

Recommendations based on the review of the 4th cycle of SD

- *to be used as reflection for the planning of the 5th Cycle of SD*
- *to be used by the ESC and EC for the preparation of the SD dedicated event during the European Youth Week in May 2015*
- *to be made available as background document for the participants of the SD dedicated event during the European Youth Week in May 2015*

Transition into new approach (theory vs. practice of 3rd cycle to 4th cycle transition)

“+” elements:

Timing - more time for consultations + quality of outcome + more momentum on national level

- time to explore the topic and define the challenges and subtopics for the national level
- time to prepare the communication of the consultation
- time to link the overall priority to the national topical priorities
- change of timing from 6 months to 18 months is very good

Topic / one overall priority - very good to have one overall topic in order to ensure political impact in EU policy level

Orientation space - it is very good to have the orientation phase so young people can input into the process of defining the overall topic

Better conditions for higher impact of the SD - Joint Recommendations are feeding into Council Conclusions step by step + on national level NWG can build more momentum

“-” elements:

Difficult to explain the new cycle - lack of clarity and no clear communication strategy

Ensuring that SD is used as a tool for policy dialogue and shaping

Not good **transition into one overall topic**, as in Rome two topics were worked on

Orientation space - it was not implemented properly as the first phase was already too much predefined

Timing of the consultation of the 5th cycle will be over the summer, which might present an important risk

Recommendations:

There needs to be open consultations with young people on defining the topic of the cycle and the Presidencies should base their decision on the final topic of cycle based on the young peoples input

We need to ensure that each EU Youth Conference will have enough diverse SD relevant stakeholders present (including the diverse Ministries), and consider the cross-sectoral presence at the Conference

Follow-up and monitoring

“+” elements:

Background document for participants shared with NWGs - Comparison between the Council Conclusion and Joint Recommendation of Rome Conference

Feedback phase - in general it is good to have this phase

“-” elements:

Diversity in the quality of the “feedback phase” - lack of support and coordination of NWG's + not clear what will happen in Luxembourg

Cross-sectoral follow-up of the SD

There is no Monitoring system

Lack of resources to deal with the follow-up phase of previous cycle while at the same time efforts, resources and focus is given to new cycle simultaneously.

Recommendations:

Among other, use the European Youth Report as a tool to define criteria of the good implementation of SD results and monitor the implementation of results in addition to process implementation

The Commission should set up and lead a structured process for monitoring and follow-up

The NWG should monitor the national level SD process

The structured monitoring process needs to be transparent and visible to all actors and SD stakeholders

Establish peer mechanisms between Member States in order to support and stimulate all countries to implement the adopted Recommendations.

Part of NWG grant should be spent of follow-up, monitoring and implementation of recommendations of previous cycle.

EU Youth Conferences (Rome and Riga – comparison, successes and challenges)

“+” elements:

Latvian Conference: More commitment of decision-makers - more presence in the workshops in the EU Youth Conference + more time and space was given to discussions and dialogue + good was not to be limited by word limits in formulation of recommendations

Editing team was more open in Latvian Conference in comparison to past Conferences.

“-” elements:



Italian Conference: Double priority in Italian conference + lack of preparation before that conference (need to better use the time before) + questions still too complex + need to review the format of the guiding framework + too much focus on recommendations vs. on dialogue

Not clear on the composition of editing team in Italian conference

Lack of DG representation in the workshops during the EU Youth Conferences

Not enough DGs attend the whole duration of the Conference

Lack of clarity on the structure of workshops - how the themes of the workshops are predefined - this limits the framework of the outputs and results

Delegates not enabled to attend the workshop they registered for and prepared for - can lead to complete mismatch (assigning people to topics their national consultations did not tackle at all)

Recommendations:

Evaluation of the Conference needs to allow the participants to express their feedback with the facilitator(s) in a very direct and concrete manner.

The process of defining the structure and themes of workshops needs to be made transparent and open to feedback.

Ensuring that participants can attend the workshops they subscribed to (at least one of the priorities)

The final recommendations need to reflect the discussions in the workshops.

A formal place needs to be defined for the recommendations that were formulated in workshops but were finally not taken to the final few recommendations but are still very relevant to remember and use them.

Opinion boulevard during the Conference could be opened to participants that were involved on local/national consultations - to be able to input directly into European level.

Organise a pre-programme to the Conference, with possible study visits and other means to ensure exploration of the topics and deepening of the reflections of participants coming to the Conference on optional basis.

In process of the formulation of recommendations it needs to be clear to whom we are addressing them, who needs to fulfill them.

Process (between the Conferences – what was happening on national level)

“+” elements:

we need more time to pass to answer this one

“-” elements:

Diversity in the quality of the consultations carried out - capacities are different (should we have more coordination from the ESC?)

Struggle to bring the questions on local level, while holidays were also in between.

The Italian conference should have been one month earlier to have more time for **preparation on national level for implementation**

The deadline for submission of content for Luxembourg is too early

Recommendations:

Deadlines need to be clear and the same for all NWG. The deadlines should be clear at the beginning of the whole cycle and should give enough time to all phases of implementation and follow-up.

The time available for the consultation period should be as long as possible.

Communication from EU level (language of instructions/Questions, timely information...)

“+” elements:

Guiding questions were more clear than in previous cycles, for NWG level

“-” elements:

Delays in on-line platform that Commission launched - NWG not using it (only 6 or 7 used it)

Recommendations:

Guiding questions should be formulated in a way that each question is clearly asking something else - need for clarity.

EU level (ESC) needs to communicate directly to the NWG chair/coordinator, not going through the Ministry in cases that Ministry is not the chair/coordinator.

Practical needs of implementation: funding

“+” elements:

More means for NWG

“-” elements:

Funding - timing for NWG + not enough

Timing of the new cycle is not corresponding with the deadlines of KA3 (Erasmus+), so local and regional applicants for SD projects do not know the topical priority of next phase/cycle before they need to apply

Timing of NWG funding and the applications

Application form for NWG direct funding is too project based

Recommendations:



Funding for NWG coming from EU Commission would need to be made available on 18 month period (depending on cycle and not depending on calendar year)