

# Fahrplan

## für die Umsetzung von Artikel 11 Absatz 1 und Absatz 2

### des Vertrags über die Europäische Union (EUV)

*Für einen besseren Dialog mit der Zivilgesellschaft und die bessere Einbindung der Bürgerinnen und Bürger für eine verbesserte Politikgestaltung*

Angenommen auf dem NRO-Forum in Riga am 2./3. März 2015 während des lettischen EU-Ratsvorsitzes

#### *Artikel 11 Absatz 1 und Artikel 11 Absatz 2 EUV*

*"1. Die Organe geben den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern und den repräsentativen Verbänden in geeigneter Weise die Möglichkeit, ihre Ansichten in allen Bereichen des Handelns der Union öffentlich bekannt zu geben und auszutauschen.*

*2. Die Organe pflegen einen offenen, transparenten und regelmäßigen Dialog mit den repräsentativen Verbänden und der Zivilgesellschaft."*

#### 1. Einleitung

Mit diesem Fahrplan sollen die Perspektiven, Strukturen und Maßnahmen aufgezeigt werden, die für die Verwirklichung eines besseren Dialogs mit der Zivilgesellschaft<sup>1</sup> in der EU und die Einbindung der Bürgerinnen und Bürger sowie ihrer Verbände erforderlich sind. Er ist Ausdruck von Forderungen nach besseren Entscheidungen, besserer Politikgestaltung und besserer Governance im Sinne der Bedürfnisse der Bürger.

Artikel 11 EUV schafft dafür die Rechtsgrundlage. EU-Organe, Mitgliedstaaten und Zivilgesellschaft - sowohl Einzelpersonen als auch repräsentative Verbände - müssen zusammenarbeiten, um Artikel 11 in die Praxis umzusetzen. Der Dialog mit der Zivilgesellschaft bietet die Möglichkeit, das europäische Demokratiemodell auszudehnen und zu stärken. Er ist von zentraler Bedeutung, um die Identifikation mit diesem Modell und dessen Vervollständigung und Modernisierung sicherzustellen.

Der Fahrplan soll eine Vorstellung davon vermitteln, was mit dem Dialog erreicht werden soll und wie er auf wirksame, konstruktive und realistische Art und Weise mit möglichst vielen Unterstützern und Interessenträgern realisiert werden kann. Er legt das Fundament für den zivilen Dialog, bei dem die Vertretungsorganisationen eine Schlüsselrolle spielen und gleichzeitig das volle Potenzial des einzelnen ausgeschöpft wird.

---

<sup>1</sup> Der Europäische Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschuss definiert den zivilen Dialog als demokratischen und öffentlichen Meinungsbildungsprozess, der je nach den beteiligten Akteuren verschiedene Formen annehmen kann.

## 2. Eine Vision für den Dialog mit der Zivilgesellschaft

### **Auf mehreren Ebenen**

Der zivile Dialog zielt auf die umfassende Beteiligung der repräsentativen Verbände und der Zivilgesellschaft<sup>2</sup> auf allen Ebenen ab - der lokalen, regionalen, nationalen und europäischen Ebene.

### **Offen, transparent und inklusiv**

Der zivilgesellschaftliche Dialog ergänzt die Verfahren der direkten Mitwirkung; die in Interessenverbänden organisierten Bürger können so auf der für sie am besten geeigneten Ebene am zivilgesellschaftlichen Dialog teilnehmen und ihren Beitrag leisten. Neben traditionellen Mitteln sollten auch digitale Instrumente wie Online-Plattformen und andere neue technologische Ansätze zum Einsatz kommen.

### **Auf bestehende Dialoge und Konsultationen aufbauen, nicht Doppelstrukturen schaffen**

Der zivilgesellschaftliche Dialog ist eine übergreifende Struktur zu bestehenden sowie noch zu entwickelnden Dialogen zwischen den EU-Institutionen und der Zivilgesellschaft über bestimmte Themen. Jede Verwechslung zwischen Dialog, Konsultation und Kommunikation ist zu vermeiden.

### **Bessere Politikgestaltung - Ideen für ein neues Europa**

Der zivile Dialog ist ein Verfahren für den Austausch von Fachwissen und zur Anknüpfung an Innovationen in Bürgerorganisationen. Er ist ein Raum, um die Werte, Grundsätze und Ziele des europäischen Projekts zu ermitteln, sie zu reflektieren und auf sie aufzubauen. Damit wird ein öffentlicher europäischer Raum geschaffen, die Kluft zwischen den politischen Entscheidungsträgern und den Bürgern überbrückt und das Potenzial der direkten Bürgerbeteiligung genutzt. Der zivile Dialog führt zu einer besseren politischen Entwicklung im Sinne des Gemeinwohls, die den Bedürfnissen und Erwartungen der Bürger besser entspricht und zu größerer Eigenverantwortung führt. Der zivile Dialog ist bei der Erarbeitung von Rechtsvorschriften von zentraler Bedeutung, da er eine Abschätzung der Auswirkungen der Vorschriften auf die Bürger ermöglicht.

### **Gemeinsame Maßnahmen zu vereinbarten Prioritäten der EU**

Der zivilgesellschaftliche Dialog ist ein Ort der Zusammenarbeit zwischen der Zivilgesellschaft und der EU-Institutionen sowie der Konzeption gemeinsamer Projekte, um EU-Maßnahmen besser umzusetzen. Dies trägt zu einem besseren Verständnis der Bürger für den Mehrwert der Europäischen Union und zur Bewertung der Auswirkungen dieser Maßnahmen auf die Zivilgesellschaft und die Bürger bei. Der Wert von sektor- und themenübergreifenden Initiativen muss im Blick behalten werden.

### **Die Zivilgesellschaft bringt die europäische Integration voran**

Der zivilgesellschaftliche Dialog bietet die Gelegenheit, Kontakte zwischen den Bürgern selbst und ihren gewählten Vertretern aus der ganzen EU herzustellen. Er kann zu Zusammenarbeit, Austausch und Projekten für den Wandel im EU-weiten Rahmen führen. Dadurch wird die Entwicklung starker Eigenverantwortung und ein stärkeres Bewusstsein für die europäische Identität vorangetrieben.

---

<sup>2</sup>

Der Begriff Zivilgesellschaft bezeichnet hier sowohl aktive Einzelpersonen als auch die organisierte Zivilgesellschaft.

### 3. Maßnahmen für den Dialog auf verschiedenen Ebenen

In diesem Fahrplan werden drei Ebenen des Dialogs gemäß Artikel 11 Absatz 1 und Absatz 2 umrissen:

#### 3.1 *Dialog mit den repräsentativen Verbänden und der Zivilgesellschaft auf nationaler Ebene*<sup>3</sup>

##### **Struktur (Artikel 11 Absatz 2)**

Wenngleich sich die einzelstaatlichen Traditionen und Rechtsrahmen erheblich unterscheiden, werden Entscheidungen der EU doch weitgehend von nationalen Instanzen vorbereitet und haben die größten Auswirkungen auf nationaler, regionaler und lokaler Ebene. Die Verträge sind für die Mitgliedstaaten bindend und gemeinsame Verpflichtungen und Ziele (wie z.B. die Strategie Europa 2020) können nicht ohne breites Engagement und Teilhabe der Bürger realisiert werden. Die thematischen Dialoge, die häufig bereits auf nationaler Ebene bestehen, müssen von der EU besser anerkannt und unterstützt werden, um sie auf andere Mitgliedstaaten ausdehnen zu können. Dialoge auf einzelstaatlicher Ebene sollten Teil der Debatte im Rahmen des jährlichen EU-Dialogs sein.

##### **Grundlage**

Bestehende Dialoge über EU-Themen auf nationaler Ebene, z.B. über Gesundheit, Jugend, Sport, Handel usw. Bürgerdialoge im Rahmen des Europäischen Jahres der Bürgerinnen und Bürger 2013 (entsprechend angepasst und neu strukturiert).

##### **Partner**

Mitgliedstaaten, Europäischer Rat, Generaldirektionen der Europäischen Kommission, östliche Partnerschaft und EU-Beitrittsländer, an den Dialogen beteiligte zivilgesellschaftliche Organisationen (auch mittels der Wirtschafts- und Sozialräte oder analoger Strukturen auf nationaler Ebene (falls vorhanden)).

##### **Nächste Schritte**

- Sammeln von Informationen über bestehende erfolgreiche Dialoge auf einzelstaatlicher Ebene. Konsultation der Interessenträger in Sektoren und Bereichen, in denen Verbesserungsbedarf bezüglich des regulären Dialogs besteht.
- Eine Empfehlung des Rates zur Einrichtung von nationalen Dialogen in den Mitgliedstaaten u.a. zur Umsetzung der Strategie Europa 2020.
- Schaffung von Verfahren für den Austausch und die Verbreitung bewährter Verfahren und Einrichtung von Orten für die Reflexion und kritisches Denken; Förderung eines gewissen Maßes an Koordination zwischen den bestehenden Dialogen, wobei ihre Unterschiede zu respektieren sind. Anstoßen einer Diskussion über Qualitätssicherungsnormen, Kriterien und Leitlinien für die Teilhabe und Verbindlichkeit, einschließlich des notwendigen Zeitrahmens für eine angemessene und wirkungsvolle Beteiligung. Förderung der politischen Bildung bezüglich gemeinsamer europäischer Werte; Schaffung offener Konsultationsverfahren (sowohl analog als auch online)

---

<sup>3</sup> Siehe einige Beispiele für bewährte Verfahren in Anlage 1.

- über EU-Themen auf nationaler Ebene mit den EU-Ratsvorsitzen, dabei soll ein jährlicher Bericht über die Entwicklung des zivilen Dialogs in den Mitgliedstaaten erstellt werden.
- Die Mitgliedstaaten sollten angemessene Mittel für die Finanzierung des zivilen Dialogs und zur Stärkung der Kapazitäten der zivilgesellschaftlichen Organisationen zur Teilnahme finden; die Europäische Kommission sollte ihre Instrumente/Programme zur Unterstützung von zivilgesellschaftlichen Organisationen überprüfen, die auf nationaler Ebene in den Bereichen Teilhabe, Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit aktiv sind; die Europäische Kommission sollte Bürgerbeteiligung/Demokratie zu den horizontalen Prioritäten ihrer einzelstaatlichen Programme hinzufügen und auf bewährte Verfahren zur Stärkung von NGO im Heranführungszeitraum aufbauen.
  - Unterstützung neuer Projekte, sowohl bezüglich Information und praktische Beiträge zur besseren Entscheidungsfindung als auch Wiederbelebung und Reform des EU-Bürgerdialogs in allen EU-Mitgliedstaaten (der im Januar 2015 in Lettland wieder eingesetzt hat); dabei ist mittels gemeinsamer Schlussfolgerungen und Rückmeldungen für jeden Dialog zu gewährleisten, dass breitere Kreise der Zivilgesellschaft erreicht werden.

### 3.2 *Dialog mit den repräsentativen Verbänden und der Zivilgesellschaft auf EU-Ebene*<sup>4</sup>

#### **Struktur (Artikel 11 Absatz 2)**

Angemessene regelmäßige und strukturierte Dialogforen, um zwischen jeder EU-Institution und der Zivilgesellschaft die Verbindung herzustellen, und dabei wo immer möglich Synergien zwischen den Institutionen schaffen. Bestehende bewährte Verfahren sollten ausgeweitet und gestärkt werden, um ihren wirksamen Einfluss auf die Politikgestaltung sicherzustellen. U.a. würde dies mit einer jährlichen Veranstaltung einhergehen, an der hochrangige Vertreter der EU-Institutionen und repräsentative Verbände/die Zivilgesellschaft sowie Vertreter der sektoralen Dialoge und der lokalen, regionalen und makroregionalen (transnationalen und nachbarschaftspolitischen) Dialoge zusammenkommen.

Dieses jährliche Treffen könnte etwa wie die Open Days des Ausschusses der Regionen strukturiert werden, mit Workshops und thematischen Sitzungen, die einfließen in: eine umfassende Schlussitzung und eine gemeinsame Schlussklärung, oder einen jährlichen Arbeitsplan und ein Follow-up zu diesem Fahrplan. Ein größeres Engagement könnte unter Einsatz innovativer Technologien und Verfahren im Laufe der Zeit entwickelt werden. Jede Erklärung würde an alle EU-Institutionen weitergeleitet werden, die alle zu einer förmlichen Stellungnahme aufgefordert würden.

#### **Grundlage**

Die Kontaktgruppe des Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschusses mit NGO, der Tag der Zivilgesellschaft des EWSA und die informellen Sitzungen des Rates EPSCO (Beschäftigung, Sozialpolitik, Gesundheit und Verbraucherschutz), der seit 2000 eine breitere Beteiligung der Zivilgesellschaft mittels Konsultationen - auf der gleichen Ebene wie die Sozialpartner - vor der Beschlussfassung in formellen EPSCO-Sitzungen praktiziert.

---

<sup>4</sup> Siehe einige Beispiele für bewährte Verfahren in Anlage 2.

## **Partner**

Europäischer Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschuss, Europäische Kommission, Europäisches Parlament und Europäischer Rat, Ausschuss der Regionen, EPSCO.

## **Nächste Schritte**

- Geeignete Maßnahmen sollten durchgeführt werden, um bestehende bewährte Verfahren zu ermitteln, auszubauen und zu stärken und die Änderungen der Beschlussfassung aufgrund des zivilgesellschaftlichen Engagements sichtbar zu machen. Es sollten Politikbereiche mit Verbesserungsbedarf ermittelt und ein Verfahren zur Unterstützung und Koordinierung dieser Aktionen und bestehenden Dialoge konzipiert werden.
- Verwendung der reichen Erfahrungen und eingehenden Bewertungen, die z.B. im Rahmen von kommissionsfinanzierten Pilotprojekten gemacht wurden. Damit sollen die Ansätze zur Bürgerbeteiligung der Programme "Plan D", "Debate Europe" und "Europa für Bürgerinnen und Bürger" untersucht und Strategien zu ihrer Stärkung entwickelt werden, mit denen die Prozesse der Teilhabe eindeutig mit denen der Entscheidungsfindung sowie anderen Verfahren wie z.B. Crowdsourcing für politische Ideen etc. verknüpft werden. Die Möglichkeiten der Online-Beteiligung müssen verbessert werden. Vereinbarung eines europäischen Status für Vereinigungen und angemessener und tragfähiger Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten durch EU-Mittel.
- Einrichtung einer Gruppe/eines Ausschusses und einer Beobachtungsstelle für den zivilen Dialog mit Vertretern aller Interessengruppen, die an der Messung und Überwachung des zivilen Dialogs und des Grads der Bürgerbeteiligung bei den EU-Institutionen beteiligt sind, und Annahme eines diesbezüglichen jährlichen Berichts. Die Überprüfung der Strategie Europa 2020 bietet große Potenziale für die Planung und Steuerung dieser Prozesse.
- Unverzüglich ein Kommissionsmitglied speziell mit der Zuständigkeit für die Koordinierung des zivilen Dialogs betrauen und die entsprechenden, für die Umsetzung erforderlichen Humanressourcen zuteilen. Jede GD sollte über für den Dialog verantwortliche Bedienstete und angemessene Mittel zur Unterstützung der Beteiligung an der Entscheidungsfindung verfügen. Im Europäischen Parlament und im Rat sollten ebenfalls spezielle Referate, politische Positionen und Posten für den Dialog geschaffen werden.
- Aufbauend auf den Tag der Zivilgesellschaft des EWSA sollte über die sektoralen und lokalen/regionalen/nationalen Dialoge hinaus ein breiteres Publikum erreicht werden.

### **3.3 *Möglichkeiten für die Bürger und die repräsentativen Verbände, ihre Ansichten in allen Bereichen des Handelns der Union öffentlich bekannt zu geben und auszutauschen (lokale, regionale, nationale und unionsweite Dialoge) (Artikel 11 Absatz 1 EUV)*<sup>5</sup>**

## **Struktur**

Alle Bürger können über die Verbände, die ihre Interessen vertreten, oder als Einzelpersonen am zivilen Dialog an der für sie geeignetsten - sei es die lokale, regionale, nationale oder europäische - Ebene teilnehmen. Diese Dialoge sollten von den Bürgern und ihren Vertretungsverbänden bzw. den zivilgesellschaftlichen Organisationen selbst mit Unterstützung durch die einschlägigen Behörden

---

<sup>5</sup> Siehe zwei Beispiele für bewährte Verfahren in Anlage 3.

organisiert werden, um möglichst bürgernah zu sein und dazu beizutragen, das Gefühl der Isolation und der Distanz zu abzubauen.

Das Format, die Agenda und die Diskussionsthemen würden von den Bürgern und ihren Vertretungsorganisationen bzw. den zivilgesellschaftlichen Organisationen selbst organisiert werden. Die angenommenen Berichte und die Vertreter würden Beiträge zum Dialog auf nationaler und auf EU-Ebene beisteuern.

### **Grundlage**

Netze von NGO, Räte, Initiativen, einzelstaatliche Allianzen im Rahmen des Europäischen Jahres der Bürgerinnen und Bürger 2013.

### **Partner**

Behörden auf verschiedenen Ebenen, Europaministerien der Mitgliedstaaten, Wirtschafts- und Sozialräte (wo vorhanden), zivilgesellschaftliche Plattformen.

### **Nächste Schritte**

- Die einschlägigen Behörden sollten günstige Rahmenbedingungen zur Förderung des zivilen Dialogs auf europäischer, nationaler und subnationaler Ebene schaffen.
- Angemessene Ressourcen und Instrumente sollten mit besonderem Schwerpunkt auf Koalitionen, Konsens und Nachhaltigkeit als Grundlage für hochwertige Beiträge zur besseren Beschlussfassung und Gewährleistung eines problemlosen Zugangs verfügbar sein.
- Besonderes Augenmerk für die Möglichkeiten der neuen Medien. In diesem Zusammenhang können sowohl Organisationen als auch Einzelpersonen die notwendigen Synergien bei ihrer Arbeit entwickeln und geeignete Möglichkeiten für die Beteiligung finden, z.B. mittels Start einer EU-Teilhabestrategie 2.0. Damit sollen der Austausch vielversprechender Beispiele zwischen allen Ebenen (lokal, regional, national und EU) ermöglicht, Ziele aufgestellt und die Schritte für die Einrichtung eines digitalen Systems für das Bürgerengagement innerhalb eines auf Respekt basierenden Diskurses in einem genau definierten ethischen Rahmen anvisiert werden.
- Auf der Grundlage der Charta der Grundrechte und in Anerkennung der Vereinigungsfreiheit die Beteiligung an der Beschlussfassung fördern mittels regelmäßiger Überwachung der Lage, Berichterstattung und Verbreitung bewährter Verfahren.
- Sensibilisierung für die europäische Dimension mit Blick auf die Lage auf der einzelstaatlichen und subnationalen Ebene und Förderung der Motivation für den Meinungs austausch.

**ANHÄNGE**  
**BEWÄHRTE VERFAHREN UND BEISPIELE**

*Im Folgenden werden einige Beispiele für bewährte Verfahren bezüglich der verschiedenen, in den Ziffern 3.1 bis 3.3 des Fahrplans aufgeführten Dialogformen aufgelistet.*

*Anlage 1 betrifft den Dialog mit den repräsentativen Verbänden und der Zivilgesellschaft auf nationaler Ebene; Anlage 2 betrifft den Dialog mit den repräsentativen Verbänden und der Zivilgesellschaft auf EU-Ebene, und Anlage 3 enthält Beispiele für Möglichkeiten für die Bürger und die repräsentativen Verbände, ihre Ansichten in allen Bereichen des Handelns der Union öffentlich bekannt zu geben und auszutauschen (lokale, regionale, nationale und unionsweite Dialoge).*

## Annex 1

### **CIVIL SOCIETY CONSULTATION PROCESSES IN EUROPE AND EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICES**

#### **-FOCUS ON DENMARK, POLAND, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND SPAIN-**

##### **1.1. DENMARK: Including Civil Society as a Means for Continuous Democracy**

Denmark has a long (informal) tradition of consulting civil society – citizens and their organisations – which was enhanced upon EU accession in 1973. Since then, it has shared its good practices at European level and influenced the quality of processes in other Member States.

Indeed, the idea is that “decisions relating to public life (labour relations, environmental protection, public services, education, etc.) are a matter of civil society itself. Hence, responsive matters must be supported by the addressees thereof. Otherwise, society might lose confidence in public institutions”<sup>6</sup>.

What’s more, Denmark’s commitment to consultation, whether among Institutions or between Institutions and civil society (organised or directly with citizens), rests on the belief that it increases communication as well as transparency, which is a principle that has become a fundamental element of Democracy.

With regard to Denmark’s relations with the EU, Danish society is still highly Eurosceptic, and consultation processes have therefore been significantly strengthened in order to maintain the highest level of transparency possible, an internal practice which serves EU democracy itself.

So even if Danish Law does not allow an individual citizen or group of citizens to submit an initiative for legislation, it can be taken as an example of good practices on including civil society in decision-making. Although the relation between public administration and civil society was originally informal, there are a number of formal practices too.

Civil society consultation is not the rule, but an often implemented exception. Indeed, civil society consultation is provided for in particular cases and defined in laws. Civil society is consulted both formally and informally.

First of all, it holds dialogues with Parliament thanks to its representation in Parliament committees. In this context, it participates in developing drafts via *ex ante* impact assessments, the dialogues and hearings it has with and by Committees discussing the potential of the draft. Informal discussions between CSOs and government are also common.

CSOs also participate in government-established advisory bodies. These are created on specific matters in order to ensure a continuous dialogue between citizens and government via their representatives<sup>7</sup>.

With regard to local democracy, citizens and CSOs are called to join in debates held by Municipal Councils where they informally participate in decision-making.

---

<sup>6</sup> D. Chabanet and A. H. Trechsel, *EU Member States’ Consultation with Civil Society on European Policy Matters*, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, October 2011, p. 43.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. for instance the DANIDA Project launched by Danish civil society and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2014 and in light of the upcoming European Year for Development 2015, for Danish support to civil society in Developing countries, [http://amg.um.dk/en/~media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Danida/Samarbejde/Civil-org/Dokumenter/Strat/Civilsamfundspolitik\\_UK\\_web.pdf](http://amg.um.dk/en/~media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Danida/Samarbejde/Civil-org/Dokumenter/Strat/Civilsamfundspolitik_UK_web.pdf)



## 1.2. POLAND: A Dialogue based on Civil Society Organisation Expertise

For many reasons, mainly historical, the notion of consultation appears in Poland “with regard to general acts prepared by government, as well as local acts prepared by municipalities”<sup>8</sup>.

Contrary to Denmark, Polish civil society and its organisations intervene more to support government policymaking rather than contribute to real decision-making. Indeed, it is mostly asked to contribute a source of expertise and knowledge on specific issues rather than be a political voice representing civil society.

Civil society consultation is not the rule, but the exception. When civil society intervenes, it does so in the framework of Advisory Bodies, along with national and/or local government representatives and experts.

Civil society consultation is provided for in particular cases and defined in laws. Indeed, the “government conducts public consultations when it is required to or when it seeks to demonstrate that they considered public opinion, but these consultations rarely influence policy decisions. Some departments or local governments consult with only those organizations unlikely to be critical of the government’s policies. At the local level, consultation processes are often formalities because most authorities continue to perceive CSOs mainly as service providers”<sup>9</sup>.

Local authorities, on the other hand, are more open to contributions from civil society, and therefore change in practices in Poland might come from the bottom up. Beyond the fact that local authorities have realized that CSOs have a capacity to perform services normally provided by the latter authorities, it is at this level that civil society has a chance to intervene more directly in policy drafting. This step has been reached via the 2011 amendment of the Act on Public Benefit Activity and Voluntary Work which introduced public benefit councils at local and regional levels. These councils consist of representatives of public administration and CSOs and provide CSOs an opportunity to express their opinions on various legislation or policy projects.

---

<sup>8</sup> D. Chabanet and A. H. Trechsel, *EU Member States’ Consultation with Civil Society on European Policy Matters*, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, October 2011, p. 43.

<sup>9</sup> 2013 CSO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia, 17<sup>th</sup> Edition, June 2014, p. 170-177. This part of the Index was researched and written by the Institute for Public Affairs, European Civic Forum Member in Poland.

### 1.3. THE UNITED KINGDOM: A Structured Dialogue for Overarching Input from Civil Society

Since 2011, the UK has made great steps forward in enhancing civil society consultation and participation from policy drafting to decision-making, an evolution which mirrors the Danish model according to which consultation is a key element to transparency and accountability, both fundamental to democracy<sup>10</sup>.

Such an approach was recognised in the Open Government Partnership UK National Action Plan 2013-2015. In this partnership, the government aims to:

- Work with civil society to develop an OGP national action plan;
- Implement OGP commitments in accordance with the action plan timeline;
- Prepare an annual self-assessment report;
- Participate in the independent reporting mechanism research process;
- Contribute to peer learning across the OGP<sup>11</sup>.

The first report was issued in 2013 and called for government to encourage more civil society participation, a conclusion which was accepted by the government in power.

#### The Compact

The UK's legal order provides a consultation mechanism for CSOs to observe, submit evidence and set agendas for consultation procedures. This mechanism is to be found in the UK Government Compact, made in 1998 and renewed in 2010.

It was developed by a Working Group that included representatives from leading voluntary and community sector umbrella bodies, representatives from community groups and organisations, volunteer organisations...who consulted over 25,000 organisations about what the Compact should include and the text was agreed in 1998<sup>12</sup>.

Although the Compact is not legally binding, it has become a kind of custom, and it can therefore be expected that signatories will act according to its provisions.

It is also followed by an Accountability and Transparency Guide, "which outlines steps to take at national and local level if these principles are not followed, including dispute resolution, internal complaints procedures and ombudsmen functions"<sup>13</sup>.

Finally, it also creates a permanent representative body for the volunteer sector, the Compact Voice.

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. quotes in *For a Democratic Europe Now*, Final Report of the "Real Civil Society Democracy in Europe", paragraph on the United Kingdom.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* above.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* above.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* above.

### Other Formats for Civil Society Consultation

Civil society also plays an important role after legislation has been enacted, namely by participating in *ex post* impact assessments, in the framework of specialised Councils or committees.

Finally, civil society is successful in its lobbying activities, another way of influencing policymaking outside the strict confines of consultation.

#### 1.4. SPAIN: Weak and Formal Consultation of Civil Society

Having been ruled by a dictatorship for almost 40 years, Spain joined the union of democracies with very poorly developed civil society.

Akin to most other European countries, no legal text deals explicitly with relations and consultation between public administration and civil society. As for France, civil society consultation is organised by specific legal provisions on specific matters. In this vein, Spanish Law has created a number of bodies, or committees, in charge of voicing civil society's concerns, such as The Advisory Council on the Environment (Consejo Asesor de Medio Ambiente), The Consumers' and Users' Council (Consejo de Consumidores y Usuarios), The Council on Women's Participation (Consejo de Participación de la Mujer)<sup>14</sup>.

Their tasks include delivering opinions, issuing recommendations and producing reports falling under their area of expertise.

Even if these organisations exist, they remain in an official framework closely linked to the government.

However, civil society's role has evolved in local administration. Indeed, under a Law of 1985 "popular consultations" may be held by mayors on issues which fall under specific municipal competence, are of a local character and of particular importance for the interests of the inhabitants. Local finance is excluded. Approval by an absolute majority of the members of the Council, as well as authorisation by the national Government, is required. However, some ACs have in practice dropped the requirement for central authorisation and now provide in their own Statutes for the convening and regulation of local popular consultations in the form of polls, public hearings, consultation fora, citizens' panels and citizen juries<sup>15</sup>.

What's more, a number of significant reforms were introduced starting in 2003<sup>16</sup>, and have gained significant importance with citizens' attempts to respond locally to the difficulties they have been facing since the beginning of the economic crisis, which is particularly virulent in Spain:

- "Popular initiatives" may now be presented for agreements, actions or draft regulations in matters of municipal competence.
- City councils were obliged to create districts, with the explicit aim of promoting and developing citizen participation in municipal affairs.
- A City Social Council (Consejo social de la ciudad) had to be established, composed of representatives of economic, social, professional and neighbourhood organisations with the task of producing reports, studies and proposals. These legislative changes were followed in 2005 by a White Paper on Local Government and new initiatives by the Spanish Federation of Municipalities and Provinces (FEMP) to promote public participation at local level.
- Finally, Spain is one of the leading countries in Europe in implementing participatory budgeting.

---

<sup>14</sup> D. Chabanet and A. H. Trechsel, *EU Member States' Consultation with Civil Society on European Policy Matters*, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, October 2011, p. 192.

<sup>15</sup> A. Del Rio Rosello, "Updating Policymaking and Participation in Europe", Thesis, University of Milan, July 2014.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid. above.*

## 1.5. GERMANY: Variety of Civil Actors and Medium-to-Strong Corporatist Political Structure

The lobbying/civil society landscape in Germany offers a great variety of different civil actors that are regularly consulted by public institutions. In literature Germany is considered to have a medium-to-strong corporatist structure, although consistent rules for civil consultation processes do not exist<sup>17</sup>. At federal level ("Bund") CSO engagement is focused on the executive body (government, administrations), whereas federal ministries give priority to selecting interest groups. Consultation procedures are normally regulated in the Common Rules of Procedure of the Federal Ministries. Though overall participation of CSOs in Germany is high, implementation varies across government institutions. Regarding EU issues, public consultations have an ad-hoc character and are not institutionalised. Dialogue forums (conferences, round tables, internet consultations) are appointed by the ministries to gain expertise in the policy-forming process whereas policy-specific networks connect different CSOs with political institutions<sup>18</sup>.

Civic involvement on European issues in Germany is highly valued, although the lack of involvement in concrete European policy issues is criticised regularly. The biggest network for European stakeholder engagement is the European Movement Germany (EM Germany)<sup>19</sup> with 239 member organisations combining labour unions, economic and non-profit associations, political parties, companies and foundations. It aims to improve German coordination of European policy and communication on European politics in close cooperation with political institutions. It therefore organises regular hearings between national and EU-politicians/experts and its member organisations to stimulate the exchange of ideas and expertise. EBD debriefings (as a reviewing tool for European Councils and Council formations) and briefings can be seen as the only sustainable practice for structured dialogue with civil society and interest groups. Other formats like "Rapporteurs in Dialogue" focus on debating the European Parliament's position in the legislation process or on the pre-legislative process of the Commission ("green paper analysis" format) under close involvement of the respective line ministries.<sup>20</sup>

EM Germany has extended this forum to other fields of European policy: aiming to bridge the gap between citizens, representative associations, and the EU; improve democratic governance in the EU; foster citizenship and citizens' participation and civil dialogue at all levels (Article 11 TEU); promote the consolidation of a European public sphere; promote transparency of decision-making procedures and lobbying activities at all levels.

In order to combine national-level engagement politics with European integration politics, EM Germany and the "National Network for Civil Society" BBE<sup>21</sup> set up reciprocal membership to improve the general legal, organisational and institutional conditions for civic involvement in the multilevel European system. Thus, EM Germany adopted BBE's demand for a "Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-Making Process".

The close cooperation of EM Germany with the Federal Foreign office has been officially assigned since 2011. Not only is internal federalism a major challenge for German EU

---

<sup>17</sup> D. Chabanet and A. H. Trechsel, EU Member States' Consultation with Civil Society on European Policy Matters, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, October 2011, p. 69ff

<sup>18</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/implementation/dialogue\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/implementation/dialogue_en.htm)

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.netzwerk-ebd.de/aktivitaeten/politik/civil-dialogue-in-germany/>

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.netzwerk-ebd.de/>

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.b-b-e.de/> as an example for a network of "civic involvement" CSOs

policymaking, but fragmented policy coordination also makes it difficult to strengthen an open and sustainable structured civil dialogue. This is not just an issue for European politics but also for national consultation standards, in accordance with Art. 11 TEU.

Above all, the extensive use of trilogues during the EU's legislation process makes it extremely difficult to balance the need for efficient law-making and transparency.

## **1.6. ESTONIA: Innovative Policy Idea Crowdsourcing Process**

As a result of a crisis in confidence in Estonian politics, in 2012 more than 10 Estonian NGOs and think tanks created the website [rahvakogu.ee](http://rahvakogu.ee) which was intended to be an action to crowdsource policy ideas that would lead to: a) improvements in the Estonian electoral system, b) increased competition between the political parties and strengthening of their internal democracy, c) a better model of financing political parties, d) more extensive civic participation, and e) stopping the politicisation of public offices. This civic action had great publicity and the support from the Estonian president and major political parties were invited to participate as observers.

More than 1500 ideas from Estonian people were collected during three weeks in January 2015. These ideas were then bundled, analysed and evaluated by experts. This evaluation allowed the initial 1500 proposals to be boiled down to the 20 most important ones. An event – Deliberation Day – was then held, where 320 randomly selected people participated and decided on 15 ideas to be presented to the Estonian parliament. The proposals were presented to the Parliament by the President of Estonia Toomas Hendrik Ilves. The proposals were discussed by the Parliament and some of them have already been transformed into law (example, the proposal to institutionalise agenda-setting civic initiatives).

## **1.7. LATVIA: Institutionalising E-participation**

2011 was a year of political turmoil in Latvia. The anti-corruption agency asked the Latvian Parliament to lift the parliamentary immunity of one of its members. This request was refused by the Parliament. Then the president of Latvia called a referendum that resulted in the Latvian people deciding to hold new parliamentary elections in October 2011. During the election campaign several NGO representatives and other civic activists demanded new forms of public engagement and institutionalisation of public oversight – one of those demands concerned the agenda-setting e-petitions.

The newly-elected parliament did institutionalise the agenda-setting e-petitions. Latvian citizens have the right to receive a reasoned response from the Latvian Parliament if they manage to collect 10 000 signatures which can also be gathered online, verifying each signature via e-signature or internet banking authorisation.

This method of participation is widely used in Latvia, especially via the public participation website manabalss.lv. In the time period between autumn of 2011 and winter of 2015, 14 initiatives have gathered more than 10 000 votes, the Latvian Parliament has discussed them and seven initiatives have either directly led to amendments of laws/policies or have been one of the important factors behind their success.

Manabalss.lv is an internet portal (run by the Foundation for Public Participation – a non-profit organisation) that has been recognised as an open government success story all across the globe. It was mentioned by US President Barack Obama during the launch of the Open Government Partnership Initiative, it has been featured in publications such as the New York Times and The Guardian, as well as recognised as "one of the outstanding challengers from Eastern and Central Europe".



## Bibliography

1. D. Chabanet and A. H.Trechsel, *EU Member States' Consultation with Civil Society on European Policy Matters*, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, 10. 2011.

[http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/19357/EUDO\\_Report\\_2011\\_04.pdf?sequence=1](http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/19357/EUDO_Report_2011_04.pdf?sequence=1)

2. *For A Democratic Europe Now*, Final Report of the “Real Civil Society Democracy in Europe” project led by Civil Society Organisations CSV (UK), Solidar (EU network), La Ligue de l’Enseignement (FR), Forum for International Cooperation Denmark (DK), IDEAS Institute (IR) and Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro (IT), November 2014. [http://www.solidar.org/IMG/pdf/for\\_a\\_democratic\\_europe\\_web.pdf](http://www.solidar.org/IMG/pdf/for_a_democratic_europe_web.pdf)

3. 2013 CSO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia, 17<sup>th</sup> Edition, June 2014.

<http://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1863/E&E%202013%20CSOSI%20Final%2010-29-14.pdf>

4. A. Del Rio Rosello, “Updating Policymaking and Participation in Europe”, Thesis, University of Milan, July 2014.

## **Annex 2**

### **2.1. Civil dialogue in matters covered by the "Europe for citizens" programme 2014-2020**

#### **2.1.1. Description**

Following the adoption of the Council Regulation establishing the Europe for Citizens programme (2014-2020), a new Civil Dialogue group was convened in June 2014 to take over the "Structured Dialogue group" established in 2007 with the previous Europe for Citizens Programme.

The group's tasks are:

- To hold a regular dialogue on all matters relating to the Europe for Citizens programme, including "Remembrance" and "Democratic and civic engagement", and to implement it.
- To bring about exchanges of experiences and good practices in those fields.
- To contribute to the dissemination of the programme's results.
- To contribute to preparation and implementation of any event or activities organised under the programme.
- To monitor and discuss policy developments in related fields.

There are usually two meetings per year, depending on the Europe for Citizens programme agenda and on the European political agenda, including the annual priorities of the European Union.

The group, which may set up working groups to examine specific questions, is composed of 55 organisations:

- Organisations selected to receive an operating grant under the "Europe for Citizens" Programme, under strand 1, "Remembrance", and 2, "Democratic engagement and civic participation".
- Organisations which have received an operating grant under the former "Europe for Citizens" Programme 2007-13 and have expressed their continued interest to take part in the dialogue.
- Some organisations/think tanks which have expressed an interest in the Europe for Citizens programme and/or work in this policy area but were not necessarily supported by the programme.

Member organisations are invited to register on the Transparency Register.

#### **2.1.2. Evolution/lessons learnt**

The success of the Dialogue carried out under the previous Europe for Citizens Programme led the Commission to propose to enshrine the principle in the new Regulation, thereby highlighting its strategic importance. The group contributes actively to implementing the programme, notably the discussion on its annual priorities; it also gets involved in major political events, such as campaigning for the European elections and analysing their results. The contribution of their working groups on EU financial support in response to the public consultation on the review of the European financial regulation led to concrete improvements (for example as regards the non-profit rule).

### **2.1.3. Links**

[http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/europe-for-citizens-programme/civil-dialogue/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/europe-for-citizens-programme/civil-dialogue/index_en.htm)

## **2.2. European Migration Forum**

### **2.2.1. Description**

The European Migration Forum is a platform established jointly by the European Commission and the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) which provides representatives of civil society a voice on issues related to migration, asylum and migrants' integration. This allows the European institutions to promote a comprehensive approach to migration, involving stakeholders at all levels. It developed from the European Integration Forum, of which eleven meetings took place between 2009 and 2014.

The Forum takes place at least once a year in the EESC and is attended by organisations representing civil society, both at EU and national level, EESC members, representatives from various EU institutions, from local and regional authorities and from EU Member States.

The agenda and organisation of the Forum are overseen by a Bureau composed of six members: a representative of the Commission, a representative of the EESC and four representatives from civil society, elected by the participants and each serving a mandate of two years.

### **2.2.2. Novelties**

The first edition of the EMF took place on 26-27 January 2015 with a focus on mixed migration flows in the Mediterranean.

Following the enlarged scope of the Forum, civil society participants, who used to be nominated by National Contact Points on Integration (national ministries), are now selected by means of an open call for interest. As each Forum will have a new theme, a selection will be made for each meeting, with due respect for geographical balance and the need for specific expertise.

### **2.2.3. Evolution/lessons learnt**

One of the political messages resulting from the most recent meeting is the need for maximum cooperation and coordination between the various actors in this field, which confirms the importance of the role played by civil society and the EESC in the Forum and, more generally, in the elaboration of migration policy at EU level.

Civil society organisations appreciated the participatory approach and will continue to be involved in the preparatory phase of future editions of the Forum. It will be important to avoid having too full a programme for a debate to which all participants can contribute.

### **2.2.4. Links**

<http://www.eesc.europa.eu/?i=portal.en.events-and-activities-european-migration-forum-1>

## **2.3. Structured Dialogue on Youth**

### **2.3.1. Description**

The Structured Dialogue on Youth (SDY) is an ongoing process that brings together young people and policymakers across the European Union to jointly discuss, formulate and put forward proposals for the development of youth policy at national and European levels. It involves regular consultations of young people and youth organisations at all levels in EU countries, as well as dialogue between youth representatives and policymakers at EU Youth Conferences organised by the Member States holding the EU presidency.

The SDY focuses on a different thematic priority for each 18-month cycle (set by the Council of Youth Ministers). During the first six months, the National Working Groups are consulted on the Guiding Framework, endorsed by the youth representatives and policymakers at the first EU Youth Conference. During the second EU Youth Conference, a joint recommendation is debated and adopted based on these consultations. The recommendations are then discussed by youth ministers from the 28 Member States during the third EU Youth Conference before being endorsed.

### **2.3.2. Novelties**

It reaches out to young people and youth organisations through 28 National Working Groups. In the current cycle, it is planned that the national consultations should be carried out using the central European Youth Portal website, for example.

The Recommendations are the basis for discussion for Member States in the preparation of the Council Conclusion on that topic addressed to European institutions and national authorities, which will be endorsed by youth ministers at the end of the 18-month cycle. These set the common practices and standards for youth policy in the EU.

### **2.3.3. Evolution/lessons learnt**

Even though it is a challenging process and its proposals are not always taken into the final Council Conclusion, it is important to acknowledge its benefits, as it formalises the active participation of young people in reflecting about the policies that directly affect them.

### **2.3.4. Links**

European Youth Forum: <http://www.youthforum.org/claims/empowered-youth/the-structured-dialogue/>

European Commission webpage: [http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/implementation/dialogue\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/implementation/dialogue_en.htm)

European Youth Portal: [http://europa.eu/youth/sd\\_en](http://europa.eu/youth/sd_en).

## **2.4. Participation of Social Platform in bi-annual informal EPSCO meetings**

### **2.4.1. Description**

Twice a year, under the auspices of the Presidency of the EU Council, an informal Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumers Affairs Council (EPSCO) meeting is organised, convening the EU Ministers for employment and social affairs. At these meetings, Member States exchange ideas on employment and social policy priorities selected by the EU Presidency, such as "Youth and Employment", "Social Services under Pressure", "Improving access to the labour market" and "Economic recovery and social policies: the role of minimum income schemes". The main topic of the meeting is discussed in a plenary session with all Ministers while other topics are touched upon in different workshops.

Created in 1995, Social Platform is the largest civil society alliance fighting for social justice and participatory democracy in Europe. Social Platform campaigns to ensure that EU policies are developed in partnership with the people they affect, respecting fundamental rights, promoting solidarity and improving lives. In this capacity, Social Platform has been invited to the informal EPSCO meetings alongside the EU social partners<sup>22</sup> since the Danish EU Presidency in 2002. This has led to a unique structured civil dialogue between the EPSCO Council and civil society organisations.

### **2.4.2. Novelties**

In 2014, The Italian EU Presidency took a step forward on civil dialogue by inviting SP to participate in their informal EPSCO meeting on equal footing with the EU ministers and the social partners. SP participated in the exchange between ministers on the poverty target in the context of the upcoming review of Europe 2020 and contributed to the discussions on a common European unemployment benefit scheme and on the importance of the social economy, pointing out the added value of the social economy to the fight against poverty. SP was also given the opportunity to participate in the Informal Joint meeting of environmental and social ministers.

### **2.4.3. Evolution/lessons learnt**

Since 2002, Social Platform was invited mainly to present its contribution on the topics covered at the meeting of the Presidency Troika (the Member State holding the EU presidency and the two following ones), the Commission, the chair of the European Parliament Employment and Social Affairs Committee, and the social partners. This meeting would take place ahead of the informal EPSCO meeting itself.

In 2008, Social Platform was invited to attend the plenary session of Ministers of Employment and Social Affairs and thus was able to hear the different positions of Members States regarding a selected topic. In the following years and alongside participating in the Presidency Troika meeting, Social Platform was invited to directly address all Ministers with a statement regarding social NGOs' position on Ministers' priorities.

---

<sup>22</sup> European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), Business Europe, the European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (UEAPME) and the European Centre of Employers and Enterprises providing Public Services (CEEP)

#### **2.4.4. Links**

[How to establish an effective dialogue between the EU and civil society organisations](#)

## **2.5. Deliberative citizen forums at European level**

### **2.5.1. Description**

The term 'deliberative forums' covers approaches used to convene groups of citizens to discuss a given or self-selected issue based on provided information and expert testimony. The aims range from gaining insights into citizens' views by formulating (consensual) recommendations for policymaking to helping to improve decisions on public policy. Forums of this type have spread around the globe and have become ready-made options for enhancing public participation. 'Deliberative forums' can be understood as an umbrella term for methods of public participation such as citizen juries, consensus conferences, 'planning cells' and many other similar initiatives. New steps to promote transnational citizen deliberation in the EU have brought initiatives based on larger groups of citizens and/or multiple-site deliberations such as Meeting of Minds, European Citizen Consultations, and EuropeWideViews (as part of the PACITA research project). These initiatives have been supported by DG Communication and DG Research. Forms of citizen involvement can be seen as an important complement to the involvement of civil society organisations at European level.

### **2.5.2. Lessons learnt**

Deliberative forums are linked with the hope to give ordinary citizens the opportunity to make their voices heard. They also help to understand the diversity of views and opinions of European citizens and thus help to understand their various needs and concerns, thereby potentially contributing to more robust policymaking. European experiments so far have been criticised as lacking impact on European policymaking, and have also been contested in terms of the functions they highlighted (Boucher 2009).

It is thus necessary to devise better ways of involving citizens at European level, e.g. by involving professionals, expert designers and contractors at an early stage of the process and clarifying purposes, values and interests in order to develop a reflexive, responsible and effective design. Negotiating designs and procedures for citizen deliberation and its role within democracy is not a purely technical or methodological process but also a political one. It implies negotiating the understanding, forms and processes of influencing political decision-making among a range of concerned actors. It defines which voices are to be heard and the degree of democratic legitimacy that can be claimed. This includes negotiations about different values, norms and interests that define the public and its role in the European Union as well as justification systems for political decision-making. It is equally important to find agents of change and champions who can take these initiatives forward.

### **2.5.3. Links**

- <http://www.participedia.net> gives an insightful overview about various methods and case studies
- [https://europa.eu/sinapse/sinapse/index.cfm?fuseaction=lib.attachment&lib\\_id=2FF96871-9617-84CB-19401CF971500B1F&attach=LIB\\_DOC\\_EN](https://europa.eu/sinapse/sinapse/index.cfm?fuseaction=lib.attachment&lib_id=2FF96871-9617-84CB-19401CF971500B1F&attach=LIB_DOC_EN), report from Meeting of Minds – European Citizens Deliberation on Brain Science
- <http://ecc.european-citizens-consultations.eu/>, website documenting European Citizen Consultations



- <http://citizenconsultation.pacitaproject.eu/>, website documenting EuropeWideViews on Sustainable Consumption

#### **2.5.4. References**

Boucher, S. 2009. *If citizens have a voice, who's listening? Lessons from recent citizen consultation experiments for the European Union*. URL: <http://www.ceps.eu/book/if-citizens-have-voice-whos-listening-lessons-recent-citizen-consultation-experiments-european->

## **Annex 3**

### **3.1. Policy Agenda on Volunteering in Europe (PAVE)**

#### **3.1.1. Description**

The Policy Agenda on Volunteering in Europe (PAVE) provides policy recommendations for a more efficient and effective policy framework in Europe to support and promote volunteers, volunteering and organisations involving volunteers. PAVE aims to ensure a lasting legacy for the European Year of Volunteering 2011 (EYV 2011) by encouraging all stakeholders to address the shortcomings of current policies. Consequently P.A.V.E contributes to reaching the EYV 2011 objectives and securing the legacy it promised for volunteering in Europe.

The recommendations agreed on by the EYV 2011 Alliance Steering Group on 17 November 2011 and endorsed by the listed EYV 2011 Alliance member organisations are directed at all stakeholders: the European institutions, member state policy-makers at all levels, social partners (employers from any sector – profit, non-profit, public, private etc. and trade unions) and civil society, and are informed by the conclusions of the EYV 2011 Alliance working groups.

#### **3.1.2. Innovation**

A total of 100 European experts in volunteering from EYV 2011 Alliance member organisations, many of them volunteers themselves, participated in this unique initiative during 2011 to develop the recommendations included in P.A.V.E. Drawing on the experiences of the diverse EYV 2011 Alliance membership of European Networks Active in Volunteering in this way has allowed PAVE to be developed with a unique practitioner's perspective and to build on the policy statements made by the EYV 2011 Alliance and the European Institutions prior to the European Year. \*

#### **3.1.3. Evolution**

PAVE has been used as an important resource for volunteering stakeholders since its presentation to Commissioner Georgieva in December 2011 at the EYV 2011 closing conference in Warsaw. Its legacy can be found in the European Volunteering Capital Competition launched by the European Volunteer Centre that rewards municipalities that demonstrate adherence to the PAVE recommendations. The European Alliance for Volunteering has also been established in order to actively coordinate and develop efforts aimed at appropriate follow-up by targeted stakeholders of the policy recommendations contained in PAVE.

#### **3.1.4. Links**

\* <http://www.eyv2011.eu/resources-library/item/39-the-european-year-of-volunteering-eyv-2011-discussion-paper>,

<http://www.eyv2011.eu/resources-library/item/40-eyv-2011-alliance-position-paper-available-in-different-language-versions-2008>

[EYV 2011 Council Decision](#) (2009)

[EC Communication on EU Policies and Volunteering](#) (2011)

[http://www.eyv2011.eu/images/stories/pdf/EYV2011Alliance\\_PAVE\\_copyfriendly.pdf](http://www.eyv2011.eu/images/stories/pdf/EYV2011Alliance_PAVE_copyfriendly.pdf)

<http://www.cev.be/initiatives/european-volunteering-capital/>

<http://www.volunteering-alliance.eu/>

## 3.2. EYCA and Civil Society Europe

### 3.2.1. Description

During the “European Year of Citizens 2013”, 62 European networks of associations representing 4500 individual organisations and 20 national coordinators have collectively developed a common value-based vision on European citizenship articulated in the founding Manifesto: “Active European citizenship is about pursuing European collective goals and values enshrined in the treaties”. They were working in different areas such as education, culture, health and youth. It has also been active in the EU Member States and in six other European countries, directly involving more than 400 national and local civil society organisations and large umbrella organisations.

Debates, conferences, screenings, workshops, exhibitions, etc. have been organised at the local, national and European levels to raise citizens’ awareness of their rights and their means of participation in the EU decision-making process by member organisations and in partnership with other stakeholders involved in the European Year of Citizens. These actions and discussions on citizenship have also been fuelled and continued online through the EYCA website and social media (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and Flickr: EYCA2013).

The main aim of the EYCA was to advocate for citizenship to become a transversal dimension of European policies and a key priority in all areas of the Union’s action so as to move toward a truly citizen-friendly European Union that would no longer be reduced to merely economic preoccupations. For the EYCA, EU citizenship should not be confined to an individual rights-based approach, as fundamental as this component is, but should have a strong value-based dimension so as to tackle Europeans’ sense of belonging to a common European project. In this respect, throughout the Year, the members of the EYCA have contributed to a transversal, multi-level and transnational reflection process on key themes linked to active citizenship in Europe via three working groups. Their recommendations have been gathered in the document “It’s about Us, It’s about Europe! Towards Democratic European Citizenship” which will be shared with European decision makers.

### 3.2.2. Evolution

It then seemed necessary to keep up the momentum, unite and coordinate these efforts to make this vision become a reality. **Civil Society Europe** (the European Coordination of Civil Society Organisations) launched at the end of last year and linked to civic movements at sub-national, national and European level aims to represent the values they claim should be at the heart of the European project. Civil Society Europe should create an encouraging environment for horizontal exchanges between civil society organisations and movements across Europe and be influential in shaping the agenda on transversal issues of common interest for organised civil society in Europe.

### 3.2.3. Links

[www.ey2013-alliance.eu](http://www.ey2013-alliance.eu)

### **3.3. Digital tools for a European Common Space**

#### **3.3.1. Description**

Digital democracy tools can complement traditional participatory methods. E-platforms for collaboration and other new-tech approaches in the digital era allow outreach to and engagement of new audiences – e.g. young people. Civil society organisations should act as mediators to facilitate the use of digital tools along with traditional ones to transform the relationship between themselves and also between EU citizens and decision-makers into more of a partnership, thus contributing to the establishment of an engaged citizenship. Exchange of promising examples between all levels (local, regional, national and European), establishment of objectives and planning of steps towards the creation of a digital ecosystem for citizen engagement.

#### **3.3.2. Development**

- Define the role of CSOs as intermediaries that facilitate the process of both decision-makers and citizens using digital tools so as to enable broader participation in the policy-making process.
- Design a comprehensive framework for combining on-line with off-line activities and devoting sufficient resources to ensure their smooth running and impact – EU Citizen 2.0 Strategy.
- Identify and create a Knowledge Centre of successful examples of e-democracy platforms that are user-friendly with simple and effective designs.
- Advocate and motivate policy-makers to engage in an open and transparent dialogue with citizens on line, using the knowledge and technology that is already available at national level.
- Advocate at EU level for progress from Commission consultations towards true co-decision.
- Shape a space for mutual learning, networking and synergy building between the different national, local and European e-democracy projects.
- Develop a training curriculum for the use of the new digital tools to foster truly pan-European discussion and overcome technical challenges.