



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	2
I. A European Convention on Youth Mobility.....	2
A. Why Youth Mobility?.....	2
B. Existing Barriers.....	2
C. Need for Intergovernmental Co-operation.....	3
D. Why a Convention?.....	3
E. What to Look For.....	3
F. What to Avoid.....	5
II. Some Definitions.....	6
A. Mobility.....	6
B. Barriers.....	6
C. Youth.....	6
D. Youth Exchange Programmes of a Certain Standard.....	7
E. Other Educational Activities Abroad of a Certain Standard.....	7
BARRIERS IDENTIFIED.....	8
I. Legal and Administrative Barriers.....	8
A. Visa and Residence Permit.....	8
B. Passports.....	12
C. Schools and Universities.....	12
D. Conscripts and Conscientious Objectors.....	15
E. Receivers of Unemployment and Social Welfare Benefits.....	15
F. Continuation of Rights in Paid Work Exchanges.....	16
G. Educational Leave.....	16
H. Medical Insurance.....	16
I. Income Tax and Child Allowance.....	17
J. Minority and Parental Custody.....	18
K. Liability of Organisers.....	18
II. Financial Barriers and Public Financial Support.....	18
III. Information.....	22
IV. Language.....	23
V. Training.....	24
APPENDICES.....	25
Appendix I: Recommendations of the 1st Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Youth.....	25
Appendix II: Final Text of the 2nd Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Youth.....	26
Appendix III: Questionnaires Received.....	27

## PREFACE

This report presents a survey of the most relevant barriers to youth mobility that can be dealt with by way of intergovernmental cooperation within the Council of Europe.

The report is based on some twenty interviews, questionnaires sent out to some forty selected organisations and all governments involved, some studies on youth mobility,<sup>1</sup> other written information material supplied by various sources, and the author's twelve years of experience with youth exchange within the European Federation for Intercultural Learning.

The author would like to express his gratitude to all who have contributed to this report by taking their time for the interviews or for filling out the questionnaire or by supplying other information and advice.

---

<sup>1</sup> *A.M. Vangansbeke*, Research on CC-EYE members and their European youth exchange programmes (1986), published by the Coordination Committee for European Youth Exchange; *A. La Rooy*, Legal and administrative barriers to youth exchange in the European Community (1986), published by the EC; National Youth Council of Ireland: Youth Exchanges Report, prepared by *Louise Bradley* (1985); Samradet for ungdomsudv eksling (SAFU), Denmark: Exchange-Education; *Etienne Grosjean*, Youth Mobility: An Investment for Europe, Council of Europe (1985); European Federation for Intercultural Learning: Youth Mobility and Education (1981); Youth Forum of the European Communities: Youth Exchanges and the European Communities: Experience and Perspectives (1982); European Parliament: Report drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport on youth activities, Rapporteur: *M.-J. Pruvot*, (1981); Draft Report on a European Community programme to promote youth exchanges, Rapporteur: *R. Bocklet*, Document (1983); Draft Report on youth service scheme, Rapporteur: *Mr. Hutton*; Agreement on International Youth Exchanges, prepared by the National Swedish Board for Consumer Policies (1986); *M. Roncoroni*, Rechtliche Voraussetzungen von Einreise und Aufenthalt ausl andischer Austauschjugendlicher, and *Gerhard Hauser-Sch onb achler*, Stipendien im Jugendaustausch?, both yet to be published by the Bundesamt f ur Kulturpflege (CH).

# INTRODUCTION

Both Conferences of European Ministers Responsible for Youth have passed several recommendations demanding the removal of barriers to youth mobility.<sup>2</sup> The former Ad Hoc Committee of Experts on Youth Questions, now European Steering Committee for Intergovernmental Co-operation in the Youth Field, has been instructed by the Committee of Ministers to follow up on these recommendations and submit specific proposals for their implementation.

This report has been prepared at the request of the Secretariat of the Council of Europe for the European Steering Committee for Intergovernmental Co-operation in the Youth Field and, in specific, for its Committee of experts on barriers to youth mobility as a working tool and discussion base.

## I. A EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON YOUTH MOBILITY

As main element of intergovernmental co-operation in this field, this report suggests the elaboration of a European Convention on Youth Mobility.

### A. Why Youth Mobility?

Youth mobility is generally recognised as valuable and needs no further justification. It is an individual and a social necessity. The effects of youth mobility are only insufficiently described as expansion of the horizon, revision of stereotypes, and increase of tolerance. It is the best and easiest way to acquire not only language, but also intercultural skills, which help the individual to cope with multicultural situations. Society needs persons who are able to tune in with people from a different background for purposes as different as economic and political relations or coping with ethnic problems.

Youth mobility also increases the awareness of the own and of the common European culture.

### B. Existing Barriers

Even at the age of mass tourism, youth mobility is connected with considerable difficulties. True, millions of young Europeans go abroad each year for a variety of reasons. But even for the most common type of youth mobility - vacations abroad - hurdles exist which are too high to pass for some and obstruct many others. Visas may be required and costly or difficult to obtain, passports are expensive to get, medical insurance will not cover the stay abroad, etc.

Young Europeans seeking to receive part of their education abroad will encounter additional problems and may discover that it is not easy to move freely in Western Europe. Bad enough that foreign school and university diplomas are usually not recognized and no credit is given at home for the time abroad. But even obtaining a visa within the EC for longer than three months may be quite a problem and subject to fees at the moment - before 1992, freedom of movement within the EC only exists for persons seeking employment!

<sup>2</sup> See appendices I and II.

In spite of these hardships, it is only the organisers of youth exchanges who get to taste the full variety of rules and regulations impeding youth mobility: Teachers that won't obtain an educational leave for a self-organised class exchange activity, youth exchange organisations that receive little or no public support for their educational activities, or, by means of support schemes, are forced to exchange accurately reciprocal in numbers (if one participant falls ill, another one can't go). Visas applied for long time ahead are only obtained after the programme has started, school-based exchange programmes are hampered with stiff language skill requirements and tuition fees. In one spectacular case, a year-programme school exchange student, after having returned home from Mexico, received unpleasant mail from his local revenue office: Food and lodging provided by his host family in this country had been regarded as taxable income...

### C. Need for Intergovernmental Co-operation

Many of these problems could be resolved by a joint effort of the member states. The majority of these obstacles could be removed with little or no financial implications. Many will not even be politically difficult or controversial. Some of these problems occur simply because nobody ever thought that a certain situation could arise. This is in particular true for the problem of visa for voluntary workers that is listed below as barrier 7.

In most cases, existing barriers are not a result of bad political will but rather stem from the rigid application of rules provided for a different purpose. Current regulations on visa and residence permits are often drafted in fear of rising xenophobia and illegal migration, and therefore do not reflect or consider the need for youth mobility, which can an effective tool against xenophobia and does not follow migration patterns.

The matter, international by nature, cannot be left to domestic policy alone. Member states will be more easily ready to remove existing barriers if this happens on a mutual basis. It is more convincing for a country to facilitate the situation of young foreigners if it can be sure that the own young citizen staying abroad will profit in a similar way.

### D. Why a Convention?

There has been no lack of declarations of good intent, but they rarely seem to trickle down to the minds of school headmasters or custom officials. Without doubting its sincerity, it should be noted that although the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the amendments made in Madrid - *soft law* and therefore not binding - contain a number of provisions endorsing youth mobility and youth exchange, little has changed. Without a convention, the recommendations passed by both Conferences of European Ministers Responsible for Youth might have a similar fate.

### E. What to Look For

This report uses a rather broad definition of youth mobility, as outlined below. This entails that the report deals with very different situations. Most of them are at least vaguely related to education, but content and value differ greatly from type to type.

The report is based on the assumption that youth mobility is in itself positive. This does not mean, however, that every stay abroad is always a positive experience. It can be a superficial change of the surrounding without long-term effects. It can be worse: Studies have shown that short-term, badly prepared encounters of persons of a different cultural background may lead to a reinforcement of stereotypes. If things come to the worst, it may turn out to be what the author likes to call an *intercultural catastrophe*. Nevertheless, the general positive approach seems to be justified. This implies that barriers should be removed if there is no other reason why they should be upheld.

In several areas, there will be a conflict between youth mobility and other political interests. The author can only suggest guidelines for solving these conflicts. These conflicts also make it necessary to distinguish more between different types of youth mobility according to their educational value. This is in itself a political question, and again the author runs danger of suggesting criteria that prove to be controversial in the end. This is an inevitable fate the author is quite willing to accept.

The same criteria should also be applied in deciding which types of youth mobility are most worth of public financial support, an area to be discussed later on in this report.

The criteria outlined below are based on the assumption that it is basically *intercultural learning* that makes youth mobility so desirable.<sup>3</sup> This does not deny that acquiring factual knowledge about another country and language skills are other important aspects.

Intercultural learning involves the meeting of different sets of values and rules. According to recent studies, it occurs more by crisis than by harmony, and more by affective than by cognitive learning: It involves often more the belly than the brain.

This type of experience requires time. One evident, but not sufficient criterion is therefore the *duration* of the sojourn abroad. A normal first reaction to other sets of values and rules is trying to ignore them as long as it is possible<sup>4</sup> and to resort to a superficial "Why, they are just like people back home" type of reaction<sup>5</sup> - or to the opposite: "They are all ...". The shorter the stay abroad, the more complementary measures must be taken to avoid this. It is difficult to draw a dividing line time-wise between sojourns worth of preference treatments and, possibly, financial support. One very general rule might be that short-term stays need additional guidance and measures ensuring involvement in the host community. Stays of less than three months might be considered short-term sojourns for this purpose.

Another important criterion is the *level of involvement in the host community*. Living under the same roof with locals, especially a homestay (staying with a family), is one way to increase this level. Others are joint work or studies with locals. It should be noted at this point that individual mobility usually reaches a higher level of involvement than group mobility. All these are of course factors to be considered in the context of the whole sojourn. The lack of one or several of these factors does not imply that a certain type of mobility should not be

<sup>3</sup> The Final Text of the 2nd Conference of Ministers, 2.2, 2nd paragraph, 6th sub-section, notes the advantages of intercultural learning in international work. (See Appendix II.)

<sup>4</sup> See Edward T. Hall, *Beyond Culture*, New York 1976, p. 46

<sup>5</sup> Hall p.63

considered a valuable educational experience. This would, however, require at least one feature of interaction with locals throughout the programme.

The next main criterion is the *guidance* and counselling the young person going abroad receives. A complete programme would cover the following points for the participant: Orientation a few weeks and immediately before departure, orientation immediately after arrival, consultation during the stay abroad, opportunity for exchange of experience with other persons in a similar situation during the stay, ongoing evaluation during the stay, and re-orientation after returning home. Similar, though less intensive measures would be taken for the immediate surrounding of the young person at home (his family) and abroad (host family or other persons living together with this person). There are several youth exchange programmes that offer such an intensive guidance. Pre-departure orientation, counselling during the stay and re-orientation after it can be considered as basic standard.

A criterion that is more difficult to describe and impossible to measure is the *level of affective involvement* reached by the person going abroad and his surrounding. This factor shows links to the other ones given above. Without affective involvement, intercultural learning is extremely difficult to achieve. Others have put this into simpler words: "*Love is the key to knowledge*".

#### F. What to Avoid

The last few paragraphs already give some clues. One thing to avoid is the temptation to go for numbers and not for content.<sup>6</sup> It is understandable from a human point that having exchanged twenty young persons without guidance support for one week is cheap and scores twenty points in the statistics, while having exchanged one person for one year with complete personal guiding will only give one. If one needs to resort to statistics, the author would like to suggest to count in exchange weeks rather than in persons exchanged.<sup>7</sup>

There is another, more threatening danger: Youth mobility may become a luxury available only to the affluent and well-educated youth. There is a number of factors that favour those already favoured in other ways. One is that less educated young persons start to work earlier. The job that gives them bread also ties them. Short of vacations abroad, little mobility is available to young workers. There are some young workers exchange programmes who try to overcome this barrier, but they are cost-intensive and few compared to other types of youth mobility.

One might mention next the limited mobility of receivers of unemployment and social welfare benefits, a problem that will be dealt with below in more detail.

Another very important factor is the cost of youth mobility, which will also be treated in a section of its own later on.

<sup>6</sup> The Final Text of the 2nd Conference of Ministers, 2.2, 2nd paragraph, 4th subsection, stresses the importance of improving the educational quality of youth exchange programmes. (See Appendix II.)

<sup>7</sup> This approach has also been used by A.M. Vangansbeke p. 105. It seems noteworthy that there are national branches of European youth organisations who have been reported to exceed the Franco-German Youth Office in the number of exchange weeks they organise annually.

The situation calls for an overall assessment and a decision, to what extent preference treatments should be envisaged for those who traditionally have less access to mobility.

Recommendation 31 of the 1st Conference of ministers recommends specific assistance in the area of youth exchanges for those young people who are most deprived<sup>9</sup>

## II. SOME DEFINITIONS

### A. Mobility

The term *mobility* is used here in the meaning of a sojourn abroad, thereby excluding permanent residence in another country (migration) and domestic sojourns. It is not limited to member countries of the Council of Europe or of the Steering Committee, but also deals with member country youth going to non-member countries and vice-versa, including in specific Eastern Europe. This view is supported by recommendation 29 of the 1st Conference of Ministers and the Final Text of the 2nd Conference, 2.2, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sub-section.

This report embraces on all types of youth mobility. It includes individual and organised travel abroad without regard to its purpose (e.g. school and university education, paid work, voluntary work, intercultural learning or simply recreation). It may in part give the impression that it focusses on youth exchange. This is, however, only insofar true as it reflects the regrettable fact that a stay abroad that is better organised and more valuable by educational and intercultural content will also encounter more intricate and more difficult obstacles.

### B. Barriers

Barriers to youth mobility are in part of legal and administrative nature, but other obstacles exist as well, notably financial, cultural and linguistic barriers as well as lack of information and training. This report is not limited to legal and administrative obstacles, but includes other barriers only where intergovernmental co-operation is feasible.

### C. Youth

No definition of youth will be given in this report. The question of age limits can be solved subject-wise (e.g. parental custody on the one hand, university students on the other) or might else be left to domestic policy. It should be noted, however, that the age of majority (18 years in most countries) would in most cases not be a suitable criterion.

---

<sup>9</sup> See Appendix I.

D. Youth Exchange Programmes of a Certain Standard

This admittedly uncouth expression will be used below several times when preference treatments seem necessary and justified for some youth exchange programmes which are especially valuable according to the criteria which have been given above under the heading *I.E. What to look for*. To repeat the suggested criteria briefly, this concerns youth exchange programmes that offer

- at least one feature of interaction with locals throughout the programme and
- guidance that involves at least some pre-departure orientation, counselling during the stay and re-orientation after it.
- Stays of less than three months need at least one more feature of interaction with locals and additional guidance.

An additional worthwhile criterion might be that the programme is carried out by other young persons, i.e. youth organisations or other less traditional forms of associated youth. This will not necessarily add to the intercultural learning experience, but it may be considered as a value in itself if programmes for youth are run by youth. This suggestion is supported by the Final Text of the 2nd Conference of Ministers, 2.2, 2nd paragraph, 3rd sub-section, and by recommendation 30 of the 1st Conference.<sup>9</sup>

E. Other Educational Activities Abroad of a Certain Standard

This expression is used below several times to distinguish activities which do not offer the points mentioned above, but are highly educational for another reason: The main purpose of the sojourn is attending an educational institution abroad - school, university, vocational training institute, etc., be it on one's own, be it as participant in a programme. One could think about using a given minimum number of hours of attendance scheduled per week as additional criterion.

---

<sup>9</sup> See Appendices I and II.

## BARRIERS IDENTIFIED

Fourty barriers have been identified so far and are listed below. Some indicate very general and broad problem areas, where solutions may be difficult and further research necessary, or where no tangible recommendation can be made at this time. Others are highly specific and only concern but one aspect or form of youth mobility.

They have been classified not by the type of youth mobility they affect - as has been done in the questionnaire -, but rather by their source, since this leaves matters in their context that need to be regulated together .

### I. LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS

Although other barriers may be at least as impeding, these are usually the most tangible ones and the largest by number.

#### A. Visa and Residence Permit

For a stay of up to three months without work experience, most member states do not require a visa or residence permit for citizen of most member states. Several exceptions exist, however, some of which are well known. For a stay of more than three months, visa or at least residence permit are generally required for all foreigners. This applies even to travel within EC countries. For EC citizen working in another EC country, obtaining a residence permit is a mere formality. This is not the case for any sojourn with a different purpose. Two member countries are not yet fully operational in the EC labour market.

#### **Barrier 1: Visa required for stay of less than three months**

**SCOPE:** Although this problem is limited to a few countries within member states, it is generally regarded as a major problem.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Members states could agree not to require visa for a stay of less than three months for young citizen of another member state. Giving regard to the politically sensitive nature of the subject, however, it remains doubtful whether intergovernmental co-operation can be successful at this time.

#### **Barrier 2: Fee is charged for leaving the country**

**SCOPE:** Limited to two countries. One generally charges a tax, the other - an island republic - an excise duty on all sea and air travel. It is regarded as a major problem by youth organisations in these countries and by some international organisations. Others are generally not aware of this problem.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree not to introduce new or additional measures in this field nor increase the fees being charged. More generous exemptions for young persons travelling abroad could be agreed upon.

### Barrier 3: Visa and residence permit fees

**SCOPE:** Fees are generally charged for the issue of a visa or a residence permit. Some countries provide exemptions for participants in secondary school exchanges, but rarely for voluntary work exchanges of a similar type.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree not to charge fees for visa and residence permits from young persons involved in educational activities abroad of a certain standard. A more generous regulation would exempt all young persons from paying such fees.

### Barrier 4: Lengthy administrative procedures

**SCOPE:** This applies to many countries, but concerns mainly visa and residence permits for more than three months. Organisers of youth exchanges complain that often their programme has started before the visa is granted. Length of procedure depends sometimes on country of origin of the applicant. Sometimes the procedure itself is complicated, e.g. written consent of hosting community is required prior to issue of visa through the consulate in the home country of the applicant.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Difficult to tackle by means of intergovernmental co-operation and law. Member states could, however, agree to allow their consulates and embassies abroad to grant entry visas without additional consultation with other authorities at least for participants in youth exchange programmes of a certain standard. In the case of young persons attending educational institutions (such as schools and universities), consent of this institution should be sufficient.

### Barrier 5: Proof of funds and securities required

**SCOPE:** This problem concerns individual and organised, short and long sojourns abroad. It can be limited to the requirement that visa are only issued if travel back is assured, but it can also mean that entry is refused if, on top of travel back, funds to cover the stay, medical insurance, etc., unlimited security by a national for all possible costs is demanded. This concerns various countries. The author has witnessed a case where the authority refused to issue a visa, after the person required to provide security had disclosed her possessions to be around FF 10.000, although the applicant had delivered proof of sufficient funds to cover all the potential costs connected with his stay.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree that concerning young persons

a) proof of funds should only be required as a part of the visa procedure, but not on the border when no visa is required for entry.

b) security by a national - especially unlimited, but also security for high amounts - should never be required unless the visa applicant cannot proof possession of sufficient funds himself.

c) especially, no such requirements should be made for participants in youth exchange programmes of a certain standard.

**EXPLANATION:** It is obviously against the public interest to have foreigners coming in that cannot cover their own stay and travel. This concerns mostly potential migrants. But in most other cases, the requirement of proofs and securities is not adequate to the situation, causes unnecessary problems and constitutes a considerable barrier to youth mobility.

a) Refusing entry to a young person that has already spent considerable amounts of money in travel, trusting the fact that no visa is required for entry, is a harsh and usually unnecessary measure. Abuse will be limited to very rare cases.

b) When the applicant himself proofs possession of sufficient funds, no security is needed. On the other hand, the demand of securities is a considerable disincentive for cross-border friendship, interaction and mobility. Most young persons will not even be able to give security for the amount required.

c) There has never been a single reported case of a participant in such an exchange being left without funds. Such a requirement is therefore absolutely unnecessary and only impeding.

**Barrier 6: Residence permit is limited to one community or region**

**SCOPE:** Concerns most likely only two countries and only stays longer than three months. It is considered somewhat impeding by organisers of youth exchanges for two reasons: In programmes involving a homestay, a change of the host family may be necessary after some time, and a family suited to the participant cannot always be found on the spot. Also, this regulation excludes programmes making use of the cultural richness and variety of one country by moving the participant around.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree not to limit the residence permit to a certain place or region, at least when participants in youth exchange programmes of a certain standard are concerned.

**REMARK:** Article 2 section 1 of the Fourth Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights states: "Everyone lawfully within the territory of a State shall, within that territory, have the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence."

**Barrier 7: No special visa or residence permit for voluntary work**

**SCOPE:** Concerns most countries. Does not create problems for stays of up to three months. Voluntary work is often not covered by a tourist visa, but there has been no reported case of ensuing difficulties. A major problem for stays longer than three months, where fees may be charged for the residence permit even within the EC. Organisers have complained that these cases require administrative procedures of incredible length and difficulty simply because this case is not foreseen in visa

and residence permit regulations. Remarkably enough, Canada (Québec) seems to have such a special residence permit for voluntary work.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree to introduce such a visa or residence permit or simplify their procedures in another way, and not to charge fees for such permits (see above, barrier 3).

**Barrier 8: No work permit/residence permit for paid work is given**

**SCOPE:** Concerns all countries. In the interviews and replies to the questionnaire, nearly everybody involved - youth organisations, institutions and governments - considered this to be a major problem. Not a problem within the EC - still excluding two countries - and within the Nordic Council.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member countries could agree to grant work permits/residence permits for work experience for participants in young workers exchange programmes of a certain standard.

**EXPLANATION:** Young workers exchanges provide intercultural learning experiences to young persons who are otherwise excluded from long-term youth mobility. Without these exchanges, youth mobility again runs danger of being a luxury of the affluent or well-educated youth. Young workers exchanges do not follow traditional migration patterns and are on an overall calculation neutral to the employment situation.

**Barrier 9: Transit visas are difficult to obtain**

**SCOPE:** A problem of concern mainly for persons travelling to small and peripheral countries and organisers in these countries.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Similar situation as in Barrier 1. Difficult to come up with suggestions that are more than a declaration of good will.

**Barrier 10: Non-national residents face difficulties in re-entering after staying abroad for a certain time**

**SCOPE:** A problem that seems to be known in several countries but that has not incited any additional comments in the questionnaire.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree that non-nationals lawfully residing in their countries shall not lose their residence permit simply for going abroad on a youth exchange programme or other educational activity abroad of a certain standard.

**REMARK:** Recommendation 31 of the 1st Conference of Ministers calls for participation by young migrants in all activities which concern them.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix 1.

### B. Passports

A Council of Europe convention has enabled the citizen of most member countries to travel within these countries without a passport, i.e. using an ID-card. Passports are, however, usually necessary for longer stays and travel to other countries.

#### Barrier 11: Passport fees are high

**SCOPE:** While in some countries passports are relatively cheap to obtain, a number of member countries charges around the equivalent of 350 FF for a full passport. Replies given in interviews and questionnaires allow the conclusion that all concerned consider this sum a considerable disincentive. Many would rather use the word "prohibitive".

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree not to charge any fee for the first full passport, or to charge a fee that is considerably lower than the one indicated above. Issuing a passport with a shorter validity but at the same *pro rata* price does not offer a solution.

### C. Schools and Universities<sup>1 1</sup>

Educational institutions are of special importance when dealing with youth mobility for a number of reasons. For one, unlike most other areas treated in this report, education is a domain of youth with adult education being the exception to the rule. For another, there is a considerable public awareness of the need for more mobility in this field, while at the same time the general trend seems to be staying at home. It has been deplored that mobility amongst university students was considerably higher at the times of Erasmus of Rotterdam. Last but not least, there are some member countries where university education can only be obtained abroad, i.e. where barriers to student mobility concern every single student.

#### Barrier 12: Lack of recognition of school and university diplomas

**SCOPE:** Concerns all countries and most types of education. Two Council of Europe Conventions exist in this field. The situation is not so bad as far as secondary school diplomas are concerned. Vocational and professional education is the main problem. Some improvements are foreseen within the EC.

**RECOMMENDATION:** This matter might prove to be too complicated and time consuming for a convention on youth mobility. It should probably be dealt with in a different convention, possibly by enlarging the existing one.

<sup>1 1</sup> The term *university* as used in this report is meant to include other institutes of higher education as well.

**Barrier 13: No credit given for the time studying abroad**

**SCOPE:** This is probably the strongest disincentive for students planning to go abroad. It concerns schools and universities. Scholarships usually only cover the extra costs above the normal ones, implying that the student or his parents have to find their own resources for the additional time of studies and entailing the danger that studying abroad tends to be a luxury only the affluent can afford. Also one of the reasons why in some countries the average years of study increase. The EC's ERASMUS takes this problem into account.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Even more difficult than the barrier mentioned above, since detailed rules would be necessary as to what activity abroad will give credit for what subject. Nevertheless a very urgent problem. Should also probably be dealt with in a separate convention.

**Barrier 14: Entrance examinations required on the spot months before courses start**

**SCOPE:** This problem has been reported only for one country. It has been considered as extremely impeding. The additional travel costs seem to be prohibitive for less affluent students. In other countries, entrance examinations can either be taken in the home country or after an orientation period preceding the course.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree on the latter procedure.

**Barrier 15: Place in school or university is difficult to find**

**SCOPE:** Usually not a major problem for university students as soon as the problems of recognition, credit and finances are solved. This concerns mainly secondary schools, where participants in year-long exchanges dominate. Concerns only some countries, but seems to be quite a problem there. Used to be a problem in others, which ended after the baby boomers had left school.

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is difficult to envisage a solution. Declarations of intent and *soft law* will most likely not trickle down to headmasters and other officials. The introduction of a right of foreign youth to attend secondary schools seems far-fetched. Co-operation is feasible as far as secondary school exchanges are concerned, possibly by reserving a small minimum quota of the total places available (possibly around 0,1 %) for this type of youth mobility.

**Barrier 16: Complicated inscription procedure**

**SCOPE:** This concerns mainly universities. The situation seems to vary greatly from country to country and within countries. Application is often required one year before the academic year starts. Lack of co-ordination with visa and residence permit requirements will sometimes lead to grotesque situations: Visas granting entry and residence permit are only issued by the host country's consulate in the

student's country of origin after presentation of written confirmation issued by the university in question. While the visa procedure takes quite some time, the university requires inscription on the spot and in person seven days after the student receives the confirmation. Students trying to avoid this *Catch 22* situation by entering the host country with a tourist visa are actually forced to go back to their country of origin.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree to simplify their inscription procedure and to harmonise inscription and immigration requirements. It is difficult to formulate more concrete proposals without having the precise current regulations at hand.

#### Barrier 17: Tuition fees

**SCOPE:** Concerns several countries and secondary schools as well as universities. As long as foreigners have to pay the same fee as residents (which is not the case in at least one country, where foreigners have to pay more), this seems only fair. University students can often obtain scholarships covering the fees. It remains a considerable problem within a few countries for secondary school exchange programmes. Since these occur on a multilateral basis, one can question the justification of charging foreigners while the own citizen receive free education abroad. It adds to the considerable fees the organisers have to charge already. It can also lead to another problem: Since most organisers do charge the same fee within one country for most destinations for reasons of simplification and equal treatment, the peculiar situation occurs that student A from country X going to country Y pays part of the tuition fees for student B going to country Z.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree not to charge tuition fees for their public schools from secondary school students participating in a youth exchange programme of a certain standard. They could also agree not to charge higher fees for foreign students.

#### Barrier 18: Proof of language skill required

**SCOPE:** Generally not a problem for "normal" students who study mainly in order to increase their factual knowledge, since without language skills they would profit little from the experience. It can be an obstacle for participants in secondary school exchange programmes where the school visit is mainly perceived as an intercultural enrichment of the programme and where no credit or diploma is foreseen anyway. Can limit severely the number of students that can be sent to a certain country or require additional and costly language courses. If similar rules would exist overseas, hardly any student could be sent to countries like Japan. This problem seems to exist only in a few countries.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree not to require proof of language skills from participants in secondary school exchange programmes of a certain standard or else offer financial assistance for language courses in these cases.

D. Conscripts and Conscientious Objectors**Barrier 19: Limited Mobility of Conscripts and Conscientious Objectors**

**SCOPE:** Restrictions vary greatly. In one country, males above 25 years of age that are registered for service will not get a passport before they have started with it. In some countries, obtaining a permission to leave the country e.g. for vacations is difficult, while others require a mere notice. Conscripts and Conscientious objectors are often granted only two weeks of holiday per year or less. Conscientious objectors, as a rule, may not serve abroad. There are few exceptions. Restrictions are considered as impeding by youth organisations benefitting from the service of conscientious objectors, who encounter great difficulties in co-ordinating international meetings and youth exchange due to their limited mobility.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree to loosen restrictions on conscientious objectors and conscripts and simplify the permission procedures. Details will most likely be controversial.

E. Receivers of Unemployment and Social Welfare Benefits**Barrier 20: Limited Mobility of Receivers of Unemployment and Social Welfare Benefits**

**SCOPE:** Young unemployed constitute a group of disfavoured young persons confronted with extreme barriers to mobility in a number of states. Availability on the job market is generally a requirement for receiving benefits. Generally this implies reporting to the agency granting the benefits within given intervals. While in some states procedures are rather generous, allowing for a few weeks of "holiday" each year, etc., some states are very strict and practically nail the young unemployed person to his or her town of residence. This may even prevent participation in the EC's young workers programme.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree on longer reporting intervals and a period of holiday each year. At least exemptions should be provided for participants in youth exchange programmes of a certain standard.

**EXPLANATION:** While it would not be reasonable or even desirable to continue paying unemployment benefits to young persons going abroad in general without regard to length and purpose of their sojourn, it is perfectly reasonable to expect that unemployed young persons participating in an educational exchange programme that will increase their intercultural and language skills (and thus their chance on the job market) should not lose their unemployment or social welfare benefits for their time abroad. This is another example where the danger exists that youth mobility becomes a luxury of the affluent and well-educated.

**REMARK:** Art. 7 sec. 2 (b) of the Decision 88/348/EEC of the EC's Council of Ministers dated 16 June 1988 (Nr. L 158/42) introducing the "Youth for Europe" programme, calls its member states for such regulations within this programme.

F. Continuation of Rights in Paid Work Exchanges

**Barrier 21: Continuation of rights in paid work exchanges is not secured for the time of intercultural and language training**

**SCOPE:** Specific problem of paid work exchanges. The training time preceding the work experience is often not counted as working time for social and disability insurances.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree to count this training time as working time for the purpose mentioned.

**REMARK:** Art. 7 sec. 2 (b) of the Decision 88/348/EEC of the EC's Council of Ministers dated 16 June 1988 (Nr. L 158/42) introducing the "Youth for Europe" programme, calls its member states for such regulations within this programme.

G. Educational Leave

**Barrier 22: Educational leave is not granted or difficult to obtain**

**SCOPE:** This problem concerns mainly teachers organising short-term exchanges for their own classes, but also participants in short-term professional exchanges. Regulations and their application vary greatly from country to country and also within countries. Sometimes no educational leave is granted at all. Sometimes application straight to the ministry and six months ahead of time is required.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree at least on simpler and less time-consuming procedures for civil servants. It might be difficult for member states to agree on more generous rules since this also concerns private employers and hence a revision of labour laws and conditions.

H. Medical Insurance

**Barrier 23: Medical insurance does not cover stay abroad**

**SCOPE:** Most answers to the questionnaire indicate that this is not a major problem for short-term stays abroad. Besides medium and long-term stays, areas of specific concern are: Disabled youth, coverage for mental illness, and conscientious objectors and conscripts, who in some countries lose their coverage on crossing the border. Within the EC, the E 111 form has resolved most problems. Some countries grant free medical insurance abroad within Europe for two months or so. Remarkably enough, in Québec a general insurance scheme covers all citizen abroad.

**RECOMMENDATION:** No drastic change of the insurance system would be needed for expanding the existing insurance to a stay abroad, as practised in many states.

Member states could use the positive experience made with the E 111 form. If such an achievement can be made, it would, however, not seem reasonable to limit this to young persons. Medical coverage abroad might be facilitated for young persons by making it part of the European youth card that is currently being discussed.

### I. Income Tax and Child Allowance

#### **Barrier 24: No tax deductions available for maintenance costs**

**SCOPE:** This concerns mainly long-term exchanges involving voluntary work or school attendance, which usually include a homestay. Natural parents have in some cases difficulties in receiving tax deductions for the programme fees they have paid. Host parents, who are usually not paid for food, lodging, etc., are usually not entitled to tax deductions for these maintenance costs.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree to consider programme fees spent by parents on youth exchange programmes of a certain standard as costs for maintenance and/or education of the child and grant tax deductibility. Host families could be allowed tax deductions for maintenance costs spent on the young person participating in such a programme.

#### **Barrier 25: Food and lodging received regarded as taxable income**

**SCOPE:** Cases have occurred where participants in exchange programmes involving a family stay abroad have later been required by the tax authorities in their own country to pay income tax for food and lodging provided by their host family. This seems to happen very rarely, though. Similar tax provisions have been reported to block some long-term volunteer work projects.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree not to regard food, lodging and similar services received within a youth exchange programme of a certain standard as taxable income.

#### **Barrier 26: Lost child allowance**

**SCOPE:** This concerns again mainly long-term exchanges involving voluntary work or school attendance, but may also apply to parents of children studying abroad on their own. While often child allowance will also be granted for the time abroad, in some countries or regions these are lost if the child stays abroad for a longer time, e.g. more than four months. It should be noted that the opposite never occurs, i.e. host parents being entitled to child allowance for their guest.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Members could agree that child allowance will not be discontinued during youth exchange programmes or other educational activities abroad of a certain standard as long as the other requirements are still met.

**EXPLANATION:** Youth mobility often implies a considerable financial burden for the participant and/or his/her family. It is therefore not reasonable and comes close to

a windfall profit for the public if child allowance is discontinued during such a sojourn.

### J. Minority and Parental Custody

Numerous minors go abroad each year, many for as long as a year involving a family stay, others in organised vacation camps or on their own. During that time, parents are not at hand to decide for and represent their child. Nevertheless, this is an area where relatively few problems seem to exist, contrary to what one could believe giving regard to the somewhat difficult legal situation.

#### **Barrier 27: Issue of passport requires consent of both parents**

**SCOPE:** Concerns (at least) one country and can be a problem especially in cases of separation and divorce. Consent of the other parent can only be replaced by a court order.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Some additional research would be necessary whether this or similar problem(s) exist also in other member states. If not, this might be left to domestic policy.

### K. Liability of Organisers

#### **Barrier 28: Liability of organisers is an area of considerable uncertainty**

**SCOPE:** Seems to be a major problem in most countries. This includes contractual and tortious liability towards participants, parents, host families and third parties. No statute law seems to exist at all with special provisions for youth exchange. Existing provisions for contracts involving a sojourn are usually geared to profit-making travel agencies. The uncertainty entails that liability insurance is difficult to obtain. In some countries, regulations contracted by national consumer boards offer some guidance.

**RECOMMENDATION:** An area which should not simply be put aside. Suggesting concrete regulations would, however, require additional research.

## II. FINANCIAL BARRIERS AND PUBLIC FINANCIAL SUPPORT

To say that youth mobility costs money is only stating the obvious, and it goes without saying that not every kind of youth mobility can be subsidised by governments. Several barriers with financial implications have been mentioned above, and their removal would also ease the financial burden of young persons wishing to go abroad without having to introduce schemes for financial support. As outlined above, youth mobility can simply mean vacations abroad, but there also

exist a number of fascinating and enriching educational types worth and in need of financial assistance.

These tend to be rather costly for reasons given above, but also because - compared to most other education - very little public financial support exists. Many youth organisations try to involve disfavoured and relatively poor young persons by offering them reduced rates, but are forced to do so at the expense of other participants who have then to pay even higher fees.

In light of this fact it seems remarkable that if a special political interest exists, governments may be ready to pay the whole cost of a large programme without asking participants even for a nominal contribution: One member country has introduced some five years ago a secondary school exchange scheme with the United States sponsored by its parliament and the U.S. Congress with all expenses paid, which is mainly carried out by youth organisations. Apart from the involvement of the parliaments, these organisations have run the very same exchanges for decades and still do so without any public financial assistance worth mentioning.

Some of the interviewed persons have complained bitterly about what they call a nationalistic approach sometimes taken by some governments, which seems regrettable in an area that is in its nature transnational. The attitude that youth exchange is basically a means of promotion of the own culture is often reflected in the requirements and regulations relating to such subsidies.

#### Barrier 29: Cost of youth mobility in general

**SCOPE:** Apart from barriers with financial implications mentioned above, one financial barrier concerning youth mobility in general is travel cost. *Interrail* and *BIGE* train tickets have already helped to reduce the cost of vacations abroad. Some countries have started to make certain youth rates available to youth from neighbouring countries.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could extend existing reduced youth rates for public transport to foreign youth, possibly by making use of the youth card that is currently being discussed.

#### Barrier 30: Cost of studying abroad

**SCOPE:** This is the type of youth mobility that has received most of the financial support given by governments. There is a large variety of scholarships and grants in many countries. They do not always meet the demand. The EC has just introduced the ERASMUS and COMMETT programmes, which is, however, limited to the EC member countries.

The most serious financial barrier impeding studies abroad has been mentioned above as barrier 13.

**RECOMMENDATION:** ERASMUS and COMMETT should be enlarged and include non-EC members as well.

**Barrier 31: Cost of youth exchanges and lack of public financial support**

**SCOPE:** One of the most impeding barriers to this type of youth mobility where even recognised and well-established programmes have experienced tremendous problems over the last years. Especially the proper training and preparation of participants, hosting community and host family (if involving a homestay), language training and the additional activities that enrich and facilitate the intercultural learning process make youth exchanges a highly cost-intensive operation, where savings could hardly be made without endangering the success.

The EC has now finally decided on an action programme for the promotion of youth exchange (Youth for Europe), which is, however, limited to EC member countries at the moment.

A number of persons interviewed have complained in their interviews and replies that governments prefer to support extremely short programmes (1 - 3 weeks). One could take it from the answers that the better a programme is in content, the less likely is public financial assistance. Quote: "Government emphasis is on numbers, NOT quality."

**RECOMMENDATION:** The programme should be enlarged and include non-EC member states as well. More assistance should go to long-term projects where - apart from a few young workers' programmes sponsored by the EC - very little public financial support exists so far.

**REMARK:** Recommendation 31 of the 1st Conference of Ministers recommends the promotion of a wide-ranging youth exchange programme encompassing bilateral and multilateral schemes in liaison with the EC.<sup>1 2</sup>

**Barrier 32: Existing support schemes don't recognise infrastructural and office costs**

**SCOPE:** Most replies have expressed great concern for this problem. There seem to exist a number of governmental exchange schemes which employ youth organisations or other organisers to run the actual exchange, but then only pay the so-called direct cost, i.e. travel, food, insurance, etc. The costs of the organisers - wages, rents, maintenance of volunteer structure including training of volunteers - are not refunded or even considered in the calculation. Since few other resources are available, some organisers see no other solution but to cheat themselves by charging these costs to other programmes they offer.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree that the so-called indirect costs should be included in every budget in schemes involving youth exchange. This does not imply that every scheme must pay 100 % of the cost, of course, but it should always be made clear what types of expenses occur and who should pay for it. For instance, the governmental scheme could provide all "direct" cost, while participants pay a fee covering the "indirect" costs (although it would seem more convincing the other way around).

<sup>1 2</sup> See Appendix I.

**Barrier 33: Support schemes don't recognise additional costs for young handicapped**

**SCOPE:** This is certainly not the biggest obstacle to the mobility of young handicapped, but nevertheless a very serious one. The youth organisation specialised in this field, Mobility International, notes that matters are improving.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree to grant the assistance they normally give to their disabled citizen also to foreign participants in youth exchange programmes of a certain standard during their stay in this country. They could also agree to recognise the additional costs needed for young handicapped in existing and future support schemes.

**REMARK:** These recommendations are supported by the Final Text of the 2nd Conference of Ministers, 2.2, 2nd paragraph, 4th and 5th sub-section.<sup>13</sup>

**Barrier 34: Support schemes demand reciprocity in numbers**

**SCOPE:** This concerns some schemes based on bilateral cultural agreements. Such reciprocity clauses have been included, as it seems, for reasons of balance and fear of paying for the person with the wrong passport. This has led to serious complaints on the ground that these clauses don't consider the reality of organisers, who can run into incredible problems with this seemingly harmless requirement. Finding participants and - where applicable - host families suited for the programme will not be equally easy or difficult in both countries. With the reciprocity clause, the lowest number of the four (2 x participants, 2 x host families) will decide the scope of the programme. Everything in the planning process depends on this number which is not known before every single participant and every single host family has been confirmed.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree to handle existing reciprocity clauses with more flexibility and to introduce only "soft" reciprocity clauses in the future, if any at all. A margin of 25 % could be considered as sufficient for the needs of the organisers.

**REMARK:** The fact should also be considered that each youth exchange is a two-way process, involving both the sending and the receiving end. Besides, governments have other means for ensuring an overall balance than demanding strict reciprocity for each single activity.

**Barrier 35: Public support is complicated and unreliable**

**SCOPE:** A number of different problems come under this heading. Sometimes organisers have to wait for a long time before a decision is reached by the public authority. Since the preparation must continue, they cannot simply lean back and wait, but have to go ahead, incur expenses, mobilise their volunteers, etc. It is again the more valuable programmes which are off worst, since they tend to be more complicated to arrange. If the decision is negative, all this has been done in vain.

<sup>13</sup> See Appendix II.

What often adds to the problem is the lack of transparency. Criteria for allocation are often not given. But even if the decision is favourable, payments are often made late, sometimes a few months, sometimes one or two years after the activity has taken place, thus creating incredible cash flow problems for the organisers, mainly youth organisations that cannot afford to work with bank loans, since these are generally not covered by existing schemes. No generalisation is possible, but there seem to be some countries where the situation is particularly difficult. All these problems have also been known in dealing with the EC.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states could agree on the following standards for their youth exchange schemes: Distribution criteria must be transparent, i.e. available in writing. Most of the payment must be made in advance, the rest during or immediately after the activity on receipt of all necessary proofs and documents. It is difficult to envisage a workable provision on the length of procedure.

### III. INFORMATION

**Barrier 36: Insufficient information for young persons wishing to go abroad**

**SCOPE:** A question that has incited many comments. The vast majority shares the view that information is indeed a problem. Many believe that information is available, but access is difficult. Others have pointed out that information is poorly networked, or that often initiative by the receivers is lacking. It has also been remarked that existing information favours the well educated and middle and upper class groups.

Several replies indicate that this information problem needs to be resolved on a national level.

**RECOMMENDATION:** An area where intergovernmental consultation would be very useful. Some member countries have introduced recently exchange bureaus or umbrella organisations for youth exchange, which may have helped with the problem of access.

**Barrier 37: Information gap between organisers, public authorities and public in general**

**SCOPE:** Another area on which many have commented in specific. The vast majority considers this indeed to be a problem. Again, umbrella organisations or youth exchange bureaus seem to have helped somewhat on national level, but they are lacking in most countries, while on European level the only existing structure is the Coordination Committee for European Youth Exchange (CC-EYE), a platform of international non-governmental youth organisations active in the field of youth exchange. One comment would rather see financial means spent directly on youth exchange programmes than in this area. The gap seems to be widest not on national, but on European level.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The last recommendation applies also to this barrier. On European level, member states could agree to create a "clearing house" for

organisers, governments, local authorities, intergovernmental and other interested organisations and possibly individuals. The task of this "clearing house" would be to collect information on who is doing what in the field of youth mobility, to publish in certain intervals (perhaps bi-annually) a booklet with a short description of each activity or organisation, and mainly to arrange contacts between different interested parties (if you look for X, go to Y). It would probably require 1-2 full time staff to do this job.

Rather than creating new cost-intensive structures, it seems advisable to make use of existing ones. The EYC or EYF could serve in this function as well, if additional staff is made available. Amongst the NGOs, CC-EYE could take over the same responsibility if provided with the necessary financial means. In any case, closer consultation and cooperation with UNESCO seems advisable, which in a less structured way and on a smaller scale already provides some of these services.

#### Barrier 38: Lack of research on youth mobility

**SCOPE:** There is amazingly little research on youth mobility in Europe, as several replies have underlined. There is for instance no clue to the total number of youth exchanges taking place in Europe,<sup>14</sup> nor a concise list of organisations involved. The same is true for other forms of youth mobility. There is very little available on the cultural impact. A few member states have recently started research on legal aspects of youth mobility.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Member states that haven't already initiated research on youth mobility could agree to do so. For this purpose, it would be extremely useful to agree on a list of questions and areas to be covered, in order to facilitate the comparison of the results. This report also specifies several problems where additional research is necessary.

#### IV. LANGUAGE

It is often a drastic experience to encounter for the first time how much relies on this capacity to communicate with others. Being left speechless, without understanding a word of what is going on around, may create the urgent and instant desire to return home. Nevertheless, the author feels that compared to the other barriers treated above, this one may be overestimated in its impeding effects, simply because it is so tangible and evident.

An important aspect of this problem is cultural: the readiness to use a foreign language. The author has seen Scandinavian blue collar workers with a remarkable knowledge of the English language and an extreme reluctance to speak it, while some Italian civil servants that spoke eighty words of a foreign language saw no reason why they should not make the best possible use of these.

The main effect of different languages is to channel mobility and to make interaction more difficult, but not to prevent it. The other connection between language and mobility should also be considered, namely that staying abroad is the

<sup>14</sup> The study of *A.M. Vangansbeke* cited above is the only survey on European youth exchange known to the author. It is limited to intra-European exchanges of CC-EYE members.

best way to acquire another language. The removal of other barriers to mobility does therefore also facilitate the learning of foreign languages.

### Barrier 39: Language

**SCOPE:** Concerns all types of mobility and all countries. It should be noted, however, that replies have not indicated language as a main problem itself, but rather the cost of language training (mentioned above under barrier 31) or the proof of language skills (mentioned above as barrier 18).

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is difficult to draft precise proposals except for the ones already made above. One of the key factors in language proficiency is of course the school education. Member states employ different methods and approaches in this field. This is certainly an area where consultation between member states would be useful.

## V. TRAINING

The problem of training especially in the area of youth exchanges has received the attention of the 1st Conference of Ministers.<sup>15</sup> It has already been treated in this report under other headings.

### Barrier 40: Lack of Training

**SCOPE:** This concerns above all youth exchange programmes and civil servants working with youth. Some youth organisations provide very good training facilities for their organisers, others lack facilities and manpower. For the organisations, it is mainly a financial problem, though, which already has been dealt with above (barriers 31 and 32). Another problem is know-how.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Some recommendations concerning training have already been made above. One possible additional suggestion is to organise training courses for civil servants that are counselling young persons in questions of mobility.

**REMARK:** Concerning the training of trainers, the EYC already provides support also for youth organisations involved in youth exchange. The EYC will also publish intercultural learning materials in the near future.

<sup>15</sup> Recommendation 31 of the 1st Conference of Ministers; Final Text of the 2nd Conference, 2.2, 2nd paragraph. (See Appendix I.)

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 1ST CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN MINISTERS  
RESPONSIBLE FOR YOUTH, 17-19 DECEMBER 1985 -MJN-1 (85) 6-

The first Conference of European Ministers responsible for Youth, meeting in Strasbourg on 17, 18 and 19 December 1985,

- I. ...
  - II. Recommends that the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe give further impetus to the youth policy pursued by the Council's organs, and ...
  27. Pursue, at European, national and local levels as appropriate, the removal of those obstacles which financially penalise young people who choose to go abroad for training or voluntary service in the welfare or cultural sector and seek as far as possible to harmonise, at European level, the rules governing support for youth exchanges within the framework of their bilateral agreements and programmes;
  28. Encourage local and regional authorities and local youth organisations to play an active role in promoting mobility by receiving and informing young people, with a view to supporting direct inter-regional exchanges;
  29. Seek to ensure that the steps taken by relevant European bodies to promote youth mobility and youth exchanges complement one another and are based on principles adopted with a view to involving the widest possible European area and fostering a more open attitude towards countries not members of the Council of Europe;
  30. Support the activities of international non-governmental organisations working at European level, which are obvious partners for the furtherance of youth mobility and other matters of concern to young people;
  31. Promote, in liaison with the European Community, a wide-ranging youth exchange programme encompassing bilateral and multilateral schemes. Specific measures to be encouraged in the short term include:
    - giving priority to vocational training and to young people in general, whether working or unemployed,
    - assistance for those young people who are most deprived,
    - participation by young migrants in all activities which concern them,
    - improving the quality of exchanges and providing training for those responsible,
- and consider the introduction of a "European Youth Card".

APPENDIX II: FINAL TEXT OF THE 2ND CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN MINISTERS  
RESPONSIBLE FOR YOUTH, 11-12 APRIL 1988 -MJN-2 (88) 9-

2.2 Youth exchange and mobility in Europe, the emergence of a youth information network and the extension of the youth card project.

Youth exchange and increased youth mobility are important aspects of strategies to prepare young people for the future. By the year 2000 the cultural, social, political and economic situation may be marked by a freer flow of information, persons, goods and services, and by more fully developed international mass media. Youth information and counselling services, programmes for intercultural learning and the introduction of a European Youth Card can be contributions to the promotion of mobility and youth exchange.

With regard to youth exchange in Europe, the Conference:

- invites each member state which is a contracting party to the Cultural Convention to include within existing cultural agreements a paragraph on youth;
- recommends that, as far as possible, the benefits of youth exchange and youth mobility should be made available to young people in all countries contracting parties to the Cultural Convention, and encourages an opening to other countries;
- notes the benefits of youth exchange programmes established and managed by young people, to secure the involvement and co-responsibility of the young and to secure equal participation of girls and boys;
- stresses the importance of improving the educational quality of youth exchange programmes, and trying to secure for participants equal opportunities as youth of the host country;
- welcomes exchange programmes for handicapped youth and other disadvantaged youth groups;
- notes the advantages of intercultural learning in international work and improved opportunities for the young to participate in the programmes of the European Youth Centre and the European Youth Foundation;
- takes note of the study on existing barriers to youth mobility in Europe.

...

APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRES RECEIVED (15 JULY 1988)<sup>1</sup>A. International Youth Organisations

1. European Committee for Young Farmers and 4H Clubs
2. European Confederation of Youth Clubs
3. Experiment in International Living
4. International Christian Youth Exchange
5. Mobility International
6. Service Civil International
7. World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts

B. National Youth Organisations*EFIL Member Organisations*

8. Dansk AFS
9. AFS à Islandi
10. Interculture Ireland
11. Intercultura (I)
12. AFS Norge Internasjonal Ungdomsutveksling
13. AFS Intercultural Programs (CH)

*ICYE Member Organisations*

14. ICJ (AU)
15. IJV (B)
16. ICJA (D) (?)
17. ICYE Finland (?)
18. AFSAI (I)

*Various Danish Youth Organisations, Members of DUF*

19. DUF 1
20. DUF 2
21. DUF 3

C. National Youth Councils

22. CRIJ (B)
23. DUF (DK)
24. EXIS (NL) - former BIJK
25. EXIS (NL) - former PIJON
26. FGhZM (M)

D. International Governmental Organisations

27. UNESCO

<sup>1</sup> Some organisations have passed on the questionnaire to others, especially their own member organisations, who then have also turned in the questionnaire. This has resulted in a fantastic return (31 replies to 40 questionnaires sent out to organisations), but has also changed the composition and thus the representativity.

E. Bilateral Governmental Organisations

28. Agence Québec/Wallonie-Bruxelles pour la jeunesse

F. National Governmental Organisations

29. Internationaler Jugendaustausch- und Besucherdienst der BRD (D)  
30. Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (D)  
31. Youth Exchange Centre (GB)

G. Governments

32. Austria  
33. Ireland  
34. Luxembourg

LSU (Swedish Youth Council) has sent additional comments without specific reference to the problem areas listed in the questionnaire. The EC Youth Exchange Bureau has also replied. Finland and Switzerland have provided detailed information on the legal situation in these countries.