**Draft Notes**

**1sth informal Meeting of the ESG**

**Cycle IX of the EU Youth Dialogue  (January 2022 - June 2023)**

**Trio Presidencies: France, Czech Republic and Sweden**

**21/09/21**

**Opening of the meeting**

Participants were welcomed to the meeting.

**Tour de table**

The list of participants is available in the Annex I.

**Adoption of the draft agenda**

The Agenda has been adopted without any changes.

**Setting up the ESG**

Discussion of ESG (European Steering Group) Draft Working Document for the

cycle.

The co-chair has presented the motto of the cycle

“Engaging together for a sustainable and inclusive Europe”

The motto comes from consultations with young people in all three countries.

The European Commission said that they like the motto as it connects to broader EU architecture.

Discussion on the ESG members and their roles.

The co-chair presented the draft ESG working document based on the previous one developed in the 8th cycle and opened the floor for discussion.

The Secretariat role has been **agreed** to be covered by the European Youth Forum.

It has been proposed that there would normally be 2 people per stakeholder group participating in ESG meetings but other people can listen in.

There is a proposal to include one external expert on the EU youth dialogue and one on sustainability topics, as permanent guests.

Two European facilitators would also be permanent members of the ESG.

The ESG members agreed on the proposal for the experts and facilitators.

The French Presidency still would need to add in the document the roles of other ESG members.

Most costs linked to participation in the ESG meetings would be covered by the ESG members themselves, though the ESG will try to have online meetings as well.

The European Youth Forum (the Youth Forum) raised a question about the funding for National Youth Councils (NYCs) to attend ESG meetings.

A discussion on the need to find a way for a global depository for documents of the ESG, does the EC have tools to work with documents, The French Presidency would look into this question and come back to ESG members.

For Sweden it is also a transparency issue that they need to figure out how to manage documents.

French NYC suggested using Agorakit that they are already using for storage purposes.

Sweden suggested perhaps establishing a subcommittee that could figure out this question.

It has been suggested afterwards to try to use Agorakit and see first how it works at the same time looking into other options without establishing a new structure for that. **Agreed.**

**French government representatives would send an updated version of the working document for stakeholders to comment and agree on.**

**Exchanges with the European Commission on various concrete issues related to the implementation of the cycle**

What is financed by the commission and what is financed by the presidencies?

EC said that each presidency is entitled to a 250 000 EUR grant that should include various activities also including the researchers and facilitators, and the EU Youth Conference, and the ESG.

Do grants start in January 2022 or maybe the French Presidency could already use the grants before to start working with the researchers. EC said normally the grant would start on the 1st of January 2022, the EC would ask FR to submit the request in December 2021. EC will look into the question whether the prep activities could be already covered.

EC said that there will be a budget allocated for activities for the European Year of Youth, maybe some conferences and events could be financed by this, would come from Erasmus+ but it is a bit early to say.

French colleagues are already liasioning with the financial colleagues at the European Commission. Need to double check with the budget and when the spending is allowed.

FR says they would have issues with procurement of researchers in terms of ensuring that the same ones are following throughout the cycle.

EC says typically with the limit of 15 000 EUR it would not be needed to have a public call.

EC will see if they could look at the budget for studies, perhaps the EU-CoE Youth Partnership or their framework agreement that they have in the EC on research that could cover those costs. **EC will get back at the ESG on this.**

Sweden would prefer to also have a joint sharing of the costs rather than three public procurements. They have a low threshold.

Czech Republic already working with their own researcher Ondrej Barta, who is usually working with Dan Moxon (he has been working on the EUYD for years).

Sweden wants to have a clear overview of costs and what would be required from the national budgets.

EC also suggested adding studies etc. to the Council Work Plan to highlight the Youth Dialogue.

The co-chair reopened the floor for the discussion whether the facilitators would be members of the ESG all the time or only when need be.

The Swedish government says for them if it is not needed to have facilitators at every ESG meeting, if it is the question of costs especially.

Czech Republic agreed with Swedish colleagues, we need to focus on a good prep of facilitators not necessarily a part of ESG.

Czech NYC said that they also think it is not necessary to invite facilitators to every ESG-meeting.

French NYC said it would be interesting to have them present but indeed if it is the question of money and time could reconsider. The French government suggested then to put facilitators as guests. **Agreed.**

French NYC suggested that ESG write together the call for facilitators and researchers.

EC suggested then keeping researchers on a needs based approach as well.

The Czech government said that we can list them as guests because we will anyway need to start working without them. Czech NYC says they agree and prefer to list them as guests as well.

French NYC said that they want to have researchers that could bring a fresh view on things, that would be the role of researchers.

Sweden said that it would be good to have the flexible way and invite the researchers as guests.

**It has been decided** that we all agree to put facilitators and researchers as guests when they need to, but emphasize having them as much as possible to have their fresh perspective.

**Agreed** to hire a duo of the researchers one on the EUYD and one thematic on sustainability and environment. There would definitely be one European facilitator at the European level and need to still decide whether it would be another one or national facilitators.

For French NYC it would make sense to have one European and one national facilitator.

The Swedish government sees an added value to have two facilitators for the entire cycle but then the question of financing. Swedish NYC said for them it would be good to have facilitators that understand the local perspective.

Czech NYC said two facilitators could share responsibility and that’s more secure for them hence would prefer to have two facilitators on the EU level and also national facilitators.

**Agreed** that if there are finances there would be two EU facilitators plus national ones and then if not one European facilitator and also national facilitators.

French NYC was asking about the grants for National Working Groups for the next three years. Would there be delays receiving money?

EC said that they are hoping to launch the new call in October 2021 and then the deadline until the end of the year. Then the money would reach them at the beginning of the next year.

**EU political agenda.** No inputs on the year of youth yet but the EC is in the process of creating the documents for the European year of youth. Reference to what was said in the state of the union address, focus on young people with fewer opportunities, ALMA is DG employment. Perhaps this could be touched upon later in the meeting in October.

**The architecture of the cycle**

The focus on the EU central survey. Is there money for this consultation? In the previous cycle the translation was provided for the survey at the European level, the platform was not youth friendly. Would there be means to change that?

EC said the translation has to be planned. The translation colleagues are under a lot of pressure most of the time. The EU survey is the only platform available. Perhaps exploring alternative ways with the researchers and maybe other tools. From the EC perspective they do not have anything else than the EU Survey.

The Survey on the EU level did not help NWGs at all. Czech NYC as well agreed, better to have the national survey that would be representative.

The French government said that we could also build upon consultations that have already been done by others in the field.

French NYC says that surveys are a good excuse to go to different places and promote the process and it is easier to promote qualitative consultations. The survey is more of an excuse and makes it more visible.

Czech NYC suggested asking other NWGs whether they would like to have a European survey, or both or only qualitative. **The Youth Forum will run an informal survey. Launch on the 4th of October results by the 14th of October.**

**Discussion on the concept note of the cycle**

French NYC presented an updated concept note.

Relying on what has been already achieved in previous cycles.

Thematic framework

One addition was to refer to other European programmes, not within the classic ones, as key to sustainable development.

Rephrasing the link between climate change and the pandemic.

Very important that the Trio is collectively addressing both goals to ensure that there is a link.

Another paragraph added that we need to reach out to young people with fewer opportunities.

The last part mentioned that we will have subgoals. The question of how they will be defined.

In the previous cycle it was easier because there was only one goal. Czech NYC said that indeed maybe young people could choose targets to focus on.

The upcoming Trio of the 10th cycle will focus on youth goal 3 inclusive societies. The government said also that perhaps the 9th cycle could be a bridge between the current and upcoming cycles and also linking it with the intergenerational dialogue. We do not want to intervene much into the overall priority of the upcoming Trio.

French NYC said it is important to stick to the targets that have been already adopted.

The Swedish government said that the links with the social dimension of sustainability were important but they never imagined that the entire youth goal would be covered. Need to rephrase it better that will focus only on some targets of the youth goal number 3. Partly on this youth goal, has to be clarified in the concept note and choosing the targets there that are relevant.

The Swedish ministry said it is important to be clear what we mean by saying we will be implementing the goals.

The Co-chair suggested that maybe based on the 14 September meeting in Paris do the framework on subgoals and provide the ESG a proposal and also look at what has been proposed previously in the concept note and NYCs taking the lead on formulating this proposal. The rest will be agreed via emails.

The question whether the concept note can be presented before the cycle officially starts. Needs to be clarified talking with the previous presidencies.

**Agreed** on the thematic framework, precise that working partly on youth goal 3 and will continue working on the subgoals. Maybe intergenerational dialogue should be more elaborated but Czech colleagues said that it will be precise in the Council conclusions. The Swedish government said it would be useful to have a few more lines only explaining the concept, not necessarily the definition as such. **Czech NYC agreed to add more sentences in the framework.**

**The design of the cycle. Presentation by the co-chair**

Need more explicit guidelines on what could be the implementation activities, Better than in the previous cycle.

**The EC said that as soon as you submit the Presidency grant, it is registered and the eligibility of costs starts. Hence the sooner the better.**

Should be clear in the French conference that the framework will be already designed. Also will be dialogue with policy makers.

A possibility to have a digital presentation of the outcomes of the qualitative consultations once all are over. Should add it in the description of the EUYCs.

Council Resolution in May during the Swedish Presidency. Connections with the 8th cycle. How to further develop the process of the governance of the EUYCs.

The question on mid-term reporting. Important to make it easy to fill in, perhaps something that can simply be completed for the final report.

The Youth Forum suggested that the Youth Coordinator would be specifical;ly mentioned when it comes to mainstreaming the outcomes of the process.

French NYC said that perhaps council debates could be focused on the youth dialogue topic, questions linked to the dialogue.

The Swedish government said it is better focusing on things that we can actually truly influence. Important how to avoid black box feeling of the youth conferences and other processes happening within the Youth Dialogue and get concrete results.

The issue of presenting the document to the Youth Working Party, priorities should be presented at the last working party of the Slovenian presidency but not the detailed Trio plans.

**Governments will check what is possible.**

**The involvement of International Non-Governmental Youth Organisations.**

**The Youth Forum will make a proposal on INGYOs call.**

**The Youth Forum will share informally documents developed on the EUYD communications.**

The French Presidency will send around the documents to be looked at.

The next meeting will be online on Friday morning, **15th October,** the deadline for the consultation then will be 14th. There the concept note would be finalised, also looking at the calls for the agenda and perhaps the EC can provide more updates on the year of youth.

Action points:

* The French Presidency will send an updated document on the ESG working document.
* We will try to use Agorakit for documents.
* The Youth Forum will launch consultation among NWGs re survey.
* The Youth Forum will share informally the information document about the communications and the EUYD.
* The Youth Forum will make a proposal on INGYOs call for the 9th cycle.
* The Commission will investigate the possibility of having research needs covered through their means (see in the text).

**The meeting has been closed.**
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