



# Consultative meeting on the reform of the European Youth Foundation's grants

11 and 12 September 2024  
European Youth Centre Strasbourg

MEETING REPORT

Author: Gisèle Evrard, Council of Europe consultant

The views expressed in this document are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Council of Europe.

October 2024

## **Contents**

Background to the reform of the European Youth Foundation .....	4
About the consultative meeting .....	5
Opening address and setting the context for the European Youth Foundation reform .....	6
New trends in young people’s democratic engagement. Implications for the EYF reform .....	8
Good practices in supporting civil society in the best interest of young people.....	12
Working groups on the EYF reform.....	15
Dilemmas.....	24
Appendix 1 – Programme .....	26
Appendix 2 – List of participants .....	27

## Background to the reform of the European Youth Foundation

The European Youth Foundation (EYF or the Foundation) is an instrument of the youth sector of the Council of Europe to promote the Organisation's values and priorities. It supports youth cooperation by providing financial support to European activities that promote peace, understanding and cooperation between young people of Europe and the world, in a spirit of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Foundation provides grants to support youth projects of youth organisations developed by, with and for young people, from the member states of the Council of Europe and the States Parties to the European Cultural Convention. The Foundation is a partner for local, national, and international non-governmental youth organisations and networks, to strengthen civil society.

The EYF was set up by the Council of Europe in 1972. The Foundation has its [own statute](#) that defines the mission and governance of the Foundation. As a complement to the statute, the EYF has operational regulations, that include the basic rules governing the manner and conditions of the use of the Foundation's resources. The operational regulations have been revised regularly, every 10 – 15 years, since 1972. These revisions ensured that the grants and the related procedures are up to date and consider the best practices in grant-making. The [current operational regulations](#) were adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 11 January 2012 at the 1130th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies and came into force on 1 January 2013.

At the moment, the EYF provides grants for international youth co-operation activities, either one-off activities or a series of activities part of an annual work plan, for covering the administrative costs of international youth organisations to carry out these international co-operation activities, and for ad hoc pilot activities that address the challenges young people face and their needs at the local or national level with a European dimension.

The EYF reform started in 2022, following different feedback sessions with EYF beneficiaries and representatives of youth organisations. The purpose was to further develop the EYF as a foundation and key instrument that spearheads the work of the Council of Europe with youth civil society, and which remains fit for its mission within the larger context of the Organisation. By the time of this consultative meeting in September 2024, the EYF had organised several consultation meetings with international youth organisations and a working group of the Programming Committee on Youth was set up in 2023 to support the revision of the grants within the existing regulations of the EYF. Following those recommendations, several actions relating to grant procedures and requirements had been implemented.

As a second step of the EYF reform, a larger restructuring of the EYF grants, including the drafting of new operational regulations, started in 2024. Following the decision of the Joint Council on Youth in April 2024, a Reference group was set in place to support the EYF secretariat in organising the consultation process in view of the EYF reform. Another decision of the Joint Council on Youth was for the EYF to carry out an open consultation on the reform, in May – July 2024. The consultation aimed to collect ideas about the changes needed regarding the current EYF grants, the related rules and procedures involved in grant-making, and the EYF support measures for applicant and grantee organisations. The open consultation was promoted widely amongst different stakeholders of the youth field. As a result, 105 contributions were received, which highlighted the following:

- While the current grant types are to be kept, the formats, procedures and application process should be reviewed, to introduce a more dynamic approach to grant-making (more deadlines, more flexible formats of activities, longer international projects, etc.).
- The grants' management and reporting should be simplified for the grantee organisations, to allow for autonomy of action in youth co-operation. In this respect, the financial instructions for grant management and reporting need a thorough updating to allow for an appropriate approach for youth organisations.
- The Foundation needs to review its practices and incentives regarding inclusion and accessibility for young people to take part and implement initiatives for which the EYF provides grants.

In parallel to the open consultation, the EYF commissioned two research studies to provide food for thought for the reform. One study focused on the trends in young people's civic engagement patterns. The second one focused on good practices in grant-making among relevant donors that support civil society.

Following the open consultation, a consultative meeting was organised on 11 and 12 September 2024.

## About the consultative meeting

The consultative meeting brought together 50 key stakeholders of the youth sector of the Council of Europe to explore and steer the main reforms in the EYF grants and procedures. It supported the EYF to engage meaningfully with its main stakeholders in a dialogue about the added value of the EYF and the main orientations for the grant reforms.

The main objectives of the consultative meeting were:

- To review the input from the studies and consultations carried out prior to the meeting.
- To identify and prioritise the main directions for the changes in the EYF grants and the related granting procedures to maintain and develop the strategic value of the EYF.
- To provide direction for the added value of the EYF within the Reykjavik Summit follow-up and as an instrument for furthering the youth perspective in the Council of Europe and in its member states.

This report was developed to provide an overview of the main discussions that took place during the meeting, together with the proposals coming up from the discussions. In this respect, the report aims to document the discussions and the viewpoints expressed in the meeting.

# Opening address and setting the context for the European Youth Foundation's reform

## Opening address by Tobias Flessenkemper, Head of the Youth Department, Council of Europe

The Head of the Youth Department reflected on the history and development of the European Youth Foundation. One of the many starting points to put funding support for European/level youth cooperation in motion was a [resolution](#) of the PACE of September 1970. This resolution, tabled by the German Parliamentarian [Marie-Elisabeth Klee](#), called for *“a structure capable of providing appropriate support to youth, whether organised or not, and of encouraging European activities with a view to pooling experience and carrying out joint tasks”*. It underscored the necessity for the coherence of European action concerning youth issues and called for action from each member state. This impulse, which began over 50 years ago, eventually led to establishing the European Youth Foundation.

Over time, the Foundation evolved, moving from a model of voluntary contributions in the late 1990s to one where member states automatically contributed a fixed percentage (1%) of their contributions to the Council of Europe's budget. This development enabled a more stable financial basis, allowing the Foundation to grow and act according to needs. The Foundation was stabilised, and became more resilient and flexible, including by responding to the needs of member states hit by conflict. Over the last 50 years, the context in which the Foundation operates has changed, and youth organisations and European youth cooperation have evolved, namely through the advent of European Union funding instruments, such as the youth programme of Erasmus+.

Today, the Foundation, based on its statutes, needs to adapt to the changing dynamics between different actors. While online activities play an ever-larger role in young people's lives, there is no replacement for building trust and confidence leading to greater European unity and peace than in-person interactions, meetings and encounters of young people leading youth organisations and networks and other young multipliers. The Foundation also brings people together, including independent donors, researchers, and trainers. To facilitate all of this, the Foundation needs to simplify processes, such as application procedures taking account of, and using the technical tools available today.

European democracies are still in a state of distress, and democracy is not something that is ever achieved for good; it is a process which needs to be sustained. Many partners and grantees of the Council of Europe and the Foundation face challenges when trying to function in shrinking spaces for civic engagement and civil society. Looking ahead, the Foundation aims to update its regulations, guidelines, and practices by spring 2025, in time for a significant anniversary and the 10<sup>th</sup> Conference of Ministers Responsible for Youth, set for October 2025.

As a conclusion, participants were invited to engage in meaningful discussions, network with each other, and contribute to the ongoing development of the Foundation, ensuring its continued relevance and success in the future.

## What has been done so far? By Gordana Berjan, Head of the European Youth Foundation

Gordana Berjan provided an overview of the current initiatives within the EYF, emphasising the modifications implemented over the past eighteen months. She explained that these enhancements were the result of both internal strategies and the insights and proposals from the open consultation process. This consultation generated significant feedback from youth organisations, many echoing previous discussions. The open consultation also offered new perspectives, particularly highlighting the necessity for faster, more adaptable, and flexible support mechanisms. The increase of the grants, revised in response to the inflation and the repercussions of the war against Ukraine, was also underlined as a substantial change. This adjustment was intended to assist NGOs in their functioning in challenging conditions. In addition, the EYF also looked at reorganising its administrative processes and enhancing access to information.

Although progress has been made, more work is needed, particularly in easing the financial and reporting requirements placed on youth organisations. Transparency in decision-making remains crucial for organisations to understand the reasons behind funding choices.

The initiatives aimed at modernising the EYF granting system, which had been identified as inadequate and in need of an urgent and comprehensive revision, were also explained.

The Council of Europe's legal team has been engaged to guarantee that any modifications are in line with the regulations established by the organisation.

Additionally, feedback from the open consultation indicated a strong demand for increased flexibility in the application and management of grants, with many stakeholders advocating for more frequent deadlines to facilitate the application process and respond to the needs faster. A recurring concern was the co-financing requirement, particularly for projects that need international partners. Youth organisations have repeatedly requested greater tolerance and reduced thresholds, and the EYF is actively exploring the best ways to address these concerns.

To conclude, Gordana Berjan invited participants to engage in discussions and help the thinking process around establishing a coherent architecture for the future operation of the Foundation.

# New trends in young people's democratic engagement.

## Implications for the EYF reform

Presentation by Tomaž Deželan, Professor of political science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana and member of the Pool of European Youth Researchers

Tomaž started by underlining the importance of research in the field of youth participation for researchers and policymakers. He emphasised the significance of knowing how young people participate, especially as this changes due to factors such as COVID-19, the political climate, and new technologies. Tomaž's purpose was to summarise the previous literature, share his observations, and draw ideas for more and better participation of young people.

### Declining youth participation in organisations

Over the period 1980-2020, young people have become less inclined to join membership organisations for the long term. Although this trend has been confirmed, most of the findings were derived from research from the US and the UK. He therefore warned the audience against replicating these patterns and findings to the European contexts since their veracity can vary depending on local factors. He noted that young people are reluctant to join more formal organisations due to changes in their priorities and changes in the mission of these organisations. However, this change does not necessarily mean cynicism *per se*, but it is a result of the change in youth engagement in civic activities, which are more flexible, cause-oriented and of shorter duration.

### Differences between age groups

Tomaž analysed the differences in participation patterns between age groups. The older generations still prefer the conventional ways of political engagement that include voting and forming associations with formal organisations (such as trade unions, for instance). These forms of engagement are highly connected with employment and labour market status. Non-institutional activism is more popular among the younger population. Their participation is often episodic, often linked to a particular issue or concern and not necessarily a long-term commitment to an organisation. Tomaž pointed out that this is not a life cycle effect where the young will grow up and enter institutional politics, but a general generational shift connected the change of values and processes that affect those generations in the process of socialization.

### Ethical citizenship and solidarity

Tomaž also tackled the ethical aspects of citizenship, underlining that concepts like solidarity, equality, and social justice remain central to how young people view their roles as citizens. Rather than focusing solely on institutional politics, today's young people tend to engage with causes that reflect their values, such as climate change, mental health, and social justice. He highlighted climate activism as a key example, where young people prioritise both environmental and social responsibility. Although their engagement may be less tied to formal political structures, Tomaž suggested that their commitment to ethical, deliberative citizenship remains strong, which is a promising development.

### The role of (youth) organisations and spaces

Tomaž emphasised the importance of both physical and digital spaces for youth engagement. Youth centres, educational institutions, and public spaces continue to play a critical role in fostering



participation, especially after COVID-19. Although digital engagement has grown, traditional offline spaces remain essential for discussions, deliberation, and for community-building. He recommended policymakers not overlook these spaces, which provide the platforms and resources young people need to engage meaningfully in civic life. Organisations should strike a balance between offline and online strategies to ensure that they meet young people's evolving needs.

### Focus on priorities

As Tomaž said, youth participation is influenced by the changes in priorities among young people. As we saw, topics such as climate change, mental health, and social justice have become more prevalent, especially in the period of and following the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that youth activism is usually project-oriented: young people engage in a cause for a certain period and a particular cause. This contrasts with the earlier generations that were and are still more likely to join formal organisation membership for the long term. Tomaž pointed out that this is not just a result of a generational shift, but also young people's expectations of getting a fast and tangible result for their activism, a consequence of their interaction with the ICT tools.

### Future directions for youth engagement

Tomaž proposed several practical steps to improve youth participation:

- Emphasise the importance of recognising informal youth groups and broadening the definition of participation to be more inclusive of non-traditional forms of activism.
- Organisations must use straightforward, non-bureaucratic language that resonates with young people, observing that they respond better to communication that is direct and relatable.
- Organisations should involve young people directly in outreach efforts, as this fosters a sense of ownership and autonomy. This approach has been particularly effective in election campaigns where youth engagement was a priority.

### Addressing barriers to participation

Tomaž strongly advised lowering the obstacles that most of the time keep youth groups and smaller organisations from getting the support they need. He called for a more direct one, such as training on project management skills and offering sustainable funding in the form of structural funds. These measures would make it possible for small organisations to be [more] sustainable and continue with their functions effectively. He also underlined the need to make effective use of the available data to minimise the bureaucratic costs on organisations and help them work towards their purposes. Efficiencies in these areas would support preventing organisations from being burdened with excessive or irrelevant requests for information.

### Concluding words

Tomaž ended his presentation by emphasising the importance of developing new, more open, and more adaptive programmes that would correspond to the new reality of youth participation. He stressed that youth informal groups and the removal of obstacles to their participation are some of the measures that can help young people remain active in society. He concluded on a positive note, pointing out that even though the form of youth participation is evolving, it is not 'dead'. Tomaž sees enormous positive potential in the ethical, project-based involvement of today's youth and calls for the stakeholders to further contribute to their activities in a creative and relevant manner.

### Q&As

*In Serbia, there is a lack of trust in institutions, which seems to drive young people away from formal engagement. When considering the EYF reform, should we explore why young people disengage from these spaces?*

→ The lack of data in some regions outside the EU makes it hard to prove issues. If there is no data, the problem cannot be addressed properly. Countries without data likely have larger underlying issues. Trust is a major factor—people often don't engage because they feel uninformed or fear making the wrong choice, as seen particularly with women who tend to be more self-critical, a matter of higher threshold of political efficacy. It is crucial to understand that not all disengagement is equal: some young people are completely uninterested, but others could engage if we provided the right tools and information.

***National Youth Councils across Europe face challenges with structural funding. Is there any research that offers guidance on securing such funding?***

→ Not as such, although many NYCs struggle due to the lack of structural funding, especially when national budgets are weak. This impacts professional organisations and their ability to guide smaller ones. It is not just about money: it is about trust. There are stereotypes about young people and institutions, which complicates the funding issue. Structural funding is vital for sustaining youth organisations and preventing them from shrinking or disappearing, as seen in various countries. Trust and continuous evidence-based support are key to securing and maintaining this funding.

***References were made about the shrinking civic space and how young people are disengaging from institutions. But are young people apolitical? Is it possible to redefine civic engagement outside traditional structures?***

→ Young people are not truly apolitical. They are simply moving away from traditional institutions and reinterpreting civic engagement. Many still follow rules and care deeply about societal issues but express this through identity politics and non-institutional means. They are redefining how they engage, and that is a valid form of participation. It is about adapting to a broken system in a way that makes sense to them.

***There seems to be a contradiction: poverty is a top priority for young people, but solidarity is less prominent. How do young people understand solidarity, and could hidden data help leverage this concept?***

→ Young people are compassionate, but their understanding of solidarity may differ. Solidarity is not just about supporting your local community; it can extend to family, friends, or broader social causes. In the research Tomaž referred to, young people showed a willingness to help, but they also had strong personal aspirations (e.g., owning a car or house), which can create inconsistencies between their ideals and actions. Politicians often exploit these gaps, which is why it is important to dive deeper into the concept of solidarity and how it is perceived by young people.

***Do you see any evidence that critical thinking is declining among young people, and how do power relations impact their political views?***

→ It is not so much that critical thinking is declining, but young people are overburdened by it. They reflect deeply on issues, often to the point of mental exhaustion, and they are very aware of the power relations affecting their lives. They want to make a difference but feel constrained by a system that often fails them. This self-awareness can lead to mental health challenges, which will be the major issue facing young people in the near future. They demand a lot from themselves and the world around them, but the structures in place are not equipped to meet those demands.

***How does participation relate to belonging to a social environment, and is there a connection between social inclusion and engagement in civic life?***

→ Social environment and inclusion are indeed key factors in participation. Young people from more disadvantaged backgrounds, or those feeling excluded, often engage differently. For example, those who benefit the most from social programmes are sometimes the most critical of the institutions that provide them. This was obvious during Brexit, where the populations who benefited most from the EU were often the ones voting against it. It is about matching perceptions with reality: those with lived experience of exclusion often feel disconnected from the very systems designed to support them.

***We live in a time where far-right groups are increasingly using democratic tools to gain power. Is there a danger that the same participatory tools can be co-opted to undermine democracy?***

→ It is a real danger. Far-right groups are skilfully using democratic processes to weaken democracy itself. This is a challenge because the tools promoted for democratic participation can be misused. While it is important to remain democratic, it is crucial to remain careful about how these tools are applied. If their use is not monitored, there is a risk to enable those who want to undermine the system. It is a difficult balance that calls for vigilance.

***There is hope in the data presented, but could you elaborate on the methodology used in the study? How do we ensure participation remains democratic?***

→ The methodology used is based on a representative sample of young people from every EU member state, and it offers a lot of hope. Many organisations have developed creative strategies to counter the shrinking civic space, and these tools are a valuable resource. Sharing these strategies throughout networks can help others combat the same challenges. The key is ensuring that participation remains genuinely democratic, even as we fight to maintain these spaces. It is an ongoing effort, but with the right support and cooperation, it is possible to safeguard democratic participation in the future.

## Good practices in supporting civil society in the best interest of young people

### Presentation by Gisèle Evrard, consultant for the EYF

Gisele's presentation provided an in-depth overview of a comprehensive study focused on identifying good practices for supporting civil society, particularly in the context of youth work. The study, still in progress, seeks to reshape donor practices to better align with the evolving needs of young people. It builds on several resources, including interviews, an analysis of 29 foundations, funding agencies, and philanthropic programmes, as well as insights from various European youth initiatives such as the EYF open consultation, the RAY research findings, and the Philea study on philanthropy, among others. The general objective is to develop a funding system that is better aligned, diverse, and sustainable.

One of the main elements of Gisele's presentation is that a systemic and comprehensive approach to the reform of the EYF is needed. This involves establishing a permanent framework that is designed to quickly respond to emerging trends in the youth work practice. She underlined that this must be done in a way that supports individual and community development, creating an enabling environment for not only grassroots activities but also policy frameworks. Gisele suggested monitoring other programmes and philanthropies to see what new funding mechanisms are emerging and to ensure that the EYF is ready to adapt. In addition, she placed the reform into a broader context where youth work is a growing profession that needs to adapt to the requirements of generations to come and become a key agent of change in society.

Gisele also tackled the concept of co-created funding practices, highlighting that co-management processes (already in place in the Council of Europe) are essential for designing effective programmes and setting priorities. She also pointed to examples where young people or CSOs were involved in the decision-making on which projects should be funded, arguing that it helps ensure a sense of responsibility and belonging on the side of grantees. The presentation also provided further motivation to explore the inclusion of stakeholders at different points in the funding process of selected projects. Gisele stated that this not only helps to encourage more flexible funding arrangements but also supports improving the working relationship between funders and beneficiaries, including encouraging peer support and learning.

Another major insight was the need to focus on building trustful partnerships between the donors and the grantees. While there is always a risk for potential misuse of the grant – inevitable, no matter the field, if partners trusted one another, there would be less paperwork, and many procedures would be much easier. Hence, rather than concentrating on impacting a whole sector because of a few less honest 'players', promoting a more trusting and supportive partnership approach would generate a different kind of partnership and generate easier and long-lasting cooperation mechanisms. This would also mean a shift in the way people think about accountability and reporting, and instead of focusing on frameworks, it would be more about learning and impact, such as resilience, power, and community well-being.

One of the most critical needs seemed to be the necessity to streamline the procedures related to funding applications, selection of projects, and reporting. The nature of youth projects is becoming more diverse and multifaceted with many of them being developed in response to new and emerging

needs which require more flexible and easily accessible formats. A first step toward simplification would be to make application forms less complex by using plain language, fewer fields, and less complicated questions. The selection should be faster but could also potentially include a two-cycle review process so that applicants can make modifications if necessary. As for the reporting processes, they also require changes: it would be useful to use video or photo reports, especially for small grants. EYF could also use more open platforms that would allow for the simplification of the application and reporting process.

Gisele ended her presentation by stressing that marginalisation is changing, and, while programmes are becoming more inclusive, there are more and more vulnerable populations. She noted that to reach these groups, one needs not only enough money but also the right structures.

## Q&As

### ***What are some of the challenges that changes in and to funding schemes create?***

→ Every change is generally met with a mix of responses; while some people embrace it, others naturally resist it due to fear of the unknown. This resistance is normal, as change often brings uncertainty. In the context of funding reforms, any changes to funding mechanisms should be approached with a mindset of embracing uncertainty. With the right preparation and mindset, the process of change should be manageable.

### ***In the donors- recipient relationship, what is the importance of trust?***

→ The role of trust is significant for the development of the relationships between the donors and the beneficiaries. The current trend is that many of the donors do shift to partnerships characterised by a trust-based approach. Such change also means that both parties involved must redefine their positions to transform the relationship from a pure 'supervisory' one. In this model, transparency and accountability are still essential, but they are framed within a context of mutual trust and responsibility. Trust-based funding allows recipients more freedom while maintaining the necessary accountability.

### ***What are the distinctions between philanthropic practices and how do American and European foundations differ?***

→ There are differences in the approach towards philanthropic activities all over the world. American foundations seem to be more flexible and quicker in their decision-making processes than European ones are. For example, some European foundations are starting to stop grants and turn to such funding models that must generate a return on investment, which is paradoxical considering the very purpose of philanthropies. This trend indicates a shift in how different regions approach funding, with European donors possibly reacting more cautiously and slowly to new developments, in contrast to their North American counterparts.

### ***What trends are emerging in donor coordination and collective funding?***

→ Donor coordination is now more and more expressed through what can be described as the use of common funds – funds created through the contributions of many donors dedicated to specific issues such as migration, for instance. This approach also encourages group decision-making and reduces duplication of tasks by different people. While direct coordination between the donors is often not possible, the concept of collective funds is a perfect and innovative solution to the problems. This trend is on the increase despite the odds, and it is viewed as a means of attaining a more efficient and effective way of distributing the funds.

***What insights were shared regarding patient approaches to long-standing foundations?***

→ One must be very patient when working with foundations that have been in existence for a very long time. These organisations often have deeply embedded processes that are slow to change. For example, some foundations established over 500 years ago are slower to adapt to new funding models compared to newer, more flexible foundations. All this has to do with history and culture when addressing such institutions; especially in comparison to more flexible American counterparts.

***What are the prospects of participatory grant-making, and how is it being adopted?***

→ There is a growing practice of participatory grant-making, where the recipients of the funds have a say on their distribution within newer and more flexible foundations. It transfers or changes power relations; funding decisions are made in a way that involves all parties in the process. While some foundations have embraced this approach, especially in the participatory grant-making sphere, it has not become a norm. However, it provides a unique opportunity for a more diverse and effective funding system.

***How can donor efforts be better coordinated to avoid duplication of work?***

→ Donor coordination can be improved through working groups and better communication about priorities and focus areas. For instance, there are working groups specifically focused on youth-related work, where donors share strategies to avoid duplicating efforts. These groups do not 'dictate' where funds are allocated, but they help donors to complement each other's work, ensuring that resources are used more effectively.

# Working groups on the EYF reform

## WG1: Support for international youth cooperation

### Main challenges and principles of the reform

- The process of securing co-funding has become very challenging for youth organisations, particularly in the current socio-economic climate. Many organisations struggle to meet this requirement, even when they have well-developed, long-term strategic plans in place.
- The current EYF reporting procedures, especially narrative forms, are overly complex and time-consuming. Simplifying these processes would allow organisations to focus more on their core activities, reducing the burden of administrative tasks.
- The WG discussions highlighted the importance of trust-based, long-term funding as a means of providing stability for organisations. The current 'short-term funding' formats often prevent organisations from building sustainable initiatives. Extending funding beyond a single year would make it possible for youth organisations to apply for multi-year grants (at least two years), generating more stability and better support for long-term planning.

### Flexibility in grant structures

The WG advocated for more flexibility in grants to better adjust to the changing needs of youth organisations. They highlighted that the current EYF system is too rigid and does not always respond to the realities faced by these groups.

- Both international and national youth organisations with international partners should remain eligible for EYF funding. This widens the eligibility and ensures that diverse cooperation models can support the co-creation and development of successful projects.
- There was a strong plea for a more flexible approach to grant duration, which would include multi-annual work plans. Allowing organisations to apply for grants over multiple years (at least two) would provide them with more stability and more opportunities to plan strategically.
- The WG emphasised that informal and grassroots movements should also be considered for funding. This could be implemented through a project for international organisations that would use part of the grant to support multiplying actions to help individuals, informal groups, and movements access international funding while avoiding some of the legal and bureaucratic challenges they may face.

### Encourage innovation and reduce the administrative burden

The WG highlighted the need to foster innovation and reduce the administrative burden put on organisations.

- It was agreed that organisations should be encouraged to experiment, with the understanding that not all projects will succeed. A culture of learning from failure, rather than penalising it, would promote greater innovation within the youth sector. A space to describe the learnings could be included in the narrative reporting process.
- There is an urgent need to move towards fully digital systems for applying, reporting, and communicating with the EYF, which would support addressing (and resolving) many of the current challenges. A centralised online platform would help youth organisations manage their documentation more efficiently. The possibility of exporting/importing financial records should be considered too.

## Financial matters

- The WG strongly supported reducing or eliminating the need for co-funding. One suggestion was to keep co-funding as a principle, treating it as a simple checkbox, without the need to provide evidence, to relieve the burden on organisations (especially smaller ones). A way to refer to co-funding (already in place) is to recognise in-kind contributions, such as volunteer time, as valid forms of co-funding.
- While the ideal scenario would mean to issue grants in one large lump sum, the WG recognised that this may not always be possible at this stage (and that it can also create situations where the lump sum does not anymore reflect the reality of costs). They proposed using partial lump sums for various parts of the budget/project. In the case of long-term projects, this can be revised with interim budget reviews or after specific project milestones. This would give organisations more flexibility to manage their funds and reduce the administrative burden of justifying every single expense.
- The group emphasised the importance of allowing organisations to adjust their budgets as project needs evolve. Currently, the EYF is responsive to these changes, but the process could be made quicker and easier. An online system for making budget adjustments was proposed as a solution. In addition, the WG recommended allowing a higher percentage of grants to cover administrative costs, which are essential but often underfunded.

## Sustainability and inclusivity

The WG also discussed how to better support sustainability and inclusivity in EYF-funded projects. Those focusing on sustainable practices (e.g., green travel) or inclusivity (e.g., ensuring accessibility for participants with different abilities) often generate difficulties due to limited funding. The WG suggested providing supplementary funds for these aspects, either at the application stage or later, once the specific needs of participants are clearer. In addition, the WG also raised the question of whether focusing on inclusion can also be an incentive for organisations to have diverse staff, and that this could mean a bonus or 'extra point' in the assessment.

## Application procedures

- As already mentioned, the WG called for the EYF to adopt a fully digital, paperless system. Moving all processes online would eliminate the need for manual submissions and allow more fluid communication between youth organisations and the EYF. The WG also recommended allowing organisations to submit reports in various formats, such as outputs generated by their financial systems, rather than forcing them to conform to EYF-specific forms (if technically feasible).
- The WG suggested introducing more or rolling application deadlines. This would allow youth organisations to apply for funding when they are ready, rather than having to wait and follow fixed (and scarce) deadlines.

## Power dynamics in mentoring and support

The WG underlined the 'risks' inherent to the relationship dynamics between funders and grantee organisations, particularly around the questions of mentoring and coaching. While these forms of support are generally seen as beneficial, they can also introduce unintended power imbalances, depending on whether the institution is both the funder and the mentor (for instance). To keep in mind:

- Mentoring and coaching can create power imbalances, especially when the funder also provides developmental support. This dual role can 'blur' the lines and complicate the relationship between the two parties.



- Over time, working with the same staff from funded organisations may affect internal power structures. This requires careful management to avoid conflicts or dependencies.

## Dilemmas

By the end of the WG time, a few questions remained open:

- The current rule that international activities must include participants from at least seven different countries was seen as potentially too restrictive. While maintaining an intercultural element is important, the group felt that this requirement could be made more flexible.
- The WG acknowledged that partnerships between larger organisations and networks and informal movements could help the latter to access funding. However, they also underlined the risk of giving informal movements false hope if they are unlikely to compete successfully with more established organisations for grants. Careful management of expectations will be important.

## Comments and questions following the plenary presentation of WG 1

- One question tackled whether statutory meetings could be included in international activities. The response clarified that, while statutory meetings are not explicitly covered, it depends on how the activities are presented and what their purpose is. The key lies in how these meetings are integrated within the broader project.
- Another question looked at the simplification of application and reporting processes. The aim is to have all processes in one place, reducing the number of proofs and receipts required and providing easier ways to account for missing documentation. Although the narrative report was not specifically addressed, there was consensus that reporting should be simplified, maintaining enough detail but still focusing on what is essential.
- When will organisations and experts be able to give feedback on the new online platform for grant management? It was explained that a company was already chosen in the summer to develop the system, and they are currently finalising the road map. Once ready, there will be opportunities for users to comment and be involved in the development process as end users.
- One comment emphasised that simplicity should guide the reporting procedures. It was suggested that the EYF could benefit from learning about the successes and lessons from ongoing projects, which would provide valuable insights and help improve future processes.

## WG2: Support for the operations of youth organisations

### Structural funding and eligibility

- The WG suggested moving towards a need-based model. This would allow organisations to secure the resources they need to function effectively, for their financial stability is essential for long-term success.
- A key point raised was the need for more flexibility in the duration of grants. The group proposed a one-year grant for newer or emerging networks and multi-year grants for more established organisations. This approach would provide more sustainability and certainty for organisations at different stages of their development.
- The WG also stressed the importance of core funding, particularly to cover essential organisational needs like staffing. Staff costs are often underfunded, and the WG agreed that

adjusting the percentage of the project budget that can be allocated to these costs would be beneficial, particularly considering the inflation.

### Revising award criteria

The WG also discussed the need to revise the criteria for awarding grants to better reflect the capacities and needs of youth organisations:

- The current requirement for organisations to have completed three international activities or study sessions in the past three years was seen as too restrictive. The WG proposed lowering this to one or two activities, with the flexibility to include projects supported by other programmes like Erasmus+, as long as one activity was funded by the EYF.
- Even if the size of an organisation's membership is important, the WG felt that the quality of engagement and participation should have more weight than numbers. This would ensure that funding supports organisations making meaningful impacts rather than those 'merely' focused on growth.
- As for WG 1, a simpler funding model based on lump sums was suggested, which would replace a rather complex point-based system. This would allow for a more predictable and flexible funding system, with grants reflecting and adjusted to the specific needs of each organisation rather than applying a standard amount.

### Simplifying reporting and reducing the administrative burden

- Reporting should focus on the outcomes and impact of the work of youth organisations rather than digging into financial and logistical details. This would allow organisations to spend more time on their core work, rather than on detailed and tedious reporting requirements.
- The WG called for a general reduction in the administrative burden placed on organisations. As for the reporting process, reorganising the overall administrative procedures would allow organisations to have more capacity to focus on youth work, rather than spending excessive time on paperwork.

### Inflation and operational grants

Considering rising costs, inflation was a key concern when discussing structural grants. The WG noted that the current level of these grants is low and should be increased. The WG also questioned whether the two-year grants currently available are sufficient for ensuring long-term sustainability, especially in the case of newer international networks, which often struggle to meet the strict criteria for these grants.

As a possible response, the WG suggested splitting operational grants into two categories: more flexible one-year grants for emerging networks, and three-year structural grants with stricter criteria for established organisations. They also proposed a progressive lump-sum system, where grants could be adjusted to the specific needs of each organisation, rather than applying a one-size-fits-all approach.

### National Youth Councils (NYCs) and emergency funding

The WG also looked at the situation of NYCs, particularly those facing the loss of public funding. The WG proposed that NYCs should be able to apply for temporary emergency funding if they can provide evidence of significant funding losses. They emphasised that without this kind of support, international collaboration is often the first to be cut, which weakens democratic participation and international engagement.

## Comments and questions following the plenary presentation of WG2

- One suggestion was made for the EYF to introduce more flexibility in its funding criteria, considering cases individually. For example, the burden on NYCs needing to partner with at least one international youth organisation or three national NGOs for international activity grants (even when international collaboration could be achieved within a single country) was also underlined. Support for NYCs could be achieved through regular Council of Europe activities focused on democracy or via international networks like the European Youth Forum, which can submit work plans with an NYC focus. The EYF's role is to provide opportunities for civil society engagement at the European level, in line with the Council of Europe's broader mandate.
- There is a need to explore what is possible within the current framework but there should still be room for creative thinking. It is important to find ways to fund party-political organisations, as engaging young people in political activism is a key part of youth participation. It might not need to be through the EYF, but we should explore alternative ways to support party-political youth organisations, which often struggle with the current grant system.
- One clarification was made to the fact that the British Youth Council is registered with the EYF and that the Foundation does support youth organisations of a political nature. The EYF aims to support civil society by responding to the needs of international organisations, which represent young people across the 46 member states of the Council of Europe. The EYF's mandate includes offering opportunities for young people to engage at the European level through their organisations. There is a need to acknowledge the broad scope of organisations supported by the EYF and perhaps networks facilitating international engagement could play an important role in addressing the challenges faced by civil society. Still, making ad hoc changes to the nature of the EYF's department would be difficult to justify.

## WG3: Support for emerging initiatives of young people

### Conceptual aspects

The guiding principle throughout the WG discussions was that there should be no limits on what young people can experience through these emerging initiatives. The WG spent time defining what 'emerging initiatives' mean and concluded that these are spaces where youth organisations and young people can experiment, try new ideas, and even 'fail forward', as already mentioned by other groups.

- Emerging initiatives and pilot activities are spaces where young people can try out new approaches. These activities should support sustainability and continuity, building the capacity of youth organisations to grow within their local contexts. The concept of 'failing forward' is therefore central: allow organisations to try, learn, and progress, whether they succeed or fail.
- Pilot activities-related grants are particularly valuable in regions where youth participation is underfunded or unsupported. These grants must help young people address needs in their communities, whether through raising competences, promoting inclusion, or building stronger community ties.
- Many pilot activities are supposedly designed to respond to serious challenges within communities or to emerging urgencies. The WG discussed the importance of having a fast-funding system that can reach organisations in need, as the speed of response is often crucial for addressing local and regional challenges.
- The grants for pilot activities are often locally focused, even though they should remain connected to broader European values such as democracy, human rights, and intercultural

learning. This European dimension can be highly contextual, and flexibility should be allowed in how it is interpreted and applied, without necessarily requiring international participants.

### Procedural aspects

The WG identified several areas that could be improved to make the funding process more accessible and flexible, particularly for grassroots movements and informal groups.

- Introducing micro-grants (e.g. 1.000€- 2.000€) with minimum reporting requirements could represent an important support for smaller initiatives. These grants would allow for experimentation and innovation without the burden of complex administrative procedures.
- Informal groups, often led by young people without formal organisational structures, should be able to access funding directly or through the grants of youth organisations. These groups are a reality today, and the eligibility criteria should reflect this, ensuring accessibility for smaller, less formal initiatives.
- As in all other groups, reporting was identified as an area in need of urgent reform. For smaller grants, the WG proposed minimal reporting requirements, focusing on outcomes rather than extensive paperwork. This would ease the administrative burden on organisations and allow them to focus more on achieving their objectives.
- This WG also suggested introducing rolling deadlines to give organisations more opportunities to apply for funding when they are ready. The WG also emphasised the need for more trust-based reporting, where less focus is placed on receipts and more on the actual impact of the project.
- Formats such as videos should form part of the application and reporting procedures, moving away from traditional narrative and complex reporting texts.

### Dilemmas

- One challenge is ensuring accountability in the support to informal groups or individuals. Trust is crucial, but the WG recognised that clear criteria are needed to manage this process effectively. Additionally, there is a need to ensure that international organisations do not simply give their funds directly only to their national members, as these national groups often have other avenues for funding.
- Another question was whether the EYF can or should fund political or legal actions that go against a government. This is a complex issue and requires careful consideration, especially when it comes to maintaining the Foundation's principles while supporting civil society organisations in difficult contexts.
- As in other groups, lump sums were mentioned frequently. If they can simplify the financial procedure, there is an ethical question around how to ensure they are equitable and cover the intended costs. It is important to ensure that lump sums do not restrict organisations that lack the financial capacity to move forward and that they meet accountability standards without creating unnecessary barriers.
- Once again, the WG agreed that the EYF should promote a culture where organisations can take risks and potentially fail without facing negative repercussions. Failure should be seen as part of the learning process, and the EYF should encourage this approach to support growth and innovation.

## Comments and questions following the plenary presentation of WG3

- One issue was raised about the intervention logic for organisations that apply repeatedly for pilot activities. Currently, these projects are seen as isolated initiatives with no strategic connection to previous ones. It was suggested that a more strategic approach could be beneficial, looking at these pilot activities as a series of actions that build on each other, rather than standalone initiatives. Moreover, the current cap of 10% of staff costs and 7% for administrative costs is insufficient, given the amount of work involved in such projects (this has been a reason for some organisations to stop applying for pilot grants).
- The WG did not reach a clear consensus on the appropriate administrative funding percentage, though it was suggested that an increase of 20%, no matter the grant type, would better reflect the administrative burden. There was also discussion about the idea of micro-granting – mentioned by several groups- which would allow smaller projects to be funded. However, the WG felt that urgent grants and pilot initiatives should be treated differently. Urgent grants would require distinct rules and processes, as they address more immediate needs compared to pilot initiatives, which demand a broader vision and planning.
- The WG's reflection and vision about what these grants should cover were quite diverse. While some grants already provide 90% funding for larger projects, there is room for a different type of grant that could offer co-funding to help leverage other funding opportunities. The key question is about what niche the EYF could fill: what does the EYF cover that isn't addressed by other funding categories? What is the role of the EYF, and where do its responsibilities start and stop, considering its statutes? Pilot activity grants hold a special function within the EYF. Originally introduced to address temporary gaps, pilot activity grants allow for creativity and experimentation in situations where other types of funding or structures are not applicable. The pilot category supports organisations in testing new ideas or initiatives in unique circumstances, no matter if geographic, social, or economic. These grants were meant to be a bridging solution for one to three years, providing temporary support during times of uncertainty or for launching new, creative projects.
- Comments also highlighted the need for a more flexible approach to how pilot grants are implemented. Pilot projects should not require excessively detailed planning at the beginning. Instead, they should allow for some flexibility in how the funds are used, recognising that the pilot nature of these grants encourages innovation and adaptability. These projects should evolve as they are implemented, reflecting their temporary and exploratory nature, which is a key aspect of the EYF's support for emerging and creative initiatives.

## WG4: Transversal elements (ecological aspects, accessibility, intersectionality)

The WG focused on the key principles that should guide any changes to the EYF funding processes. The primary emphasis was on keeping the system simple and avoiding overcomplicated procedures, as organisations already face numerous challenges. If it is important to maintain simplicity, it is equally important to ensure that quality is not compromised. A balance should be reached between rewarding good practices, such as improving accessibility, and not penalising organisations with limited capacity to implement certain measures.

## Inclusion and accessibility

The need for EYF-funded projects to be inclusive and accessible to all young people, especially those from marginalised backgrounds, was strongly emphasised.

- Rather than imposing strict inclusion requirements, the WG suggested incentivising organisations to include participants from diverse backgrounds. Projects focusing on accessibility should receive additional funding to cover the associated costs.
- Organisations should have the flexibility to adjust their budgets after approval to cater for unforeseen accessibility requirements, such as securing accessible venues or providing specific support for participants.

Many organisations know what accessibility means for their target groups and their local context, and they should be trusted to define what is necessary. There should be a mechanism allowing budgets for inclusion and participation measures to be increased after the grant agreement has been signed, especially when new accessibility needs emerge. This would prevent organisations from having to cut necessary project elements to meet accessibility standards.

Plans for making events accessible should be encouraged but not mandatory, as not all events will require such measures. Organisations should feel supported in their efforts to enhance accessibility, knowing that EYF is there to assist when needed. For example, the EYF's tailored support during the COVID-19 pandemic, such as providing expert consultants, was highly praised. Many youth organisations lack in-house expertise on accessibility, so continued access to external consultants or experts would be valuable and appreciated.

Accessibility should extend to online platforms, ensuring that the EYF's digital tools and websites are accessible to users with disabilities, including those with visual impairments.

## Sustainability and environmental responsibility

The WG advocated for stronger support for environmentally responsible practices within EYF-funded projects.

- The EYF should actively encourage the use of sustainable travel options, such as trains, even when they are more expensive than flights. Governments often subsidise air travel, making it the cheaper option, but the EYF can help by reimbursing train discount cards, like those from Interrail, to promote greener alternatives.
- Developing comprehensive sustainability checklists and rewarding environmentally responsible practices would encourage organisations to adopt greener approaches in their work. This could include using eco-friendly materials or reducing waste in events and activities.

Another area discussed was the environmental impact of merchandise. Instead of opting for mass-produced items, organisations should be encouraged to use environmentally friendly suppliers, such as small businesses offering sustainable products. This focus on sustainable consumer choices would contribute to broader environmental goals without overwhelming organisations with additional burdens.

## Age and safeguarding

The WG underlined the importance of ensuring that EYF-funded activities are inclusive, particularly in terms of age and safeguarding.

- The WG proposed increasing the age limit for participants in EYF-funded activities to 35. This change would allow a wider participation, particularly of those who become engaged in activism

later in life (for instance because of facing different abilities) or from underrepresented communities.

- Safeguarding is crucial in all EYF-funded activities, especially when working with children. Trainers and staff should be equipped with the necessary competences, tools and knowledge to implement safeguarding principles effectively, ensuring the safety and wellbeing of all participants.

### Information sessions and consultative support

- The group stressed the importance of regular information sessions, which not only provide technical guidance on applications but also allow organisations to exchange good practices. This would help to improve the overall quality of projects and proposals.
- Organisations often face challenges at various points during their funding cycle. Tailored advice and consultative services would help organisations navigate these difficulties and ensure that they can maximise the impact of their grants.

### Comments and questions following the plenary presentation of the WG4

- There was support for the idea of hiring experts, suggesting that this could help organisations gain access to necessary expertise in areas where they may lack guidance or information. It was also suggested that capacity-building and information sessions could benefit from having the EYF financial department staff present to address specific financial questions. The role of a consultant should not open to those who face challenges entering the world of grants, as these organisations are often excluded, as well as grantee organisations.
- A comment underlined the ongoing debate about the age limit for youth, particularly referring to the fact that although the age limit for board members is 35, it is not always formalised in statutory documents.
- Sustainability practices in other programmes like Erasmus+, where there are top-ups for sustainable travel, were highlighted. Sustainability is a major priority for the Council of Europe. Two important questions were raised: how to make EYF-funded activities more inclusive and accessible, and how to make the granting procedure more open to groups that face greater difficulties accessing funds.
- The sustainability of venues was discussed, asking whether there are national networks that compile a list of sustainable and green venues. A suggestion was made to consider alternative venues, such as cottages, rather than expensive 4-5-star hotels. The EYF was praised for its flexibility in adjusting event locations based on the travel needs of participants, which has been a smooth process.
- Considering alternatives to written applications was suggested to make the process more agile and inclusive. Training courses were proposed to empower grantees to prioritise accessibility and sustainability in their projects. Regarding green travel, the emphasis was placed on incentivising sustainable practices, rather than just covering the costs.
- A question was raised about whether EYF allows participants to stay longer if they had another event in the same location, which would reduce the need for additional travel. The response indicated that while EYF has generally been strict on this, the EYF is open to discussing solutions when justified, and this feedback will be considered. It was pointed out that EYF has historically been flexible, provided that clear explanations are given when requesting changes or exceptions.
- It was added that any tools or materials produced should have long-lasting value beyond the immediate event, even if they carry Council of Europe branding.

## Dilemmas

This session allowed the full group of participants to explore together different dilemmas that appeared in the working groups.

### Dilemma 1: Informal groups and their access to EYF grants

The group agreed that the Foundation grants could help applicants to reach out and support informal groups active at European level. This will require updated accountability mechanisms. Applicants providing funding could take opportunities away from organisations who maintain a legal personality and thereby built a living civic space. On the supply side, there was a reflection whether informal groups could apply for grants. Pilot activities allow youth organisations and networks to apply and support informal groups in their projects. On the demand side, there is also the fact that informal groups may not wish to honour administrative processes or become accountable to funders. The Foundation is invited to see how informality can be accommodated within its regulatory framework. Partnerships with established organisations could be a way to allow more informal group to be part of the Foundation's beneficiary community.

Independent donors address the issue in various ways. Some use agents that act as 'fiscal hosts' for informal groups, while others use consultants to help formal organisations manage the financial side. While the group recognised there are risks, they also felt that informal groups could offer new opportunities for youth cooperation at European level.

### Dilemma 2: Where does international cooperation start – 7 countries?

The Foundation's regulations require projects to involve participants residing in seven or more member States of the Council of Europe. Emerging organisations and networks might find it challenging to reach this number initially. The bar of involving at least 15% of the Council of Europe member States aims to secure effective European cooperation but might be difficult for certain issues or groups. For instance, Roma projects, which involve fewer countries and use local languages, could nevertheless contribute to adding value at European level. A reduced number of countries however also reduces diversity of views and experiences.

At the same time, the Council of Europe is a multilateral organisation with 46 member States that has a mission to support youth co-operation at European level. Multilateralism is essential in international youth co-operation as it fosters an inclusive, coordinated, and sustainable approach to addressing European and global challenges faced by youth, as well as empowering young people to actively participate in shaping a more peaceful, prosperous, and equitable future. In this respect, the criterion of seven countries was not considered as a crucial obstacle for reaching those aims, bearing in mind the pan-European character of the Organisation.

The idea of solidarity was seen as key. It is not just about the number of countries but also about working together on shared values and ideas. Some suggested that the Foundation should provide coordination with other donors, especially for regions like the Western Balkans or the Eastern Partnership, where there is already targeted funding.



### Dilemma 3: Reporting and AI

The main question here was whether and how the AI technologies affect the way organisations apply for and report on grants. While AI can be useful, there were concerns expressed that it takes away from the 'personal touch' of applications, presenting pre-made content instead of genuine and original ideas. The challenge is to use these tools wisely while ensuring that applications and reports still reflect the applicants' true opinions and thoughts.

One suggestion was to simplify the reporting process by asking more focused questions that get to the heart of what's important, rather than requiring long, detailed reports. There was also interest in trying new formats like video applications with automatic transcripts, which would make things easier and more engaging for both the applicant and the EYF.

However, some worried that relying too much on AI might be a short-term fix that does not address the deeper issues. AI can be a tool for innovation, but it should not replace original thinking. The group also mentioned the environmental cost of AI and stressed the importance of understanding its impact.

The group reflecting on this dilemma concluded by emphasising that the relationship between donors and grantees is more important than the format of applications. For marginalised communities that struggle to access funding, the key to change is building strong relationships, not just focusing on the technical aspects of applications and reports. Shifting towards a more relationship-based approach to funding could help tackle some of the challenges posed by AI and other new technologies.

## Appendix 1 – Programme

### Tuesday 10 September

*Arrivals of participants*

19.00 Dinner at the European Youth Centre

### Wednesday 11 September

09:00 Opening, introductions and context of the EYF reform

*Welcome by Tobias Flessenkemper, Head of the Youth Department, Council of Europe*

10.00 What is new and relevant in young people's democratic engagement? Implications for the EYF reform.

*Presentation by Tomaž Deželan, Professor of political science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana and member of the Pool of European Youth Researchers*

11.00 Break

11:30 Good practices in supporting civil society: how to orient donor practices in the best interest of young people

*Presentation by Gisèle Evrard, consultant for the EYF*

13.00 Lunch break

14:30 Working groups on EYF reform:

- WG1: Support to international youth co-operation
- WG2: Support to operations of youth organisations
- WG3: Support to emerging initiatives of young people
- WG4: Transversal elements to include in grants (ecological aspects, accessibility, intersectionality, etc.)

19.00 Reception and dinner

### Thursday 12 September

09:00 Opening of the meeting and review of the previous day

Collecting input from working groups

11:00 Break

11:30 Further elaboration on the main open questions

12.30 Follow-up to this consultative meeting and closing of the meeting

13.00 Lunch

*Departure of participants*

## Appendix 2 – List of participants

### **International youth organisations**

Pegah Moulana, Youth and Environment Europe  
Kerry Hargadon, Service Civil International  
Nikola Planojevic, Co-operation and Development Network  
Lala Safarli, Human Rights Education Youth Network  
Cristiana Cerri Gambarelli, Forum of Young European Greens and Fantapolitica, Italy  
Vasiliki Tsaklidou, European Students' Union  
Anna Daróczy, Phiren Amenca  
Sina Riz a Porta, European Youth Forum

### **Local and national youth organisations**

Nana Pirtskhalaishvili, Initiative for Civil Society, Georgia  
Christina Schneider, National Youth Council, Germany  
Laura Alčiauskaitė, European Network for Independent Living and The Fifth Corner, Lithuania  
Angel Dimitrovski, AED Ekvalis, North Macedonia  
Mihai Vilcea, National Youth Foundation, Romania  
Vitalie Cirhana, Millenium NGO, Republic of Moldova

### **Donor communities**

Dmitry Dobrovolschi, The German Marshall Fund of the U.S.  
Alex Farrow, Kaleidoscope Trust  
Hanna Stähle, PHILEA  
Florence Gabbe, Franco-German Youth Office

### **Youth research community**

Laden Yurttagüler, Alumni of the Pool of European Youth Researchers  
Tomaž Deželan, Pool of European Youth Researchers  
Andreas Karsten, RAY network (Research-based analysis of European youth programmes)  
Andreas Hieronymus, Dalslands Studio / Imir – Institut Researching Migration and Racism E.V.

### **Youth trainers' community**

Bogdan Imre, EYF trainer, support measures for youth organisations

### **Statutory bodies of the Council of Europe youth sector**

#### ***European Steering Committee on Youth (CDEJ)***

Vakhtang Baakashvili, CDEJ member, Georgia  
Uwe Finke-Timpe, CDEJ member, Germany

#### ***Advisory Council on Youth (CCJ)***

Nina Grmuša, Chair of the CCJ  
Anja Jokić, Bureau member of the CCJ

### **CMJ Reference group for the EYF reform**

Laurence Hermand, CDEJ member, French speaking community of Belgium

Markus Wolf, CDEJ member, Austria  
Riika Pasanen, Member of the CCJ  
Konstanze Schönfeld, Member of the CCJ  
Álvaro González Pérez, European Youth Forum

#### **Consultant**

Gisèle Evrard Independent consultant for the EYF study on good practices of supporting civil society

#### **Council of Europe Secretariat**

##### ***Legal Advice and Litigation Department (DLAPIL)***

Jörg Nobbe, Head of the Legal Advice Division

##### ***Democratic Institutions and Civil Society Division, Directorate for Democracy***

Urška Umek, Head of Division

##### ***Youth Department***

Tobias Flessenkemper, Head of the Youth Department

Rui Gomes, Head of the Education, Training and Cooperation Division

Yael Ohana, Programme manager, Education, Training and Cooperation Division

Ruxandra Pandea, Senior project officer, Education, Training and Cooperation Division

Marius Schlageter, Policy advisor, Youth Policy Division

Gordana Berjan Head of the European Youth Foundation

Sylvia Ivanova, Deputy Head of the European Youth Foundation

Mara Georgescu, Programme manager, European Youth Foundation

Katalin Lerch, Senior finance officer, European Youth Foundation

Marilyn Horst, Finance officer, European Youth Foundation

Margit Barna, Project officer, European Youth Foundation

Stephanie Attil, Project officer, European Youth Foundation

Nino Kheladze, Assistant, European Youth Foundation