to represent their generation at all levels. The NWG wishes to give them a greater role at local level too.”* (HU)

Fourth, some of the NWGs shared **aims that are rather general** and potentially difficult to evaluate, as is the case in the following examples:

- *“The main aim of the dialogue is to get young people interested in politics and to increase their awareness on how to get their opinions heard. In all our events various topics are discussed but special emphasis will be on the issues like climate, sustainability and inclusion. The findings of the consultation will be used in all our advocacy work at national and local levels.”* (FI)
- *“Introduction of the EUYD process to the young people. Introduction of the Youth Goals to the young people. Facilitate access to participation.”* (AT)

Other NWGs, on the other hand, came up with very **concrete aims** that can be rather directly linked to impacts, as following examples showcase:

- *“The consultation plan of our NWG is prepared by a sociologist. The results will also be summarised in a publication by him. The NWG has high expectations with the publication; as written in a youth-friendly language, they aim to make it accessible not only for the younger but the older generation too. The publication is designed to create an intergenerational dialogue. The NWG is committed to encourage meaningful and facilitated sharing of views between young people and other generations. In the dissemination phase, the findings of the consultation will be presented in seven regions of the country. In addition to providing information at local level, finding common solutions and encouraging intergenerational dialogue are an essential parts of these events. By presenting our publication on a national level, the NWG hopes to inspire young people to take action at both local and national level.” (HU)*
- *“We plan to make good use of the outcomes by discussing them among the NWG members and to promote the content in order to push for ideas on how to implement them. By using the NWGs network we’ll be able to transpose the content down to the local and regional levels, youth workers, municipalities. We’ll discuss those outcomes with the member organisations of our NYC or at least make them available to them in order to promote the next step to discuss their implementation in the national context. For the upcoming “Youth Convention” we’ll make sure that the young participants and the politicians taking part are aware of the output of the consultation phase in order to discuss opportunities for the implementation. Our NYC is also a member of the Higher Council on Youth where we will promote the outcomes among its members and the ministry in charge of youth and education.” (LU)*

Fifth, last but not least, the aims can also refer to the policy domain or to the practical applications. In the domain of the **policy-focused aims**, the EUYD-related processes feed into policy processes, and we can showcase the following examples:

- *“The results will be used to consider how to relocate resources, proposed changes on the national agenda and eventually move steps onwards to the PNRR and use it at the best possible. At the same time, we would like to gather more data in order to be able to create a strategy for spreading a better sustainable opportunity system and a policy that can be of support and basis from local to national level.” (IT)*
- *“In-phase: we gather information and input for the advice (the consultation sessions in the context of the EUYD do make part of this). Heart-phase: with the volunteers and EU Youth Delegates, we discuss all the inspiration: which recommendations do we conclude on? Out-phase: the advice is approved by the board and now we go talk to policy makers, youth organisations, educational institutions or just those in power to decide on our recommendations ▫ involved actors (such as journalists, mainstream media platforms or youth information organisations concerning the advice on climate communication).” (BE-NL)*

On the other hand, the **practice-oriented aims** strive to support practical applications as can be seen in the following examples:

- *“The consultation process serves to keep these issues on the agenda but also to shine a light on possible opportunities for exploring possible actions. The findings will give us the scope to identify potential local partners in terms of further engagement on the emerging issues.” (IE)*
- *“The aim of the activities is to involve as many young people as possible and show them the opportunity to be active in their surroundings and in society.” (CZ)*

Conclusions on Aims

The aforementioned dichotomies refer to a situation in which there are two extreme examples of how the aims are being formulated by NWGs. These extremes, however, are rather rarely the case. **The aims set by various NWGs tend to combine different elements from the abovementioned dichotomies, at times mixing aspects of each extreme.** This can be seen as a positive trend, since, as can be seen in the concrete examples of the different dichotomies, various aims can support various impacts on different levels both within and outside of the policy domain. The fact that the NWGs seek synergies when formulating EUYD aims creates potential for wide-reaching impacts.

The dichotomies can be useful in future thinking of setting up aims within the EUYD processes as they can serve as an inspiration that provides food for thought in the planning phase of the EUYD. The dichotomies can also serve as a point of initial contact, since they include concrete examples from different NWGs, and hence they create an opportunity to reach out to any given NWG for further details.

1.2. Activities within National EUYD9 Processes

NWGs could also share what activities they plan for the 9th Cycle of the EUYD national consultations. **Both quantitative and qualitative activities were mentioned in the NWG consultation planning¹, as well as online and in-person activities, events on national and local levels, activities led by young people (e.g., ambassadors) as well as implemented by the NWGs directly, and activities focusing only on young people and those also involving policymakers.**

Starting with the quantitative consultation methods, there are several NWGs that chose to implement **full-scale surveys**, both online and offline, namely: BE-DE, CZ, DE, EE, FI, HR, HU, NL, SK. As an example, utilising synergies with other youth field processes, the German-speaking community of Belgium implements the following survey: *“A survey on sustainability conducted as part of the European Year of Youth for people aged 12 to 30 to identify their needs. The results will also be used for the EU Youth Dialogue.”* The Czech NWG, for example, outsourced the full-scale survey in order to manage the workload connected to this exercise: *“We have commissioned standardised research, the questions deal with sustainability and inclusion and are based on the consultation tools we have at our disposal.”*

Other NWGs plan on utilizing **opinion polls**, namely: AT, BE-DE, BE-FR, BE-NL, DE, ES, FI, FR, MT, SE. As an example, the Spanish NWG used an opinion poll to include young people from a specific geographical location: *“Our Ceuta Embassy has carried out a digital survey through their regional youth council to know more about the interests of the young people in Ceuta.”* Another example shows how a specialized smartphone application can be used to implement an opinion poll, as is the case in the Dutch-speaking community of Belgium: *“In Flanders, we have developed (the youth information actors together with higher education institutions) an application which we use to interrogate young people. Every day 3 questions are asked and as NYC we are closely involved in the drafting of these questions. So, we use the application as well in the context of the EU Youth Dialogue. Daily we get answers from around 800 to 1300 young people between 12 and 30 y/o.”* The main difference between a full-scale survey and an opinion poll is the level of detail that is available in the data as a result of

¹ It is not possible to fully quantify these activities, because different NWGs submitted different level of detail: while some only listed types of events, others listed all of the planned activities. For this reason, types of activities are the main focus of this chapter as these also have the most potential to support national consultation processes across the EU.

the exercise, with the survey holding a potential for more detailed data, while the opinion poll highlights only basic preferences of the young people.

Among the qualitative activities, most of the NWGs plan some form of **local activities**, such as local workshops, moving debates, focus groups, street face-to-face activities, and other. NWGs that plan such local activities are: AT, BE-DE, BE-FR, BE-NL, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, HR, HU, LU, LV, MT, SE, NL, PT, SK. A Maltese NWG example can be quoted: *“MT-NWG will use spaces in youth cafes and youth hubs to generate discussion with young people.”* The Danish NWG also includes local spaces where young people will occur: *“We will make mobile [on the spot] interviews to young people participating in the Danish People’s Meeting (Folkemødet) and the Political Festival of Europe.”*

Many NWGs also plan **national-level activities and events**, such as national youth conferences, Youth Dialogue events, Youth Participation Lab, national gatherings funded via Erasmus+, youth festivals, webinars, national meetings of the youth councils and parliaments, activities with NYC member organisations, interviews with youth organisations, and other. NWGs that implement such activities are as follows: AT, BG, CZ, DE, DK, ES, FI, HU, LV, NL, SE, SI. As an example, the Slovenian NWG stated: *“EUJD Ambassadors will conduct interviews with organisations and representatives of young people.”* Some of the NWGs also include **online events**, which allow participation of young people from different regions, such as online debates, focus groups, round tables. The following NWGs implement these online formats: BE-DE, ES, GR, IT. As an example, the Spanish NWG implements an *“Online Talk and debate around digital inclusion”* and describes it as follows: *“Young people from Murcia University, our embassies and the Childhood Platform have been discussing around social inclusion on the digital world and online hate speech.”*

A specific type of activities or events are those where young people and stakeholders or policymakers meet for eye-to-eye dialogue, such as: mixed roles round tables (e.g., politicians, young people, experts, etc.), stakeholder groups, panel debates with policymakers (e.g., with the Deputy Minister for Climate), European Year of Youth events featuring policymakers, sessions in municipalities with the presence of policy makers, etc. Many NWGs also implement these mixed activities and events, namely: BE-DE, BE-NL, BG, CY, DE, ES, FI, LU, LV, PT. Finding synergies with other processes, the Luxemburgish NWG has the following plans: *“In 2022 we’ll have the opportunity to meet with Commissioners who are visiting Luxembourg, the last one was in February (Mr. Shinas), the next is planned for June (Mr. Sinkevičius). Both are the perfect opportunity to discuss the YG#3 and #10.”*

Multiplier activities, in other words events for the young people implemented by the young people, are also planned by some NWGs, such as: training activities for youth who become multipliers, creating pools of youth ambassadors or delegates, and supporting the multipliers in implementing further events, such as picnics with ambassadors. NWGs that employ these schemes are namely: AT, CY, CZ, DE, FI, IT, SI. As an example, the Czech NWG stated: *“We have selected and trained young ambassadors of the EU Youth Dialogue from various regions. We work with them to prepare their activities. Young ambassadors focus on various topics. They are preparing events: simulations of decision-making bodies, discussions with politicians, environmental events - for example, don't waste food, etc.”*

Lastly, several NWGs also implement **innovative participatory and consultative formats** such as: a letter to a minister (a writing format in which young people share their thoughts via a letter to a minister; BE-FR), live videos (*“Use online platforms, social media and alternative methods of communication and consultations (such as podcasts & live videos).”*; CY), board games (giving as well as receiving information while playing), outdoor games and activities, sports events (*“Sport activities in collaboration with NGOs working with young people with fewer opportunities”*; ES), summer schools

(“We will organise summer school, where our members are invited to discuss and take part in trainings and events at which we create an opportunity for rural youth to take part in as well.”; EE), or a TikTok and Instagram competition on sustainability solutions (“Ambassadors will implement a TikTok and IG contest for young people to propose solutions to how a sustainable Slovenia would look like in the future.”; SI). The following NWGs plan on implementing these innovative approaches: BE-FR, CY, EE, ES, SI.

Conclusions on Activities

Many different types of activities can be implemented to create the national consultations, as shown above. **Mixing these activities** to match the national aims of the NWGs (see previous chapter for an overview of potential national aims) as well as to contribute in the best possible way to the overall EUYD processes (via data submitted at the end of the consultations) and to fit the national realities in which the NWGs operate, is a common approach taken by NWGS

Many NWGS **look for synergies with other ongoing or planned processes** such as planned surveys, youth festivals, or other participatory projects, activities, and mechanisms. Finding such synergies often means that not only the processes support each other and generate results which would not be possible otherwise (both for the EUYD processes and the synergetic activities), but the synergies also:

- help manage workload of the NWGs (e.g., in case of surveys which may already be partially prepared by others),
- provide further dissemination and consultation opportunities (e.g., reaching young people at festivals or other events),
- have potential to create partnerships with other organisations working with young people (e.g., organisations working with various target groups),
- maximise financial resources (e.g., it is less financially demanding to set up workshop at an activity which is already under way than to organise the whole activity).

Furthermore, NWGS are planning **activities which offer not only the consultative element, but also the element of deliberation with policymakers**, which have the potential to deepen impacts of the national consultations. These can have deeper impacts on the young people involved in the processes (e.g., debates with policymakers can develop young peoples’ skillsets in specific ways) and even impacts beyond the EUYD consultations themselves (e.g., some of the debated ideas can stay with the policymakers or can even have more structured impacts on policymaking on the national, regional, or local levels, if preparations are made in that regard).

NWGS are also focusing on **innovation in the participation and consultation processes**, as shown by examples of innovative participation and consultation activities. These can involve different consultation channels (writing, making videos, playing games, or even outdoor activities), focus on different youth groups (e.g., those attending various sports), and use creative approaches (e.g., utilising playful and non-formal learning settings).

1.3. Outreach within National EUYD9 Processes

NWGs also shared information on the outreach strategies they plan to utilise during the national consultations. **There are several general approaches the NWGs utilise in reaching various young people, and especially marginalised young people (MYP), namely:**

- **cooperating with existent actors working with MYP,**
- **tailoring consultation activities to the needs of various target groups, including MYP,**
- **holding consultation activities in such places where MYP live,**
- **combining online and in-person events,**
- **creating adaptable designs for consultation activities,**
- **using low-threshold communication,**
- **compiling gender-balanced and diversity-balanced implementation teams,**
- **financially supporting participation in consultation activities**
- **holding consultation activities specifically targeting MYP.**

In most cases, the NWGs strive to establish **cooperation with existent actors** who are directly in touch with various groups of MYP. Such cooperation can help in various ways: as vital knowledge source (e.g., to identify approaches useful to implement consultation activities with various MYP, to identify locations where such activities can take place to reach MYP, etc.) or even as key implementation partners (i.e., to directly cooperate on implementing various activities together with the existent actors). The NWGs list various types of structures they cooperate with in order to increase their outreach, namely:

- youth organisations and other organisations with specific target groups (e.g., young people with disabilities, young people living in poverty, youth organisations in rural or remote areas, ethnic minorities, LGBT+ young people, young migrants, young people who are NEETs, youth facing homelessness, etc.),
- youth organisations and other organisations representing specific target groups (e.g., local youth councils, umbrella organisations, Scouts, etc.)
- institutions caring for various young people, including MYP (e.g., schools, open youth work organisations, etc.).

Some of the NWGs **utilise various consultation formats that are tailored in order to allow young people from all walks of life contribute in such a way which is accessible to them**, including MYP. In order to make this approach work, it is important to have good knowledge of the needs of a given target group. For example, the NWG from Luxembourg elaborates: *“In Luxembourg, the language barrier is being tackled by us on a regular basis. During the (financial) planning phase of our activities, we make sure to be able to offer translation services wherever we can.”* The NWG from French-speaking community of Belgium elaborates: *“We implemented various format (moving debate, writing activity, focus group) that requires different type of skills (oral, written, etc.)”* The Czech NWG also commented in a similar direction: *“We are trying to create our events as inclusive as possible for groups of young people with fewer opportunities (barrier-free access, the possibility to ask for an interpreter in sign language, good accessibility of events for people from the countryside or from other outlying regions...)”*

Some of the NWGs also choose such **geographical locations which allow MYP to be reached** without the need for the MYP to travel, in other words, plan for events in locations where MYP live. This is very common for rural youth but is also utilised in other groups of young people. In words of the NWG from

French-speaking community of Belgium: *“We also offer to move everywhere in the Belgian French-Speaking Community, so that young people do not have to travel to participate.”* Latvian NWG suggests an interesting approach to this outreach strategy: *“In addition, we aim to cooperate with youth NGO that especially works with youngsters with fewer opportunities, so it will help us to reach youth right where they are and make consultation events in unusual places such as bus stops, parks, skate parks etc. For participation, we will use also small motivation presents- merch products we have created during the 8th cycle of EUYD such as earplugs, hammocks, water bottles etc.”* Swedish NWG utilises its contacts with local organisations to implement local workshops: *“With the help of the Swedish Agency for Youth and Civil Society, we have developed the method of these workshops, and reached out to municipalities and youth organisations, and encouraged them to organise local democracy workshops for unorganised rural young people. We have invited them to two webinars where we have promoted the opportunity to recruit young people at local youth centres and organise local democracy workshops for them.”* And an original approach can also be found in case of the Dutch NWG: *“Since this year is also the European Year of Youth, the Dutch Youth Representatives European Affairs implemented a highly successful project: Brussels by Bike. They travelled by bike through the Netherlands to collect input from youngsters along the way. They combined the findings in a report, which they handed to several policy makers at the EU (Frans Timmermans, Biliana Sirakova, Mohammed Chahim and Caroline Nagtegaal van Doorn (MEP) . The route they biked was aimed to target the youth in harder to reach areas - outside the most populated areas of the Netherlands.”*

Offering a **combination of in-person and online events** is also seen as one of outreach strategies by some NWGs. This allows young people from various areas to join in-person if possible, and online if that better suits them. It needs to be noted, however, that there are MYP who have limited or no internet access due to lack of hardware (e.g., PCs, laptops, smartphones, etc.) or connection (e.g., LAN or Wi-Fi access, mobile network coverage, etc.). Online opinion polls can be seen as online tools used to reach a wide range of young people as well.

Adaptable plans and flexible event designs are also one of the outreach strategies. Instead of following rigidly set rules of events or activities, these are planned with enough space for the organisers to adjust it in line with the needs of young people, including MYP. As the Portuguese NWG states: *“Although we already have a session plan outlined for these sessions, our plans will have to be adapted taking into account the specificity of each of these groups.”* Austrian NWG states that they prepare: *“flexible consultation plans adaptable to audience with different needs.”*

Accessible communication is also mentioned among the outreach strategies. Apart from simple and youth-friendly language, some NWGs also include sign language in their communication as well as various other options. The NWG from Germany elaborates on what they use: *“Website translation in easy language and English; Low barrier communication via Instagram; Youth friendly toolbox/materials; Sign language interpretation at events; Different forms of visual communication.”*

Some NWGs also mention **gender-balanced and diversity-balanced teams** which implement the consultative activities and hence in themselves contribute to welcoming various young people. As an example, the Cypriot NWG stated: *“Firstly, the team of Youth Ambassadors for the EU Youth Dialogue grew in order to ensure the diversity of the members of the team and also that the team will be able to engage in the process with young people with fewer opportunities.”* A similar approach is also taken by the Spanish NWG: *“During our call for ambassadors, we already reach out for young volunteers with inclusion profiles, and currently 64% of them have different fewer opportunities profiles (in line with the categories proposed by the Erasmus+ program, such as LGTB community, young people from rural areas, disabilities, low incomes, migrants, Roma, etc.).”*

Events and activities which are free of charge and also offer to cover expenses which occur as a result of participation (e.g., accommodation, travels, food, drinks, special needs, etc.) are seen as a good practice in inclusive national consultation planning. As the Dutch NWG notes: *“We ensured an attractive programme in which we either facilitated a lunch or drinks afterwards, to ensure a good experience for the youngsters participating in the activities and to be able to also chat informally and to draw new connections between young people. This served as a motivation to join the consultation event/activity, but also to lower potential barriers to participate.”*

Last but not least, **some NWGs stated that they design some of the consultation activities directly for the MYP**. As the Irish NWG showcases: *“We will host events for specific cohorts of young people e.g. an event specifically for young people from minority backgrounds and we will also offer to do outreach workshops with groups who are not ready yet to attend big events.”*

Conclusions on Outreach

While inclusion as one of the key elements of consultative activities is stressed by all NWGs, there are different strategies on how to reach this goal. Similar to previous chapters, even in case of outreach, **it seems most NWGS find it beneficial to combine different approaches** so that they fit the (a) capacities of the NWGs, the (b) national realities in which the NWGs operate, and even (c) specific groups of MYP that are usually underrepresented in traditional consultative events. All of the NWGs also seem to be using various combinations of outreach approaches, and this chapter may support them in widening the portfolio of these approaches even further.

2. Good Practices

This section summarises good practice examples collected and submitted by NWGs in the five target areas that are listed below even with the short descriptions that were available to NWGs:

- **Information and Education**
 - Describe a good practice example of information sources and opportunities which works well in connection to climate change and the link between climate change and social inequalities. What helped this concrete example to become a success?
- **Action and Empowerment**
 - Describe a good practice example of a mechanism ensuring needs of young people are taken into account in decision-making processes (e.g., generation tests, etc.)? What helped this concrete example become a success?
- **Governance**
 - Describe an example of good practice of a youth participation mechanism which is successful in going beyond consultation, holding policy makers accountable for what was agreed upon? What helped this concrete example become a success?
- **Mobility and Solidarity**
 - Describe an example of good practice of a mobility opportunity (related to environmental topics) fit for different disadvantaged young people? What helped this concrete example become a success?
- **Access to Infrastructure**
 - Identify a good practice example of an infrastructural system (i.e., not only key elements of infrastructure, but such which work very well in synergy of several elements that support sustainable choices), that is highly praised by the young people, and describe why that is? What helped this concrete example become a success?

The good practices that the NWGs collected are already established in various EU countries, and they relate directly to the overarching topic of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD, namely “Engaging together for a sustainable and inclusive Europe”. Combining the European Youth Goals #10 and #3, the good practices aim at “Achieving a society in which all young people are environmentally active, educated and able to make a difference in their everyday lives” and “Enabling and ensuring the inclusion of all young people in society”.

NWGs provided a description of the good practice examples², and subsequently they also elaborated on success factors³, and inclusion aspects⁴. Not all NWGs submitted examples of good practices, and not all NWGs submitted good practice examples in all five target areas: Specific information on missing good practices is listed in each of the subchapters for reference.

All of the submitted good practice examples are listed in full sorted by country as Annex 1 and sorted by target area as Annex 2. The following subchapters summarise the main characteristics of the good practice examples and focus mostly on the success factors that support good practice design, establishment, and maintenance.

² The NWGs were asked to describe the good practice example and explain why it is successful.

³ The NWGs were asked to answer the following questions: What helped the good practice example to be established? What helps the good practice to keep running? What helps the good practice to reach young people? What helps the good practice to be effective?

⁴ The NWGs were asked to describe any mechanisms supporting involvement of young people with fewer opportunities.

2.1. Types of Good Practice Examples

Overall, the good practice examples fall under two main categories: civic participation, and political participation domains. In case of **civic participation**, these encompass various civic initiatives and project implementation which directly aim at helping to resolve given issues in concrete contexts. In principle, these good practice examples:

- Create and implement innovative initiatives in their own right.
 - Example from the Spanish NWG: *“A good practice put in place in different cities in Spain is to create in all populations a “Community Good Garden” or “Edible Garden”. They bring people together to grow food – sharing the reward of fresh and tasty produce. They are established usually in a public space, a shared area on an estate, etc. They serve to experience agriculture, planting and harvesting common plots, herbs and fruit trees, but they also hold workshops on many different sustainability topics, such as: building an insect hostel and their benefits to the earth, how to elaborate organic fertilisers, compost workshops, etc. All these topics lead to other daily issues related to sustainability such as garbage management, animal care, responsible consumption, etc.”*
- Support creation of new and innovative initiatives.
 - Example from the Dutch NWG: *“One of the most booming/growing youth initiatives on climate change in the Netherlands is the ‘Jonge Klimaat Beweging’ (JKB) (Young Climate Movement). The movement organises various activities, actions, initiatives to voice the concerns of young people in the Netherlands about the climate crisis and to lobby for progressive, inclusive and empathetic climate policy. One of the main examples of their work is the Young Climate Agenda. Through video’s, social media and their website they explain their vision for a sustainable world in 2050 – encompassing all elements of sustainability (work, housing, food, education, transport). Through this lobby they can reach many young people and inform them about climate change, but also about what needs to be done by policymakers, decision-makers as well as how to lobby/voice concerns.”*
- Collect information on new and innovative initiatives that already exist and increase their visibility.
 - Example from the NWG of the French-speaking community of Belgium: *“From 16 May 2022, Imagine, an independent and slow press, is launching the Tour de Wallonie des Jeunes Solutionneurs (Tour of Wallonia of youth solution makers). A societal and editorial transmedia project that aims to promote people and places that have a positive social and environmental impact. They are inventing citizen start-ups, creating alternative currencies, reinventing sustainable agriculture, exploring new forms of collective housing, re-localized consumption, participatory democracy... From all over Wallonia, which is full of these “million quiet revolutions”. Through this event, which is both societal and editorial, Imagine [the organisers] will give a voice to these young solution-makers, promote their initiatives, and tell the story of a Wallonia that is moving, creating, innovating and projecting itself.”*

Good practices in the **political participation** domain aim at changing policy on different levels, from national, through regional, to local (or, for instance, municipal). As an example, the Austrian NWG quotes a political participation process in Vienna: *“Werkstatt junges Wien is a big participation project for children and young people in Vienna. In a participatory process, different topics were developed together with children and young people, and they have formed the basis for a Children and Youth*

Strategy for Vienna. The City will implement this plan on behalf of everyone involved. As an outcome, one million Euros were dedicated as a participatory budget - children and young people living in Vienna can decide what will be implemented with this budget."

The main difference between these two approaches is in the systematicity of impacts. While the civic participation good practices may bring about solid impacts, the political participation good practices are more systematic and, usually, also more long-term than the civic participation practices, hence have potential to create long-term and wider impacts. In this sense, it is useful to think of civic participation activities and projects as blueprints of potential policy changes or, at least, to be anchored as long-term supported mechanisms on various levels, in order to ensure impacts of the civic participation projects are as profound and wide-reaching as possible. It is also important to be aware of what type of initiative one is preparing (civic or political participation) to be able to predict impacts in a realistic way.

The good practices can also be either one-off or long-term (continuous) initiatives. One-off initiatives are typically projects, events, workshops, conferences, and the like. Many of these one-off initiatives, however, carry potential for longer-term initiatives, or showcase practices which can and should be implemented in other projects and initiatives, and some of the one-off projects even aim at this multiplication effect explicitly, as can be seen in an example provided by the German-speaking community of Belgium: *"With their solidarity project "No time to waste", the Scout leaders from Unit St. Paul in Eupen (East-Belgium) sensitized 18 members aged 13-16 years for a respectful use of raw materials and got them to be less wasteful with them. In the course of the project, the scouts were first prepared for the camp with various activities that they had chosen and set up themselves (among other things, creating natural products for the camp: jam, chocolate, baked goods, cleaning products, deodorant, shopping bags, beeswax cloths). The twelve camp days took place according to the "zero waste" principle and were characterised by healthy nutrition. When shopping, local and seasonal products were used: Bread from the bakery, vegetables and fruit from the market, dairy products from the farm, other items from the unpacked store. Every day there was a vegetarian dish and every day the focus was on general waste prevention and no-waste activities: using bamboo toothbrushes, sharing hygiene products, creating a herb garden, etc."* While it can be assumed that success factors listed in the following subchapter might all help turn the one-off projects (or their components) into long-term, continuous ones, it can also be argued that a specific support might provide further help. Potential specific support might include platforms for sharing of good practices (e.g., round tables, peer learning events, conferences, contests, online and offline publications, etc.), and even including the good practices into existent platforms for youth workers and other interested stakeholders (e.g., Training of Trainers events, national youth conferences, national and international Tool Fairs, etc.).

Good practices can also operate on different levels: national, regional, or local. In this case, of course, there is a question on what support mechanisms would be needed to either upscale or downscale the good practices in order to make them useful at different levels than the one they were originally designed at. This can also involve feeding outcomes of civic participation activities into policies, and, in reverse, also support creation of civic participation activities which build on certain policies and finding such mechanisms which allow this exchange of ideas between the policy and practice on a continuous basis.

The following subchapters include short summaries of the good practice examples, however, for the full description of these good practices, please refer to the Annex 1 and Annex 2 where they are listed by country and by topic as full texts.

2.1.1. Summary of Good Practices in Information and Education

The Toolkit of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD describes this subtheme as follows: *“Climate change is a complex issue and as such spans different scientific areas, connects different policy domains, links to many areas of human production and consumption, and can be difficult to fully grasp in all its implications. Young people should have access to youth-friendly information sources, and opportunities to learn about the nature and causes of climate change, and its relation to social inequalities all around the world. These learning opportunities and resources should be based within the formal education as well as in non-formal and informal learning contexts. These resources and opportunities need to be accessible, inclusive and reach out to young people from all walks of life. They should also focus on climate change aspects (e.g., what is it, what affects future predictions, how it connects to current economic and production realities we live in, what actions can be taken individually and nationally, etc.), as well as the link between the climate change and social inequalities (e.g., effects of climate change on different nations, the topic of climate refugees, the occurrences when climate change introduced famines, potential for war conflicts connected to droughts in certain regions, etc.)”* All of the NWGs submitted their good practice examples to this section apart from the French and the Croatian NWG.

The good practice examples in this subtheme included preparation of youth-friendly materials, various workshops, educational (non-formal and informal) and participative activities for young people, summer schools, living libraries with young people from regions affected acutely by climate change, educational games, but also a combination with other initiatives, such as the Edible Garden in Spain or Urban Gardening in Greece, youth climate delegate scheme, or deliberative mechanisms focusing on debating skills, and activities in which young people present their own solutions to climate challenges such as Young Climathon in Malta or Young Climate Movement in the Netherlands.

2.1.2. Summary of Good Practices in Action and Empowerment

The Toolkit of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD describes this subtheme as follows: *“The needs of young people should be represented at all levels of government and should enable young people to have their interests reflected in the decision-making processes. Such tools that ensure needs of future generations are taken into account in policymaking are essential especially when dealing with burning questions of today, such as the climate emergency. These tools should ensure intergenerational dialogue takes place at all times when decisions affecting more than one generation are debated and taken. Exploring the tools and mechanisms used in ensuring intergenerational dialogue and balance in decision-making can help provide basis on which such tools become widely used across the European countries and institutions. These can be e-tools, parliamentary or legal processes and guarantees, committees of various titles that oversee generational justice in decision-making, youth organisations conducting advocacy and many other formats. It is also crucial that these tools are transparent and in communication with young people via different channels.”* All of the NWGs submitted their good practice examples to this section apart from the NWGs from Croatia, France, and the French-speaking community of Belgium.

The good practice examples in this subtheme included political participation processes focusing on influencing policies (e.g., consultation mechanisms, representative structures such as youth councils, or specialised ad hoc structures such as Youth Assembly on Climate in Ireland, or Youth Convention in Luxembourg, etc.), multiplication activities (e.g., training of trainers, youth ambassadors), simulations of political processes for young people (including, for example, youth elections), but also policy assessment mechanisms (e.g., Youth Check in Germany, Child Impact Assessment in Sweden), or guidelines for sustainable practices (e.g., the Green Guide of Youth Associations in Portugal).

2.1.3. Summary of Good Practices in Governance

The Toolkit of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD describes this subtheme as follows: *“Youth participation mechanisms often include a consultation component, but it can be difficult to see beyond the multitude of follow-up processes on the political level to ensure the results of the participatory mechanisms have been implemented, or at least taken into account. Seeing results is, nevertheless, one of the key conditions of meaningful participation, as opposed to tokenistic youthwashing in which events are only labelled as youth participatory without any follow-up processes in place, and hence with no chance of achieving any results at all. At the same time, political processes are often complex and take time, which can impair feedback and follow-up processes, making well defined structures for follow-up an important tool in this domain. Strengthening meaningful youth participation via increasing accountability of policymakers and decision-makers (e.g., by implementing well-defined follow-up processes to the participatory mechanisms) can be achieved by identifying key success factors of mechanisms leading to such accountability. In case such mechanisms cannot be identified, young people should think forward to outline how such mechanisms could look like, and in what phases of the policy process these would be most effective, in order to outline and implement them in the future.”* All of the NWGs submitted their good practice examples to this section apart from the NWGs from Croatia, France, the German-speaking community of Belgium, and Italy.

The good practice examples in this subtheme included various youth political participation mechanisms (e.g., Climate Youth Council in Austria, ad hoc projects in French-speaking community of Belgium, in the Czech Republic, in Malta, and also utilisation of the EUYD processes in Cyprus and Germany, high-school board of directors in Denmark, National Youth Councils in Spain, Youth Advisory Councils at different Ministries in Estonia, and the Youth Platform of the Social and Economic Council in the Netherlands, a digital platform for public initiatives in Latvia), policy assessment mechanisms (e.g., Youth Test in Dutch-speaking community of Belgium), and guidelines (e.g., Youth’s Green Compromise in Portugal).

It is apparent that the good practices submitted in this subtheme (Governance) and in the previous subtheme (Action and Empowerment) overlap to a great extent. This is due to these subthemes being rather close to each other, and even potentially intertwining with one another.

2.1.4. Summary of Good Practices in Mobility and Solidarity

The Toolkit of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD describes this subtheme as follows: *“Youth mobility and volunteering in the environmental sector can take place in many different forms: as a semester abroad, as a volunteering year in a neighbouring country, as an internship in the European Parliament, or as a work placement after the studies are over. These opportunities can enable young people to volunteer and take part in environmental initiatives, support environmental organisations or to become involved in sustainability and inclusion causes. In all those cases, it is imperative that all young people, including marginalised young people (e.g., ethnic and religious minorities, mentally or physically disadvantaged, NEETs, and many others), have equal opportunities to participate and enjoy the many advantages such mobility periods can bring to both personal and working lives. Identifying mechanisms which help marginalised young people to take part in such opportunities, makes these opportunities attractive and relevant to them, is hence key to increasing their participation in the future and contributing to positive societal development.”* All of the NWGs submitted their good practice examples to this section apart from the NWGs from Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, France, and Slovakia.

The good practice examples in this subtheme included mobility projects based on inclusive approaches, short and geographically close mobility opportunities for MYP in French-speaking community of Belgium, Rural Youth Platform in the Czech Republic, volunteering projects, Erasmus+ and European Solidarity Corps projects, activities connected to COPs, introducing free public transport in Luxembourg and different discounts in Latvia, and initiatives focusing on trash cleaning such as the one mentioned by the Portuguese NWG.

2.1.5. Summary of Good Practices in Access to Infrastructure

The Toolkit of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD describes this subtheme as follows: *“When tackling climate change, infrastructure young people live in to a large extent affects their choices when it comes to sustainable living. Accessibility of public transport within as well as outside of population centres impacts how many young people rely on personal means of transportation. Presence or absence of quality cycling lanes affects how many young people will choose bike over car in their daily commute. Access to affordable, sustainable, and quality housing determines where the young people will live and how much commuting they will need to do in order to access employment, social and healthcare services, and do their shopping. Availability of shops offering local produce, again, influences the shopping choices of young people and affects sustainability of their everyday living. In order to support access of young people to such infrastructure they see as necessary for making sustainable choices, we need not only to identify the key infrastructural elements young people desire, but also explore how these elements need to work together to allow young people using the whole system towards sustainable living. Just as eco-friendly public transport that only stops at large malls with no sustainable products in stock will not allow young people to shop, eat, and consume sustainably, then building eco-friendly houses will only work if they are built at accessible places or supported by subsidies in the area of electromobility. Exploring key infrastructural elements as well as their interplay in allowing young people to live sustainably is key in making these changes happen.”* All of the NWGs submitted their good practice examples to this section apart from the NWGs from Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, France, the German-speaking community of Belgium, Luxembourg, and Slovakia. Apparently, this is the subtheme where the least good practice examples were collected.

The good practice examples in this subtheme included collecting and sharing interesting practices, sustainable youth centres, bike sharing systems, the Youth Leader Card in Germany, IT solutions (e.g., RuralCar [the carpooling for rural areas], TooGoodToGo [to avoid food wasting in supermarkets and restaurants], MarketPlace [Post services just for farmers], Tal Cual [to reduce food waste and improve healthy food access by buying “not perfect” fruits and vegetables rejected by supermarkets and big shops], Conscious Shoppers Association, ShareWaste, Mol Bubi), car-free streets, free or discounted public transport which also runs during night-time, package-free shops, the Rediscovery Centre (the National Centre for the Circular Economy in Ireland), revitalisation of abandoned places, Renewable Energy System Scheme (to further encourage better use of the renewable energy being generated in Malta), participatory budgeting in schools in Portugal.

2.2. Success Factors of The Good Practice Examples

Based on the good practice examples submitted by the NWGs, it shows that activities supporting inclusive and sustainable Europe are strengthened by the success factors listed in this subchapter. It is also worth noticing that the success factors seem to be rather universally helpful across different topical areas (subthemes) and can be therefore applied in a wide variety of contexts.

Direct engagement of young people and MYP as leaders and organisers of the good practices seems key. This, nevertheless, is not always easy to achieve since such engagement demands young people to have rather specific skills. It is, therefore, vital that there are mechanisms to enable young people to develop such skills and to enable them to actively contribute to creation, implementation, and evaluation of good practices, both the civic initiatives, and the political participation activities. This is already happening in some cases, as the Estonian NWG points out: *“We have established youth participation councils under 76 rural municipalities or city councils and four ministries. In order to achieve this objective, the participation councils hold meetings; provide training opportunities for members; introduce and promote democracy amongst young people; participate in the meetings of the rural municipality or city council; participate in the work of rural municipality or city council committees.”* At the same time, youth-friendly communication is crucial to inform young people and to attract them to take part in the good practices. Explicitly utilising informal and non-formal learning environments (i.e., be explicit about the advantages of joining the initiative in an attractive and informative way), gamifying and using various games in their own right, tailoring information to the interests of young people, and utilising such information channels which are attractive to young people (e.g., peer-learning and living library formats, etc.), these are youth-friendly communication strategies used in various good practices. Austrian NWG offered an example of such an approach: *“The “climate reporters project” is implemented by the NGO “CliMates” with the support of the Federal Ministry for Climate Action. Through the project, young people are empowered to create content on the topic of climate change and related topics. The aim is to offer information about climate change created by young people in a youth-friendly way and to raise awareness about this issue in a young target group. The climate reporters produce a regular podcast on current issues, a blog and use other media as well. Furthermore, events are organised regularly where current issues are discussed and young people can benefit from the exchange.”*

Direct link between the bodies implementing the good practice and policy stakeholders is one of key success factors. This link can have many forms, from official endorsement of a given process by a certain policymaker or policy body (e.g., by a Department at a City Hall, a given policymaker, etc.), through established and pre-negotiated ways in which the practice is connected to the policymaking processes (e.g., in the form of recommendations to a concrete body or policy process, etc.), all the way to utilising existent mechanisms of political participation (e.g., commenting on policymaking procedures via standard channels, if available, based on the good practice outcomes, for example). An example can be shown by the French-speaking community of Belgium: *“In order to update the Walloon Air Climate and Energy Plan (PACE), the Forum des Jeunes was mandated by Philippe Henry, Minister of Climate, Energy, Mobility and Infrastructure, to carry out a consultation specifically aimed at young people. From November 2021 to February 2022, 550 young Walloon people aged 16 to 30 were given the opportunity to express their views on the measures they would like to see put in place and to give their opinion on 5 themes: consumption, mobility, housing, production and training. The elements collected were compiled in a report with the aim of feeding into the construction of the new PACE. At the same time, a citizens' panel, made up of some sixty citizens, was also organised and resulted in 168 recommendations also intended for political representatives.”* It is necessary to also note that this link between the good practices and the policy level are vital in both the civic participation initiatives, and in the political participation activities.

Direct engagement of experts from different fields, such as practice, policy, academia, business, and others, can be very beneficial to the good practices, as it enables these practices not only to build on the expertise of various actors, but also to be anchored in different settings (e.g., overlooked by youth, supported by private enterprises and NGOs, evaluated by academia, disseminated and further utilised by policymakers, etc.). An example by Portuguese NWG can be quoted: *“Youth’s Green Compromise*

arises from the inputs of an auscultation survey regarding “Youth Engagement for Global Action”. Accordingly, the results showed that young people believe that schools may have a crucial role on environmental action and education, providing the wide range of young people involved. Thus, with a perspective beyond curricular learning, the Youth’s Green Compromise was created in order to invite schools and students to work together and come up with a collective action plan to raise awareness on climate change and sustainable development, implementing new practices on the community. The compromise was well established since it originated on a convergence between CNJ (Portuguese youth council), FNAJ and IPDJ. Moreover, it is currently active due to the efforts of schools on awareness campaigns, adoption of sustainable practices and by raising environmental responsibility. Thus, youth is mainly involved by school communities as well as by CNJ and FNAJ. This good practice is effective since the approach is done by the construction of a “school compromise”, structured and created by the students, allowing them to have debate and discussion phases and also implementation of the compromise itself.” At the same time, open-source reporting on outcomes of previous projects, initiatives, and good practices, are invaluable information sources for anyone interested in designing their own projects and activities, and such open-source reports should be at all times supported. Such outcomes are also beneficial to visibility and transparency (see below) and can be also one of the aspects in which public bodies can assist the good practice organisers (see below). The Greek NWG states: “Urban gardening is not only a way to grow vegetables more sustainably, but it is also an attractive way for young people to meet other people and acquire new skills. Urban project provided an opportunity for strengthening social inclusion through constructive activities, contributions to the community, relationship building, and interpersonal skills development. Through the development of learning resources adjusted to the needs of young people, we achieved to support the professional development of young people and actively involve local youth threatened of marginalisation. The development of an e-learning platform and an application for android and ios that enables distance education regarding the steps of creating urban gardens and supporting the engagement of young people all over Greece were the main elements that make the Urban project a good practice. Also, the app’s creation allows young people from all over Greece to get to know practical steps on how to create their own urban gardens locally.” Another example from the Czech NWG reads: “According to the members, the key factor that helped establish and run the project/organisation was the interconnection of multiple actors and experts in the NGO sphere and beyond that and co-creation of common ideas. Important was also a link to the young MEPs across the political spectrum that was possible through the involved youth political organisations. Young people are the drivers of change themselves and other young people are reached through a network of members of involved organisations.”

Funding of good practices requires continuity (day-to-day stability) **in combination with effective utilisation of additional financial resources** (e.g., project-based funds such as Erasmus+). Continuous funding enables actors in the field to operate on a day-to-day basis and focus on preparing innovative content. Additional, project-based, financial resources create a gateway to fund innovative initiatives in the civic and political participation domain, but they also require administrative expertise in order to successfully design project application and, just as importantly, to administer the project correctly. In order to support various stakeholders in designing, implementing, and evaluating good practices, continuous funding should be available, and further education and peer learning on project administration should be offered in sufficient quantity and quality. An example of interesting funding opportunities is presented by the Maltese NWG: “The Government launched the Renewable Energy System (RES) Scheme, which is administered by the Regulator for Energy and Water Services to further encourage the better use of the renewable energy being generated by the country. This scheme is funded through national funds and allows for Voluntary Organisations, including youth organisations

or organisations working with or for young people to apply for a grant for the installations of photovoltaic panels.”

General support of good practices from public bodies is also one of the success factors. Public bodies, such as municipalities, can assist good practice implementation by providing spaces (e.g., land, venues, offices, accommodation, etc.), by providing certain services which then do not have to be funded as part of the good practice implementation (e.g., gardening support, publishing support, etc.), and even by providing expertise (e.g., legal, administrative, etc.). Such support can significantly help good practices in its establishment and maintenance as it lowers not only financial, but also human capacity demands for the main organiser. As the Spanish NWG states: *“The initiative [Edible Garden] comes from the municipalities aware of the topic and gives the opportunity to all citizens to benefit and experience sustainability. City councils are the ones who usually offer public land and the facilitators (sometimes volunteers) for the workshops. Maintenance is also carried by the municipality gardening services.”*

Publicity, visibility, and transparency are crucial for the good practices to be successful. Good practices that happen without public knowledge risk to stay isolated and limited in scope. On the other hand, good practices with good visibility have potential to create multiplication effect by inspiring others to implement similar practices, or even to implement policy changes that would make the practice more anchored and sustainable, widening its impacts significantly. Publicity and visibility go hand in hand with transparency. Transparency is crucial not only for the sake of effective visibility strategies, but also to ensure young people are aware of what is happening, how their contributions to various processes have been utilised, and what other processes are potentially also connected to the initiatives in the future. Transparency is especially key in political participation practices as these tend to be multi-layered, complex, and long-term, and young people need to be aware of what already happened, what is planned for the near future, and what is expected to happen long-term. As the Slovenian NWG states: *“The subsidised ticket for young people in education was already in place before, so the initiative built on the visibility of the project, and the best practice that allowed it to reach young people was word-of-mouth by those using it among their peers.”*

Legal and policy backing can be one of success factors as it provides necessary ground for various debates and negotiations. This is best illustrated by concrete examples. Youth Law in Latvia, for instance, constitutes an important tool supporting establishments of good practice examples via supporting youth organisations and youth participation domains: *“Participation mechanisms set out in the Youth Law in Latvia, such as: in order to become a youth organisation, the representation of young people on its board must be mandatory, its activities must be aimed at promoting the participation of young people and to get funding; support is provided for the representation of national youth organisations in networks of international organisations; Youth Advisory Council in Latvia – aim of it is to promote the development and implementation of a coherent youth policy at the various levels of government (local, national and European), as well as to promote the participation of young people in decision-making and public life. Council has the right to form working groups, to request and receive the necessary information from the persons involved in the implementation of youth policy through the Ministry, as well to invite experts and officials with advisory rights to council meetings. It is the most direct opportunity for young people from youth organisations to join; with at least 12 youth organisations are members of Council. Decisions affecting youth policy in Latvia are coordinated with the council or come directly from the suggestions of the council members.”* In Sweden, for instance, creating concrete legal rules to implement The Convention on the Rights of a Child made positive impacts: *“Our good practice example of a mechanism ensuring that the needs of young people are taken into account is the so-called ‘child impact assessment’ (‘Barnkonsekvensanalys’). Ever since the*

Convention on the Rights of the Child became law in Sweden, a child impact assessment has to be done before a political decision is made by, for example, agencies and municipalities. This is an assessment of the impact of a political decision on the child that must form part of every political decision and is successful because it makes decision-makers take children into account.”

Last but not least, **cumulative effect of the good practices** is an important success factor as well. Simply put, the more of good practices are in place, the more likely it is for new ones to occur, since inspiration and guidance can both be found in the existent practices and hence the existent practices pave way for more innovations to come. An example stated by the Estonian NWG can be quoted: “*We have established youth advisory councils under 4 four ministries out of 11. Under Ministry of Education and Research; Ministry of Environment; Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications operating youth councils’ purpose is to discuss issues concerning young people within the competence of the rural municipality or city and to make proposals thereon to the rural municipality or city council and the rural municipality or city government based on the needs and interests of young people. They hold meetings with ministries and can hold them accountable for passing certain proposals. (...) Already existing local municipality youth councils helped youth councils under ministries to be established as they were a good example for youth participation. Regular and structured meetings help the youth councils to achieve their goals on a national level. They also represent different organisations from the area of the ministries.”*

General Conclusions

This mid-term report analysed information provided by the NWGs in June 2022, focusing on the national consultation plans and processes, and on good practice examples in subthemes identified during the French Presidency of the Council of the European Union, and defined by the Toolkit of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD. In order to support NWGs in achieving the goals of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD, namely “**Engaging together for a sustainable and inclusive Europe**”, the following main success factors were identified across all topics in this report:

- ❖ **Finding the right mix of aims and methods.**
- ❖ **Finding synergies.**
- ❖ **Finding the right composition of actors.**
- ❖ **Capitalising on innovations.**
- ❖ **Setting inclusion as a default approach.**
- ❖ **Employing intergenerational dialogue.**
- ❖ **Strengthening cross-sectoral cooperation.**

First, **finding the right mix** of aims and methods seems crucial. NWGs show great variability in the aims and plans they prepared, and the same can be stated for the good practice examples. It is imperative to know what the needs are, what is doable in a given context, and what works for young people in the given area or context. Needs analysis is a must and findings the right mix is directly linked to that. Several dichotomies were identified in this report which can be helpful in establishing the right mix of aims:

- Ad hoc VERSUS systematic aims
- Organisation aims VERSUS those going beyond this scope
- EUYD-focused aims VERSUS those going beyond this scope
- General aims VERSUS concrete aims
- Policy aims VERSUS practice-oriented aims

Second, **finding synergies** is just as important. Again, that is true for both the national consultation planning, and for the good practices. To name a few examples, it is key to find synergies between policy and practice, in the domain of national and international aims, across practices on various levels, and even in work of various bodies. Information provided by the NWGs showcase those synergies are not only helpful in making the practices and consultations efficient, but often also contribute to innovations which would hardly be possible without the synergies.

Third, **finding the right composition** of actors is key. When it comes to both the national consultations and the good practice examples, it is vital to find a suitable composition of policymakers from various contexts and levels, young people from all walks of life, multiplicators from various professions and expertise, and any other actors who are interested to contribute to the process.

Fourth, **capitalising on innovations** is an efficient way to create good practices within the national consultations and beyond. Cumulative effect of the good practice examples was mentioned in this report, i.e., the good practices themselves have potential to support further innovations by inspiring others, by providing valuable outcomes, and by showcasing lessons learned. It is key to use this cumulative effect to one’s advantage, exploring available resources, getting in touch with organisations and individuals who have expertise in a given domain or who stand behind certain good practice examples, and even attending conferences and various other platforms where good practices are explained, shared, and debated.

Fifth, **inclusion as a default setting** seems to be rather common, and it is key this approach is used as widely as possible across the national consultations and also across all good practices. Creative approaches to outreach as well as to inclusion itself are debated and presented in one of the chapters above, and these provide only a glimpse of what is possible in this domain. Reaching out to, and meaningfully including young people from all walks of life strengthens all consultation processes and all good practice examples.

Sixth, **intergenerational dialogue** is one of the key mechanisms to ensure intergenerational justice in practices and policies. As this important component is visible in some of the consultation plans (e.g., mixed deliberation platforms, etc.), and some good practices (e.g., Youth Tests and similar mechanisms ensuring impacts of policies are assessed towards the needs of future generations, etc.), it is advisable to keep this component in mind in further consultation plans and good practices and widen engagement of the intergenerational dialogue components.

Seventh, **cross-sectoral cooperation** needs to take place to ensure young people are included across sectors in all matters that concern their current or future interests, as is visible namely in the domain of infrastructure. While this tendency has been on the table for some time now, in practice it is still rather rare, despite the fact that especially wide and complex issues such as climate emergency cannot be tackled by one sector alone. Young people should be taking part in debates concerning different domains, even those not traditionally related to them, such as energy, infrastructure, housing, food production, and many other.

This report is part of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD, serves most notably as an input to debates which are to take place during the Prague EUYC in July 2022, and moreover is valuable in itself as it highlights (a) key aspects of national consultation planning across the EU Member States, and (b) success factors in good practices which concern subthemes identified earlier in the process of the 9th Cycle of the EUYD.

Annexes

Due to the size of the Annexes, these are listed in two separate documents:

- Annex 1: Good Practice Examples by Country
- Annex 2: Good Practice Examples by Topic