
Cross-Border Volunteering

Cost of Non-Europe Report

STUDY

EPRS | European Parliamentary Research Service

Authors: Michaela del Monte and Thomas Zandstra

European Added Value Unit

PE 536.370 - July 2015

The Cost of Non-Europe for Cross-Border Volunteering

Study

On 9 January 2014, the Committee on Culture and Education (CULT) requested a Cost of Non-Europe report on cross-border volunteering in the EU, which would include the results of the European Year of Volunteering and the CULT reports on volunteering, for which Marco Scurria MEP was rapporteur.

This paper has been drawn up by the **European Added Value Unit** of the Directorate for Impact Assessment and European Added Value, within the European Parliament's Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services. Its aim is to help improve understanding of the subject matter by providing evidence of the specific benefits that could be achieved through European action to increase the visibility of cross-border volunteering and its socio-economic contribution.

This assessment builds on expert research commissioned specifically for the purpose, provided by:

- Milieu Ltd. (Belgium), rue Blanche 15, B-1050 Brussels

Abstract

The study examines the legal, administrative and other barriers to cross-border volunteering which prevent it from achieving its full potential. Those barriers include uncertainty and the risk of forfeiting social security benefits, the unclear framework for obtaining residence permits in some host countries, the lack of clear procedures for the recognition of the skills and competences gained through volunteering, the lack of positive action and information on volunteering opportunities, and insufficient preparation and training for volunteers.

The cost associated with the barriers to cross border volunteering is estimated at **65 million euro** per year, increasing the positive economic benefit by a third mainly through the removal of administrative barriers.

While the cost of non-action, in political and economic terms, is relatively modest, stronger EU action would increase its visibility, its socioeconomic contribution and foster increased participation in cross-border volunteering.

AUTHORS

Michaela del Monte and Thomas Zandstra, European Added Value Unit

ABOUT THE PUBLISHER

This paper has been drawn up by the **European Added Value Unit** of the Directorate for Impact Assessment and European Added Value, within the Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services of the Secretariat of the European Parliament.

To contact the Unit, please e-mail: EuropeanAddedValue@ep.europa.eu

LANGUAGE VERSIONS

Original: EN

Translations: DE, FR

DISCLAIMER

The content of this document is the sole responsibility of the author and any opinions expressed therein do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Parliament. It is addressed to the Members and staff of the EP for their parliamentary work. Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorised, provided the source is acknowledged and the European Parliament is given prior notice and sent a copy.

This document is available on the internet at: www.europarl.eu/thinktank

Manuscript completed in March 2015. Brussels © European Union, 2015.

PE 536.370

ISBN: 978-92-823-7139-8

DOI: 10.2861/871983

CAT: QA-02-15-530-EN-N

Note on methodology

Cost of Non-Europe (CoNE) reports are designed to study the possibilities for gains and/or the realisation of a 'public good' through common action at EU level in specific policy areas and sectors. They attempt to identify areas that are expected to benefit most from deeper EU integration, where the EU's added value is potentially significant.

The specific aim of this Cost of Non-Europe report is to examine the existing legal and administrative barriers, among others, that prevent cross-border volunteering activities from delivering their full potential and to assess and quantify the cost of non-Europe in political and economic terms.

Wherever possible, it identifies the root cause of the gaps and barriers that hinder cross-border volunteering and classifies them according to their nature and relevance. Moreover, it examines the different policy options included in Parliament's resolutions on volunteering¹ and ascertains the extent to which those recommendations could help to overcome the identified gaps.

It also examines the other, non-economic benefits that further EU action could deliver in this sector. Where it was not possible to quantify all the costs and effects, a qualitative complementary approach was used.

¹ European Parliament resolution of 12 June 2012 on recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU (OJ C 332 E, 15.11.2013, p. 14), and European Parliament resolution of 10 December 2013 on volunteering and voluntary activity in Europe (Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013)0549).

Table of Contents

Note on methodology	3
List of Tables	5
Executive summary	7
Introduction	9
Background and current trends	10
The cost of non-Europe for cross-border volunteering	13
Recommendations	17
ANNEX I: Research Paper on the <u>Cost of Non-Europe Report on Volunteering</u>	19
ANNEX II: European Parliament resolution of 12 June 2012 on recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU (2011/2293(INI))	161
ANNEX III: European Parliament resolution of 10 December 2013 on volunteering and voluntary activity in Europe (2013/2064(INI))	174

List of Tables

Table 1:	Economic contribution of cross-border volunteering	14
Table 2:	Estimated number of annual cross-border volunteers within the EU.....	39
Table 3:	Number of EVS volunteers in selected countries	42
Table 4:	Estimated number of annual cross-border volunteers within the EU.....	70
Table 5:	Summary of calculation of the economic value of EU cross-border volunteering activities	73
Table 6:	Tariff values of different target groups (2010)	74
Table 7:	Reference values used to calculate low, medium and high cost scenarios	75
Table 8:	Estimated annual costs of reduced time contribution by cross- border volunteers due to shorter length of placements	77
Table 9:	Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations.....	77
Table 10:	Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by public authorities	78
Table 11:	Estimated annual benefits of EU action.....	80
Table 12:	Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by EU-level Authorities*	81
Table 13:	Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by Member State Authorities*	82
Table 14:	Estimated annual net benefits of EU action	83
Table 15:	Estimated annual cost of impact of uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits in terms of potential volunteers refraining from participating in cross-border volunteering.....	84
Table 16:	Estimated annual cost of impact of uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits in terms of last-minute cancellations.....	84
Table 17:	Estimated annual indirect costs linked to last-minute cancellations.....	85
Table 18:	Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations.....	86
Table 19:	Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by public authorities	86
Table 20:	Estimated annual benefits of EU action.....	87

Table 21:	Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by EU-level Authorities*	89
Table 22:	Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by Member State Authorities*	90
Table 23:	Estimated annual net benefits of EU action	91
Table 24:	Estimated annual cost of lack of recognition of the skills and competences gained through volunteering in terms of forgone time contribution by cross-border volunteers	92
Table 25:	Estimated annual cost of information on volunteering opportunities not being adequately disseminated in terms of forgone time contribution by cross-border volunteers	93
Table 26:	Estimated annual costs of forgone time contribution due to lack of adequate training.....	94
Table 27:	Estimated annual benefits of EU action	96
Table 28:	Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by EU-level Authorities*	98
Table 29:	Estimated annual net benefits of EU action	99
Table 30:	Estimated annual cost for option 2.....	123
Table 31:	Estimated annual cost for option 4.....	126

Executive summary

For many years, the European Parliament has supported cross-border volunteering in the EU as a successful method for building and supporting European civil society. It has advocated that volunteering should be granted stronger support through the removal of barriers that hinder cross-border volunteering.

This Cost of Non-Europe study examines barriers to cross-border volunteering that prevent it from achieving its full potential and assesses the cost of non-action in both political and economic terms.

No research has ever covered the full spectrum of volunteering in all Member States. It is estimated that 92 to 94 million adults are involved in volunteering in the EU. Of this number, 7 000 volunteers take part in cross-border volunteering schemes. As most cross-border volunteers work full-time, this relatively small number of volunteers nevertheless has a substantial economic impact. This study estimates that the annual economic value of cross-border volunteering activities may range between 88 million and 176 million euro.

Volunteers and their organisations face similar barriers regardless of the type of cross-border volunteering scheme in which they are involved. Four main types of barrier were identified that have a great impact on volunteers and volunteer organisations and that could be overcome through EU action:

- the lack of legal recognition of volunteer status (with regard to the loss of social security and unemployment benefits and to access to services linked to legal residency status);
- the lack of diversity in recruitment and of information about volunteer opportunities;
- the lack of consistent recognition of the skills acquired;
- the lack of adequate training and pre-departure preparation for cross-border volunteers.

The cost assessment for this study suggests that costs associated with these barriers may range between 25 million euro and 135 million euro per year depending on the case, with an average estimate of around **65 million euro per year**. The bulk of those costs stem from the fact that volunteers are contributing less of their time to cross-border initiatives than they potentially could. Administrative costs (for example, for the provision of information and support to volunteers) account for a much smaller share of those costs.

Stronger EU action in this area could lead an increase in the visibility of cross-border volunteering and its socio-economic contribution, the development of more efficient policies on cross-border volunteering and a rise in participation. Parliament's resolution of 10 December 2013 recommends that a European statute on associations should be developed. This study estimates that in this case the costs of establishing such a statute

would be disproportionate. The main costs of establishing a statute on associations are assumed to relate to:

- True cost of the legislation (accruing to EU authorities)
- Recognition of volunteer organisations under the Statute by competent authorities (accruing to Member State authorities)
- Changes to ensure conformity with the Statute's requirements (accruing to volunteer organisations).

This study demonstrates the potential of producing a voluntary code on cross-border volunteering. In addition, existing European cross-border cooperation frameworks, which now focus primarily on activities within the framework of cohesion policies, could be extended to include cross-border volunteering.

Introduction

Volunteering concerns people's need to participate in society and to feel that they matter to others². As an active method of building civil society, volunteering contributes to the development of inter-cultural dialogue and plays a major role in combating prejudice and racism. Although the majority of European volunteers are active in their own country or in countries outside the EU, cross-border volunteering initiatives within the EU have a proven value with regard to integration, employment, social cohesion and European citizenship³.

In March 2009, the Czech Presidency of the Council of the European Union held a conference on the implementation of the Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers Across the European Union. The conference produced several key messages for policymakers with regard to cross-border volunteering:

- The need to build capacity for and create bridges among the organisers of voluntary activities;
- The need to create new opportunities for cross-border volunteering;
- The need to promote cross-border volunteering;
- The need to recognise the experience gained through volunteering and through non-formal education and learning.

These key messages were recalled in Parliament's aforementioned resolutions on volunteering adopted in 2012 and 2013. In these resolutions, Parliament called for:

- i. a legislative proposal for a European Statute for Associations to give them the legal framework within which to operate, reduce the administrative costs associated with cross-border volunteering activities and establish voluntary structures at a European level which encourage the mobility of volunteers in the EU;
- ii. a single point of contact in the form of a service with responsibility for volunteering policy;
- iii. volunteering policy to foster dialogue and cooperation between stakeholders in the various Member States.

Against this background, the study examines the barriers to cross-border volunteering that prevent it from achieving its full potential and assesses the possible gains from future EU action in that area.

² Leigh, R. et al., 'State of the World's Volunteerism Report: Universal Values for Global Well-being', United Nations Volunteers (UNV), 2011.

³ International Labour Organisation (ILO), 'Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work', ILO 2011, p. 13.

Background and current trends

The importance of volunteering has long been acknowledged by the EU. However, no research has ever covered the full spectrum of volunteering in all Member States.

The history and contextual background of volunteering in Europe varies greatly between EU countries. Whilst certain Member States have long-standing traditions involving volunteering and well-developed voluntary sectors, the voluntary sector in other countries is still emerging. The manner in which volunteering is organised in a given Member State is strongly influenced by the history, politics and culture of society in that country.

A recent analysis of volunteering identified that 92-94 million adults are involved in volunteering in the EU. This in turn implies that 22-23 % of Europeans aged over 15 years are engaged in voluntary work⁴.

The most commonly reported sectors in which volunteers are active are⁵:

- Sport and exercise
- Social, welfare and health activities
- Religious organisations
- Culture
- Recreation and leisure
- Education, training and research

These findings do not single out cross-border volunteering initiatives, but it is estimated that around 7 000 cross-border volunteers are active in the EU. At less than 1 % of the total number of volunteers in the EU, those volunteers represent only a small percentage. Nevertheless, cross-border volunteers contribute on average more hours per year than local volunteers. Their impact on society is therefore still substantive, as research demonstrates that in-country volunteers work an average of four hours per week, while cross-border volunteers tend to work full-time⁶.

Owing to its transnational nature, cross-border volunteering is considered to be more organised than volunteering at national level. Cross-border volunteering is therefore often arranged through a volunteer organisation. Whereas volunteering at national level can often be done in a person's spare time, cross-border volunteering requires full-time

⁴ GHK, 'Volunteering in the European Union', Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), 2010.

⁵ GHK, 'Volunteering in the European Union', Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), 2010.

⁶ European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound), 'Second European Quality of Life Survey: Participation in volunteering and unpaid work', Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, 2011.

involvement⁷, has a specific time frame and is often based on pre-defined tasks and responsibilities⁸. It is also due to its transnational nature that cross-border volunteers and their organisations face more barriers to their activities. Such barriers limit the time that volunteers can dedicate to volunteering activities and might very well deter potential cross-border volunteers.

Traditionally, the EU has perceived the border between Member States as a potential obstacle to development in border regions in general. Initiatives to overcome cross-border barriers first began to be developed in the 1950s, starting in the Rhine Basin, which involved border areas in France, Germany, Switzerland, Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands⁹.

However, a legal framework for cross-border cooperation was first defined only in 1980 in the European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities (the Madrid Convention)¹⁰, which was followed by three protocols to facilitate cross-border cooperation in Europe. This convention also inspired the adoption of Regulation (EC) No 1082/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on a European grouping of territorial cooperation (EGTC).

EU policies on cross-border cooperation focus mainly on government entities, rather than on volunteering schemes, although it is obvious that cross-border volunteering schemes face similar barriers. Despite such barriers, 7 000 volunteers take part in cross-border activities within the EU. Their activities are organised through different schemes and vary greatly with regard to the relations, actors, institutional settings, legal frameworks and financial tools involved. How these initiatives are deployed is determined by the way in which the Member States involved are organised, by the capacities and competencies of the authorities in each State, by the degree of access to the relevant legal and financial frameworks and by the propensity of stakeholders in border areas to cooperate.

Cross-border volunteering schemes can be divided into five different categories. International schemes such as the International Red Cross and Red Crescent also operate across borders, but they mainly place their volunteers outside the EU.

EU-funded schemes are the main suppliers of cross-border volunteers in Europe, among which the European Voluntary Service (EVS) is cited as the main source. The other volunteering schemes that provide cross-border volunteers in the EU are the Europe for Citizens programme, which has given volunteering priority in its 2014-2020 funding

⁷ Exceptions to these assumptions are those cases where people live on or close to a border and volunteer 'abroad' in their free time.

⁸ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers across Europe: Study for the Committee of the Regions', 2010.

⁹ Istituto di Sociologia Internazionale di Gorizia (ISIG), 'Manual on removing obstacles to cross-border cooperation', 2013.

¹⁰ Council of Europe, European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Cooperation between Territorial Communities or Authorities, Madrid, 1980.

scheme, the Grundtvig Programme, which aims to combat the exclusion of ageing citizens, and the EU Aid Volunteers initiative.

Cross-border volunteering is also promoted through state-funded volunteering. The focus and budgets of Member States vary, but several States have national schemes of this kind. The schemes with the largest budgets and the highest numbers of volunteers are found in Germany, Italy and France.

There are also bilateral cross-border volunteering schemes, but these are less widespread in the EU. One example is the Franco-German Youth Office (FGYO) but no specific cross-border data was identified for this scheme.

Finally, small local initiatives are run in cross-border regions, but no specific cross-border data was gathered for these schemes either.

Regardless of the type of scheme involved, volunteers and their organisations face similar barriers. Four types of barrier were identified that have a great impact on volunteers and volunteer organisations and that could be overcome through EU action:

- the lack of legal recognition for volunteer status (with regard to the loss of social security and unemployment benefits and to access to services linked to legal residency status);
- the lack of diversity in recruitment and of information about volunteer opportunities;
- the lack of consistent recognition of the skills acquired;
- the lack of adequate training and pre-departure preparation for cross-border volunteers.

The cost of non-Europe for cross-border volunteering

Nearly 100 million people in the EU volunteer their time either through public, non-profit or for-profit organisations or directly for friends or neighbours. However, despite the number of volunteers, there is little aggregated data available on the economic impact of volunteering in the EU.

National studies demonstrate that volunteering has a substantial impact on national economies. In the United Kingdom, it was calculated that for every 1 euro of public funding spent to support volunteering, volunteers give 30 euro worth of work¹¹. The economic value of formal volunteering in the United Kingdom has been estimated at more than 65 billion euro per year, i.e. 7.9 % of GDP. Another recent study on the value of the non-profit sector¹² calculated that, for France, volunteers represent 3.2 % of the total workforce and contribute 1.4 % to the country's GDP. Volunteers' contribution to Portugal's GDP is even more substantial, where non-profit organisations account for 76 % of gross value added in the field of social services. However, these national studies do not specifically calculate the impact of cross-border volunteering.

To assess the cost of the barriers to cross-border volunteering, first the impact of cross-border volunteering on the EU economy was calculated using the 'replacement cost' approach¹³. This method estimates the value of volunteering by analysing what it would cost to hire someone to do the work that volunteers perform for free. The replacement cost approach requires knowledge of the following:

- The approximate number of hours volunteered during a reference period by all EU cross-border volunteers;
- The average wage in order to estimate the value of those hours.

Based on the available information, presented in figure 1, it is estimated that the annual economic value of cross-border volunteering activities in the EU may be between **88 million** and **176 million euro**.

¹¹ European Volunteer Centre (CEV), '[Manifesto for Volunteering in Europe](#)', CEV and Volunteering England, 2006.

¹² Salamon, L. et al., '[The State of Global Civil Society and Volunteering: Latest findings from the implementation of the UN Nonprofit Handbook](#)', Working Paper No 49, Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies, Baltimore, 2012.

¹³ International Labour Organisation (ILO), 'Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work', ILO 2011.

Table 1: Economic contribution of cross-border volunteering

Concept	Economic contribution		
	6 months p.a.	9 months p.a.	12 months p.a.
Estimated number of hours volunteered per year by EU cross-border volunteers	5 880 000	8 820 000	11 760 000
Estimated number of cross-border volunteers	7 000		
Estimated average number of hours volunteered per cross-border volunteer per year	840	1 260	1 680
Estimated average hourly gross earnings per worker in the social sector	15 euro		
Average annual gross earnings per worker in the social sector	25 000 euro		
Average number of hours worked per worker per year	1 680		
Estimated annual economic value of cross-border volunteering activities in the EU	88 200 000 euro	132 300 000 euro	176 400 000 euro
Estimated annual economic value of cross-border volunteering activities per volunteer in the EU	12 600 euro	18 900 euro	25 200 euro

The replacement cost approach may subsequently be used to estimate the economic value lost due to the aforementioned barriers. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this study has identified four types of barrier that have a great impact on volunteers and volunteer organisations and that could be overcome through EU action, namely:

- the lack of legal recognition for volunteer status (with regard to the loss of social security and unemployment benefits and to access to services linked to legal residency status);
- the lack of diversity in recruitment and of information on volunteer opportunities;
- the lack of consistent recognition of the skills acquired;
- the lack of adequate training and pre-departure preparation for cross-border volunteers.

For each of these barriers, the most significant direct and indirect costs were identified and then quantified as far as possible. This study paid special attention to the expected distribution of estimated costs by grouping them according to the target group in which they were expected to accrue. Nevertheless, it must be noted that this assessment demonstrates that the barriers are often interconnected and that the effect of removing a given barrier depends highly on what other related measures are taken. This distinctive feature made it difficult to identify the costs associated with each specific barrier. The cost assessment was therefore converted into an overall assessment, which demonstrated that the total costs associated with these barriers may be between 25 million and 135 million euro per year, with an estimate average of around **65 million euro** per year¹⁴.

¹⁴ The detailed calculations can be found in Chapter 4 of the Annex.

To unleash the full potential of cross-border volunteering, the existing barriers be removed through the setting of uniform standards across the EU. Parliament's resolutions on volunteering recommend that a European Statute on Associations will be developed to ensure that volunteer organisations are given proper legal and institutional recognition. However, developing statutes of this type in European legislation poses particular difficulties. Second, this study calculated that in the case of establishing a European Statute on Associations, the costs seem disproportional. The main costs for this option are assumed to relate to:

- Legislative development including negotiations (accruing to EU authorities)
- Recognition of volunteer organisations under the Statute by competent authorities (accruing to Member State authorities)
- Changes to ensure conformity with the Statute's requirements (accruing to volunteer organisations).

The costs entailed would include research and policy development, consultations, impact assessment, legislative preparation and all costs associated with carrying out a legislative negotiation in the Council and in the European Parliament.

This report suggests that a better target would be instead to adopt a voluntary code on cross-border volunteering via a Commission communication. A voluntary code on cross-border volunteering would provide volunteer organisations with guidance on how they should be set up and organised. The content of the code could be similar to, or even more extensive than, any legislative proposal. In particular, a request could be made to the Commission to develop a core set of standards that all cross-border volunteering associations would aim to follow, as well as additional 'gold' standards for associations which want and are able to go further. A communication of this kind could be developed and adopted by the Commission through its internal procedures and would not be subject to legislative procedures. Such an approach was used by the European Foundation Centre to develop its guiding principles¹⁵.

In addition the Madrid Convention and Regulation (EC) No 1082/2006 on a European grouping of territorial cooperation (EGTC) could be applied to cross-border volunteering schemes, in particular those funded by the state. Together with the aforementioned code, these existing legal frameworks for cross-border cooperation could facilitate cross-border volunteering by providing a set of standards which would remove the current barriers.

This study also found that removing the barriers to cross-border volunteering would have a substantial social and political impact. Volunteering in general provides a way to gain confidence, meet new people, make new friends and extend one's social network. It gives people a 'sense of usefulness' and/or a 'sense of achievement', which are often linked to the desire to help others. The knowledge that one has made a difference to

¹⁵ European Foundation Centre, 'EFC Principles of Good Practice: A Self-Regulatory Tool for Foundations', 2014.

another person often leads to enhanced self-esteem¹⁶. The removal of the aforementioned barriers would allow volunteers to gain even more social satisfaction from their efforts. With regard to cross-border volunteering, the removal of barriers would also help to increase cultural awareness and it would contribute to European integration, including by providing increased possibilities for individuals to take part in informal learning and intercultural exchange, such as learning a foreign language, developing general skills that would be applicable in the workplace of their country of origin, and enhancing their social competences and sense of solidarity¹⁷.

Volunteer organisations will also benefit from increased cross-border volunteering thanks to the removal of barriers, as cross-border volunteering provides organisations with valuable intercultural experience and a larger workforce, thereby enabling such organisations to deliver better services.

Finally, societies as a whole will benefit from increased cross-border volunteering as it encourages good citizenship in general. It establishes a sense of solidarity and increases citizen participation in social life on both sides of the border. It also contributes to community well-being by strengthening people's sense of belonging and by increasing participation and overall happiness. Volunteering also enhances the resilience of communities with regard to their 'collective capacity to engage and mobilise community resources to respond to, and influence, change'¹⁸.

¹⁶ GHK, 'Volunteering in the European Union', Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), 2010.

¹⁷ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, Study for the Committee of the Regions', 2010, p. 59.

¹⁸ Leigh, R. et al., 'State of the World's Volunteerism Report: Universal Values for Global Well-Being', United Nations Volunteers (UNV), 2011, p. 87.

Recommendations

For many years, Parliament has stressed that cross-border volunteering in the EU is a successful method for building and supporting European civil society. Such volunteering also contributes to the development of intercultural dialogue in Europe and plays a substantial role in combating prejudice and racism. For these reasons, Parliament advocated increasing the support provided to cross-border volunteers and their organisation in the EU by removing the barriers that hinder them. The cost assessment included in this study estimates the Cost of Non-Europe associated with such barriers to be around **65 million euro** per year.

There is a lack of European statistical data on cross-border volunteering and on volunteering in general. With the exception of a few countries, volunteering is not covered in official Eurostat statistics. Stronger EU action on data collection would increase the visibility of cross-border volunteering and its socioeconomic contribution, which in turn would improve the visibility of volunteer work and therefore the confidence placed in it. This would also encourage the development of more effective policies to support cross-border volunteering in the EU, which could attract more potential volunteers.

A number of areas have been identified in which the EU could act to support cross-border volunteering in the EU:

- A voluntary code on cross-border volunteering, which would provide volunteer organisations with guidance on how they should be set up and organised. The content of the code could be similar to, or even more extensive than, any legislative proposal.
- The Commission could be asked to develop a core set of standards that all cross-border volunteering associations would aim to follow, as well as additional 'gold' standards for associations which want and are able to go further.
- The EU Regulation on European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation and the Council of Europe's Madrid Convention on cross border cooperation could be applied to cross-border volunteering schemes, in particular those funded at the national level. These existing legal frameworks for cross-border cooperation could facilitate cross-border volunteering by providing a set of standards which would remove the current cross-border barriers.

Research Paper on the Cost of Non-Europe Report on Volunteering

Annex I

Research paper By Milieu Ltd

Abstract

- Cross-border volunteering initiatives within the EU mainly operate under international or EU funded placements or national funded schemes. They represent a small share compared with all volunteers within the EU (data collected for this study estimated the portion as less than 10,000 volunteers a year).
- The study examines legal, administrative and other barriers to cross-border volunteering that prevent cross-border volunteering from achieving its full potential, including uncertainty and risks of forfeiting social security benefits; unclear framework for obtaining a residence permit in some hosting countries; lack of clarity with regard to recognition of the skills and competences gained through volunteering; positive action and information on volunteering opportunities and training and preparation for volunteers.
- The magnitude of the costs of non-action both in political and economic terms (i.e. Cost of Non-Europe) assessed for selected barriers in the context of this study appear low. However, stronger EU action could increase the visibility of cross-border volunteering and its socioeconomic contribution, fostering a more efficient model for cross-border volunteering and enhancing participation. Areas where the EU can act to promote cross-border volunteering relate to funding programmes, information events, research to allow more evidence-based policy making and priority setting in funding programmes, developing tools for reflecting upon and demonstrating cross-border volunteering skills and engaging in dialogue with representatives of volunteer organisation.
- The study examined four options for improving dialogue between EU institutions and civil society, including the establishment of an EU Statute for Associations. Given the likely costs and difficulties of adopting the Statute, this study puts forward a more feasible and efficient approach to develop a Communication that serves the same objectives as a Statute but which would be adopted on a voluntary basis, in combination with a stakeholder engagement plan (for e.g. through the establishment of a European Commission Steering or Advisory Committee on cross border volunteering issues or a European Parliament Intergroup).

AUTHORS

This study has been written by Levent Altan, Vanessa Leigh, Jelena Milovanovic, Nienke Van Der Burgt (legal/policy analysis) and Guillermo Hernández, Sandra Planes and Gijs Nolet (cost assessment), at the request of the European Added Value Unit of the Directorate for Impact Assessment and European Added Value, within the Directorate General for Parliamentary Research Service of the European Parliament.

The study was supported by a panel of senior experts: Gabriella Civico (European Volunteer Centre); Robert Leigh (Senior Consultant, United Nations Volunteers (UNV)); Eberhard Lueder (Red Cross EU Office) and Alix Masson (European Youth Forum). Piotr Sadowski (CSV and Volonteuropa) carried out the peer review.

LINGUISTIC VERSIONS

Original: EN

DISCLAIMER

The content of this document is the sole responsibility of the author and any opinions expressed therein do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Parliament. It is addressed to the Members and staff of the EP for their parliamentary work. Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorised, provided the source is acknowledged and the European Parliament is given prior notice and sent a copy.

Manuscript completed in July 2014. Brussels © European Union, 2014.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	24
Overview of EU cross-border volunteering (Chapter 2)	24
Barriers to cross-border volunteering (Chapter 3)	25
Cost assessment (Chapter 4)	26
EU actions (Chapter 5)	27
Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society (Chapter 6)	27
List of Abbreviations	29
Chapter 1	30
1. Scope of the study	30
2. Methodology	31
2.1. Desk research	31
2.2. Initial analysis and determination of long list of barriers	32
2.3. Stakeholder consultation process	32
2.3.1. Semi-structured interviews	32
2.3.2. Stakeholder survey	33
2.4. Shortlist of barriers and analysis	33
2.5. Data collection	34
2.6. Cost assessment	35
2.7. Examination of legislative actions requested in the Scurria reports	35
2.8. Research on the EU Statute for Associations; development of policy options	35
Chapter 2 EU cross-border volunteering overview	37
1. Main characteristics of the cross-border voluntary sector in the EU	38
1.1. Structure and duration	38
1.2. Age categories	38
1.3. Profile and skills required of volunteers	38
1.4. Main sectors and objectives of volunteering	38
2. Size of the sector	39
3. Overview of the main-cross-border volunteer schemes in the EU	40
3.1. International schemes	40
3.2. EU funded schemes	40
3.3. State funded schemes	44
3.4. Bilateral cross-border volunteer schemes	47
4. Civil society volunteer organisations involved in EU cross border volunteering	48
5. Benefits of volunteering	52

Chapter 3 Barriers to cross-border volunteering	56
1. Criminal record check procedures	57
2. Legal and regulatory framework for volunteering	59
3. Lack of mutual recognition between Member States	61
4. Lack of clarity regarding tax exemptions for employee volunteering	61
5. Lack of sustainable funding for organisations (EU funding programmes; red tape; other)	62
6. Lack of clarity with regard to recognition of skills and competences gained through volunteering	62
7. Training and preparation for volunteers (including cultural/linguistic issues)	63
8. Insufficient positive action and information on volunteering opportunities	63
9. Diversity in recruitment of volunteers	64
10. Measuring: difficulties in obtaining comparable data to measure the contribution of volunteering	66
Chapter 4: Assessment of costs of barriers to cross border volunteering and potential benefits of eu action	67
1. Introduction	67
2. Cost assessment methodology	68
3. Assessment of costs of barriers to cross-border volunteering and of potential benefits of EU action	76
Chapter 5 EU actions	100

Chapter 6: Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society	102
1. Introduction	102
2. Historical Background to EU Statutes	102
3. General objectives of EU Statutes	104
3.1. Civil Dialogue	104
4. The problems that EU Statutes seek to resolve	105
4.1. Problems arising in the establishment and functioning of organisations	106
4.2. Different administrative rules	106
4.3. Different taxation rules	107
4.4. Problems relating to the recognition of organisations at the EU level	107
4.5. Public consultation design: concerns relating to the scope of individual consultations	107
4.6. Openness and reach: identification of stakeholders and communication with them	108
5. Options for a Statute for a European Association	111
5.1. Widening the scope of the proposal for a Regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation	111
5.2. Proposal for a Council Regulation on the European Statute for Associations	112
5.2.1. Content of the Statute	113
5.2.2. National approaches to self-regulation by civil society volunteer organisations	113
5.2.3. Principles of good practice established by EU volunteer organisations	117
5.2.4. Existing and previously proposed EU Statutes	117
5.2.5. EESC Criteria for engagement in dialogue with the EU institutions	119
5.2.6. Formation of a volunteer association	120
5.2.7. Organisation of a voluntary association	120
5.2.8. Feasibility Considerations	120
5.2.9. Advantages and drawbacks	121
5.2.10. Cost assessment	122
5.3. Recommendation on a volunteer code	123
5.3.1. Cost assessment	124
5.4. Options, other than a Statute, to strengthen institutional recognition	124
5.4.1. Advantages and drawbacks	125
5.4.2. Cost assessment	125
5.5. Summary of options	127
ANNEX I: Bibliography	129
Annex II: List of stakeholders consulted	136
Annex III: Scurria recommendations on cross-border volunteering – EU follow-up and recommendations for action	138
Annex IV: Data identified on cross-border volunteering	150

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study provides an overview of EU cross-border volunteering and its characteristics; it examines legal, administrative and other barriers to cross-border volunteering that prevent cross-border volunteering from achieving its full potential and assesses the costs cost of non-action both in political and economic terms (i.e. Cost of Non-Europe) for selected barriers. The study also identifies EU actions in this area and recommends areas for further action. Finally, the study assesses four options for improving dialogue between the EU and volunteer civil society organisations.

Overview of EU cross-border volunteering (Chapter 2)

Cross-border volunteering is considered to be more organised than volunteering at national level, and is typically organised through civil society volunteer organisations. The duration of placements can vary from a few days to over a year. Many placements involve young volunteers, but there are some programmes in place to promote senior volunteering. While some cross-border volunteering placements require specific skills, many (including those sponsored by the European Voluntary Service (EVS)) do not.

The proportion of cross-border volunteering compared with all volunteering in the EU remains relatively small. The main cross-border volunteering initiatives in the EU operate under international or EU funded placements or nationally funded schemes.

Many international schemes send volunteers abroad, but these are mainly for placements outside of the EU. The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies has 780,000 volunteers active in the EU, mostly in-country with a small number sent across the EU, for example in the context of civil protection (figures specific to cross-border volunteering are not available). Regarding EU funded schemes, the EVS is the major initiative sponsoring cross-border volunteering for young people (18 to 30 years old). Between 2007 and 2014, some 28,346 volunteers were sent abroad within the EU. The EVS continues under the Erasmus+ programme (2014-2020). An estimated 10,000 volunteers are expected to serve abroad in 2014 with numbers increasing throughout the programme lifecycle and anticipated to reach around 20,000 volunteers in 2020¹⁹. Another source of EU funding is the Europe for Citizen's programme, set up to promote citizens' understanding of the Union and foster EU citizenship.

Several Member States have national schemes that promote cross-border volunteering. The most well-established schemes were identified in France, Germany and Italy, with initiatives also identified in Luxembourg and the Czech Republic.

The benefits of volunteering for volunteers, hosting civil society volunteer organisations, and for society as a whole are well documented. They include improving employability, gaining confidence and increasing social networks, allowing older persons to remain engaged in professional activity, promoting good citizenship and a sense of solidarity. From an economic perspective, studies such as the 2013 Johns Hopkins University study outline the contribution of volunteering towards GDP. Specific benefits of cross-border volunteering beyond those

¹⁹ Source: Email correspondence with Mariann Klingberg, DG EAC Unit D1, 12 June 2013.

mentioned above are less well documented but there does appear to be a clear benefit in terms of increased cultural awareness and solidarity at EU level.

Barriers to cross-border volunteering (Chapter 3)

An extensive list of barriers to cross-border volunteering was identified in the literature and further explored through stakeholder interviews and surveys. These barriers include administrative/legal barriers; financial barriers; as well as barriers linked to recruitment, training and recognition of volunteering.

Barriers considered for the cost assessment were those having a specific impact on cross-border volunteering, that may be susceptible to EU action, and that have not already been subject to EU/Member State action. The focus was also on barriers likely to have the greatest impact on volunteers/civil society volunteer organisation and that affect the largest proportion of those groups. Using the selection/exclusion criteria described above the barriers described in the following table were selected for the cost assessment:

Barriers shortlisted	Recommended EU actions
<i>Administrative/legal barriers (these stem from there being a lack of a clear legal framework for volunteering at EU level)</i>	
1. Volunteering is not a legal ground for obtaining a residence permit in some hosting countries. This mainly concerns long term cross-border volunteers and can affect their access to every day services in the host country (e.g. banking). Practical impacts include time spent by host organisations to support volunteers address this barrier.	Provision of information to competent authorities about the existence of this barrier and its effects, as well as coordination of Member States’ actions to remove this barrier. Specific EU actions could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Setting up a European Parliament Intergroup on volunteering .- Development of a stakeholder engagement plan including setting up a Steering group.
2. Uncertainty and risks of forfeiting social security benefits. Rules applicable to receiving social benefits vary across Member States. The prospect of losing out on benefits on return home may deter people from volunteering abroad.	
<i>Recruitment, training and recognition of volunteering</i>	
3. Lack of clarity with regard to recognition of the skills and competences gained through volunteering. This can be exacerbated in a cross-border context where skills learnt abroad are less likely to be recognised upon returning to the country of origin than home acquired skills, and lead to a reduced demand for going abroad.	The Commission Recommendation to the Council - of 20 December 2012 on the validation of non-formal and informal learning should be fully implemented in advance of target date of 2018 to ensure volunteering is recognised.
4. Insufficient positive action and information on volunteering opportunities can lead to fewer people coming forward to volunteer abroad.	The Commission should organize information events on possibilities offered by different funding lines including Erasmus + and Europe for Citizen’s programme.

Barriers shortlisted	Recommended EU actions
5. Inadequate training and preparation for volunteers (including cultural and linguistic preparation) can lead to volunteers terminating their placement early or to a lack of continuity (hosting organisation refusing to receive further volunteers; volunteers not engaging in future placements).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projects should be funded under the Europe for Citizens Funding Programme to ensure training for volunteer managers. - Information on funding opportunities under this programme should be disseminated. - EU should resort to social media to promote volunteering opportunities, including awareness of the European Youth Portal. - The European Youth Portal should be updated more proactively. - EVS in particular should invest further in pre-departure preparation, particularly for marginalised/disadvantaged groups.

Other barriers such as criminal record check requirements; lack of sustainable funding for civil society volunteer organisations (and red tape for accessing funding); lack of diversity in the pool of volunteers sent abroad; and difficulties in obtaining comparable data to measure the contribution of volunteering, were excluded from a detailed assessment based on the criteria above.

Cost assessment (Chapter 4)

The illustrative assessment The cost-assessment of selected barriers to cross cross-border volunteering, which is essentially based on stakeholder consultations, suggests that costs associated with these barriers may range between approximately EUR25m and EUR135m a year depending on the scenarios, with a central estimate of about EUR65m per year. The bulk of these costs stem from volunteers contributing less of their time to cross-border initiative than they potentially could. Administrative costs (for e.g. provision of information and support to affected volunteers) account for a much smaller share of these costs.

Compared to other policy areas or economic sectors for which EU value added or Cost of None Europe assessments have been carried out (e.g. Common Security and Defence, EUR26bn; combatting violence against women, EUR7bn; single European transport area, EUR5bn), the magnitude of the costs assessed in the context of this study appear low. This relates to the fact that cross-border volunteering seems to be a relatively marginal phenomenon (less than 10,000 volunteers a year) compared to the EU volunteering sector as a whole which amounts to tens of millions of volunteers annually.

Issues such as criteria for issuing residence permits, entitlement to social and unemployment benefits, training and recognition of cross-border volunteering could help limit part of the costs arising from an absence of a common European approach. Stronger EU action in this area could also lead to benefits beyond cost avoidance by increasing the visibility of cross-border volunteering and its socioeconomic contribution, fostering a more efficient model for cross-border volunteering and enhancing participation.

EU actions (Chapter 5)

While there are various self-regulation initiatives at Member State level, there is no express Regulation on volunteering at EU level.

Nevertheless, the EU can act in a number of ways, for example, through information events; research to allow more evidence-based policy making and priority setting in funding programmes; developing tools for reflecting upon and demonstrating cross-border volunteering skills; and engaging in dialogue with representatives of volunteer organisation. Indeed, recommendations have already been put forward in the 2013 Scurria report for both national and EU action and for action relating to both domestic and cross-border volunteering. Recommendations specific to cross-border volunteering have been examined with new suggestions put forward taking into account identified problems and gaps and additional suggestions. These include for example recommendations to promote social inclusion through volunteering, improved dissemination of positive information on cross-border volunteering and investment in training, ensuring the recognition of volunteering through Commission Recommendation of 2012 on the validation of non-formal and informal learning, and improving dialogue between the EU and civil society.

Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society (Chapter 6)

The European Parliament Scurria report recommended developing a European Statute on Associations in order to help ensure that volunteer organisations are given proper legal and institutional recognition²⁰. Organisations actively promoting the European Statute for Associations contacted for this study indicated that their main objective for a Statute is institutional recognition, which is linked to strengthening of their position in civil dialogue.

The study therefore examined **four options** for **improving dialogue between EU institutions and civil society**, examining advantages and drawbacks and evaluating the cost effectiveness:

- Option 1: Widening the scope of the proposal for a Regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation (EFS);
- Option 2: Proposal for a Council Regulation setting up a European Statute for Associations;
- Option 3: Recommendation on a voluntary code through a Commission Communication;
- Option 4: A 'stakeholder engagement plan' - the establishment of a European Commission Steering or Advisory Committee on cross border volunteering issues or a European Parliament InterGroup.

Cost elements considered included costs related to legislative development (for e.g. negotiations); changes to ensure conformity with the Statute's requirements; setting up the Steering Committee (accruing to EU authorities); preparing, organising, conducting and attending stakeholder meetings (accruing to volunteer organisations and EU authorities). Given the likely costs and difficulties of adopting the Statute, the study recommends following a combination of Options 3 and 4: the Commission could develop a Communication which serves the same objectives as a Statute but which would be adopted on a voluntary basis and also

²⁰ European Parliament, Resolution of 10 December 2013 on volunteering and voluntary activity in Europe (2013/2064(INI)), 10 December 2013, P7_TA(2013)0549, p. 7.

serve as a means to improving engagement with volunteer organisations. The European Parliament could also adopt resolutions or commitments to the same effect (Option 3). Other ways of engaging actively with volunteer organisations could involve setting up informal bodies, such as a Steering Committee for ad-hoc consultations, or a platform to exchange information and ideas or best practices (Option 4).

List of Abbreviations

bn	Billion
CA	Competent Authority
CSR	Corporate social responsibility
EVS	European Voluntary Service
EESC	European Economic and Social Committee
EU	European Union
m	Million
p.a.	per annum (per year)
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
TEU	Treaty on the European Union
TEU	Small and medium-sized enterprises
SME	per year

Chapter 1

1. Scope of the study

The volunteering landscape is broad and diverse and there is no single definition of what a civil society volunteer organisation (volunteer organisation) is. Volunteering can take place in a formal or informal setting, for short or long periods and can be organised by NGOs, the State or private companies. As such it is necessary to establish certain parameters for this study. This research focuses specifically on cross-border volunteering fulfilling the following criteria:

Cross border volunteering criteria

- It takes place outside the volunteer country of residence, from one EU country to another irrespective of nationality;
- It is unremunerated (except for volunteer allowances and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses);
- It is undertaken voluntarily on the basis of a person's free choice and motivation;
- It benefits volunteers, those receiving services from a volunteer association, communities and societies as a whole.

There are many forms of voluntary engagement abroad: work camps or short-term volunteering (up to 1 month), medium (1-3 months) and long-term engagement (over 3 months). Most of the administrative/legal barriers to cross-border volunteering analysed in the report apply to long-term volunteering as it requires more preparation, planning and paperwork than other types of activities²¹.

The issue of not for profit volunteering within commercial enterprises (such as Corporate Social responsibility) was also considered. However, feedback from the European Volunteering Employee Network members revealed that there are very few examples of cross-border volunteering of employees within Europe. Employee volunteering tends to occur from the EU to developing countries, but not within the EU²².

Volunteering organised by for profit companies were not included in the scope of the study as most volunteers participating in these initiatives travel outside the EU.

The study focuses on **formal volunteering** (i.e. volunteering carried out through a volunteer organisation), in light of the difficulty of collecting data on informal volunteering.

²¹ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', year?

²² Interview with EVEN Network, 24 April 2014.

While research suggests that the main forms of cross-border volunteering are engaged in by younger persons, the study considers **all age groups**.

For the purpose of this report, references to organisations/volunteer organisations are used interchangeably throughout the report when referring to civil society volunteer organisation

2. Methodology

The following steps were taken during the course of this study and are described further in the methodology below:

- Desk research
- Initial analysis and determination of long list of barriers
- Stakeholder consultation process
- Semi-structured interviews
- Stakeholder survey
- Data collection
- Cost assessment
- Examination of legislative actions requested in the Scurria reports
- Research on the EU Statute for Associations; development of policy options and cost assessment

2.1. Desk research

The study analysed the characteristics of cross-border volunteering, barriers to cross-border volunteering and EU actions through a literature review (sources consulted are listed in Annex I). The focus of the desk research was on the following:

- **Main characteristics of cross-border volunteering sector in the EU**, including its size and scale (number of volunteers sent abroad and the extent of volunteering), main sectors and schemes, main volunteer organisations active in this field;
- **Benefits of volunteering**, including benefits for volunteers, volunteer organisations and for society as a whole and contribution to the EU economy;
- Legislative, administrative and other (language, cultural, financial) **barriers to cross-border volunteering**;

Follow-up to the **legislative actions** requested by the European Parliament Scurria reports, including actions at EU level and selected Member State best practices.

2.2. Initial analysis and determination of long list of barriers

While there is a range of literature setting out the various difficulties that volunteers and organisations face in this field at national level, there is little focus on which of these barriers might or do affect cross-border volunteering. Equally, there is little information on specific cross-border barriers which are not also national level barriers.

Therefore, to identify barriers that operate in a cross-border context, all the potential implications of any given barrier, how these might interact with the way that volunteers make choices about cross-border volunteering, and the way that such volunteering operates in practice, were examined. A long list of barriers to cross-border volunteering was established.

2.3. Stakeholder consultation process

2.3.1. Semi-structured interviews

Stakeholder interviews were carried out with aim of gaining further qualitative insight into barriers to cross-border volunteering, assessing the impact of these barriers on volunteer organisations, and gathering quantitative data concerning practical implications of each barrier. Stakeholders were asked about the practical impacts of the barrier, including time spent by volunteer organisations in resolving an administrative issues/advising volunteers; volunteers foregoing the volunteering experience or returning home early.

Selection of representative pool of interviewees

The stakeholders were selected from different sectors and types of volunteer organisations, to ensure a representative sample of the cross-border volunteering sector, including:

- Sending volunteer organisations;
- Hosting volunteer organisations;
- Representatives of employee volunteering (EVEN Network);
- Representatives of State funded schemes;
- Representatives of the Red Cross.

It also included a balance of sectors, including sports sector, church association, rescue organisations and fire services, and from different countries including France, Slovenia, United Kingdom, Spain, Germany, Belgium, Italy.

In total 15 stakeholders were consulted. See Annex II for the list of stakeholders consulted. The broad cross-section of stakeholders consulted provided a good representative view of the cross-border volunteering sector.

A note on theoretical sampling: in light of the small amount of qualitative information available in literature on the cross-border volunteering sector, the semi-structured interviews helped fine-tune the research and understanding of barriers. Responses from initial interviews helped guide the ensuing interviews as researchers gained stronger insight into the practical implications of the barriers from a cross-border perspective.

2.3.2. Stakeholder survey

Following the semi-structured interviews, a follow-up survey was sent to the same representative sample of interviewees to gather further elements for the production of quantitative estimates. This was to overcome the difficulties encountered during the project in obtaining quantitative data through the semi-structured interviews.

The survey aimed to obtain average values on characteristics of cross-border volunteering, including the typical duration of EU cross-border volunteering placements, the percentage of EU cross-border volunteer dedicated full-time to the assignment, and the time spent by volunteer organisations to organise the cross-border activities for each volunteer sent/hosted. The survey asked for specific ranges of estimates to help determine the scale and cost of barriers. The following box presents an example (see the complete survey in Annex VI)

Approximately how much time does your organisation spend helping volunteers deal with problems generated by this barrier (e.g. opening a bank account; obtaining health insurance; access to services, etc.)?

- ☐ No time spent
- ☒ 1 - 4h/volunteer affected
- ☐ 5 - 8h/volunteer affected
- ☐ 9 - 12h/volunteer affected
- ☐ > 12h/volunteer affected (please specify)

2.4. Shortlist of barriers and analysis

Based on the feedback obtained from the stakeholder consultation process, the Research Team established a shortlist of the barriers using a set of exclusion criteria, as well as selection criteria based on the proportion of volunteers affected and the magnitude of the impact:

Criteria for shortlisting the barriers

Exclusion criteria:

- Not a cross-border issue;
- No scope for EU action;
- The barrier has already been resolved by EU/Member State action.

Selection criteria:

- Does the barrier have a sizeable impact on volunteer organisations?
- Does the barrier have a sizeable impact on volunteers?
- Does the barrier affect a sizeable proportion of volunteer sectors?
- Does the barrier affect a sizeable proportion of volunteers?

The barriers were then assessed according to a rating of Low, Medium and High:

- Barriers which either did not fulfil any of the selection criteria or fulfilled at least one exclusion criteria were rated as Low.
- Barriers which did not meet any exclusion criteria and fulfilled one to three selection criteria were rated as Medium.
- Barriers which did not meet any exclusion criteria and fulfilled four selection criteria were rated as High.

The barriers that achieved a Medium or High rating were selected for the cost analysis. The full exclusion/selection table is presented in **Annex V**.

2.5. Data collection

The study collected available data on cross-border volunteering within the EU, including the number of volunteers sent under the most significant EU funded schemes (such as the European Voluntary Service) or State funded schemes.

Very little data on the number of volunteers engaging in cross-border volunteering was available through desk research. Data was either simply not available, or was not even disaggregated to reflect the share of EU volunteering (for international schemes), let alone the share of volunteering that operates cross-border.

The data was gathered by contacting the main cross-border volunteer schemes identified during the desk research. Data was obtained by phone/email on selected EU schemes and the most significant State funded scheme sponsoring cross-border volunteering within the EU.

Data on local/national volunteer mobility initiatives is very often not collected systematically. International schemes such as the Red Cross were also contacted but no disaggregated data was identified. The raw data gathered is presented in Annex IV.

An important limitation in the data gathered is that it is not collected for the same periods of time across schemes. The Research Team produced an annual average based on the data presented in Annex IV.

2.6. Cost assessment

The cost assessment provides an assessment of the economic implications of selected barriers to cross-border volunteering, as well as of the potential benefits of further EU action to remove those barriers. For a step by step methodology to the cost assessment, please refer to **Chapter 4**.

2.7. Examination of legislative actions requested in the Scurria reports

The study also examined the specific recommendations and actions made in the European Parliament Scurria reports.

This included an assessment of the state of play of legislative and non-legislative recommendations mentioned in the two Scurria reports, follow-up actions and gaps.

2.8. Research on the EU Statute for Associations; development of policy options

Information on the EU Statute for Associations was obtained by contacting key stakeholders involved with the Statute including:

- European Alliance for the Statute for Europe (including supporting organisations)
- European Economic and Social Committee (EESC)
- European Commission (DG Enterprise and Industry and Directorate General Internal Market and Services)

Based on this stakeholder consultation and the shortlist of barriers three legislative options and one soft-law option were developed for an EU Statute for Associations and other measures to resolve relevant problems.

Stakeholder interviews confirmed that a Statute was not likely to address the barriers identified as being the most significant in cross-border volunteering but rather related to improving stakeholder engagement to EU institutions.

Based on the research findings, four options were examined, of which one was rejected and three were subject to a cost assessment. This broad approach to the development of the Statute has been considered in terms of how it might be implemented (what type of instrument will be used), its effects (what obligations will be placed on volunteer organisations and national authorities), and the Statute's content and scope.

Chapter 2 EU cross-border volunteering overview

Key findings

- EU cross-border volunteering fosters EU identity and solidarity, helps tackle discrimination and promotes social inclusion; it engages people of all age and encourages intergenerational cooperation;
- Cross-border volunteering is typically more structured than volunteering on a national level due to its transnational nature, with placements lasting from a few days to over year;
- The proportion of cross-border volunteering compared with all volunteering in the EU remains relatively small. The main cross-border volunteering initiatives in the EU operate under international or EU funded placements or national funded schemes in a limited number of Member States (including Germany, Italy, France, Luxembourg, Czech Republic).
- The European Voluntary Service is the principle EU initiative promoting EU cross-border volunteering. Between 2007 and 2014 , close to 30,000 young people engaged in cross-border volunteering under this scheme; the EU also promotes senior volunteering with programmes such as the Grundtvig programme.

Volunteering is a basic expression of human relationships. It is about people's need to participate in their societies and to feel that they matter to others²³. It has a proven value for integration, employment, social cohesion and European citizenship²⁴. At the level of the EU, there has been a general upward trend in the number of **volunteers active in the EU** over the last ten years. It was estimated that in 2010 the number of volunteers in the EU ranged between 100 and 150 million²⁵.

As regards **cross-border volunteering within the EU**, this is a valuable activity which has particular potential in promoting education, employment and citizenship. The sections below outline the main characteristics of the cross-border volunteer sector and the benefits of volunteering for volunteers, volunteer organisations and society as a whole.

²³ Leigh, R. et al, 'State of the world's volunteerism report. Universal values for global well-being', UN 2011.

²⁴ International Labour Organisation (ILO), 'Manual on the measurement of volunteer work', ILO 2011, p. 13.

²⁵ GHK, 'Study on volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010.

1. Main characteristics of the cross-border voluntary sector in the EU

1.1. Structure and duration

Because of its transnational nature, cross-border volunteering is often considered to be more organised than volunteering at a national level. Typically, cross-border volunteering is arranged within a volunteer organisation. Whereas volunteering at national level can often be done in a person's spare time, cross-border volunteering requires full-time involvement²⁶, has a specific time frame and is often based on pre-defined tasks and responsibilities²⁷. The duration of cross-border volunteer placements varies greatly, and can be from a few days to over a year.

1.2. Age categories

While many cross-border placements involve young people, with some programmes such as the European Voluntary Service (EVS – described below) setting age limits for persons (up to 35). However, there are also programmes aimed at other age groups, including within the new Erasmus+ funding programme (which incorporates the former EU funded Grundtvig Senior Volunteering Programme)t aimed at people aged 50 and over. Under the SEVEN scheme, which is a network promoting senior volunteering (described below), a typical active senior volunteer is a retired woman, with an acceptable knowledge of a foreign language belonging to a medium or high social class.

1.3. Profile and skills required of volunteers

Cross-border volunteering is open equally to specialised and non-specialised volunteers and often serves as a tool for acquiring experience. Some programmes require specific skills. Axega, the Galician civil protection organisation, for example, gathers professional firefighters from Spain who are deployed to neighbouring Portugal in fire emergency responses²⁸. Other schemes such as those sponsored under EVS are open to volunteers without specific profiles and skills. Sending volunteer organisations can also provide pre-departure training, including language and cultural training²⁹.

1.4. Main sectors and objectives of volunteering

Regarding types of volunteer organisations accredited under the EVS, the most significant source of cross-border volunteering in the EU, the main areas of focus include firstly fostering European awareness and identity; followed by combating forms of discrimination and fostering

²⁶ Exceptions to these assumptions are the cases where people live on or close to a border and volunteer 'abroad' in their free time.

²⁷ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', year?

²⁸ Interview with Axega, Galician civil protection organisation, 15 April 2014.

²⁹ Interview with Slovenian Cave Rescue Service, 17 April 2014.

artistic and cultural activities; providing services in the social field (healthcare, civil protection, education); actions related to the environment; and supporting third countries (for example, post-conflict rehabilitation and development and cooperation)³⁰. As regards volunteering among seniors, this occurs mostly in social care, as well as in culture and youth education.

2. Size of the sector

The proportion of cross-border volunteering among all volunteering activity in the EU remains relatively small and there is little robust data on the number of volunteers sent and hosted abroad within the EU.

The EU Youth Report cites a 'Youth on the Move' Flash Eurobarometer from 2011 revealing that only around 2% of young respondents reported having spent a period abroad for the purpose of cross-border volunteering. This is taken from a pool of young people having engaged in mobility programmes and is not representative of the EU young population as a whole. While this figure does not take into account other forms of volunteering or non-EU initiatives, it reflects the main share of cross-border volunteering within EU. The table below outlines the main data identified on cross-border volunteering in the EU for the major EU and Member State funded schemes. It is calculated based on annual averages from disparate data between [2007-2014]. Full details on this data and sources are provided in Annex IV.

Table 2: Estimated number of annual cross-border volunteers within the EU

	Country	Estimated number of EU cross-border volunteers / year
European Voluntary Service (EVS) Scheme	EU	4000
State Funded Schemes		
<i>FSJ- Voluntary Year of Social Service</i>	Germany	1500
<i>FÖJ - Voluntary Year of Ecological Service</i>	Germany	450
<i>French Civic Service</i>	France	100
<i>International Voluntary Service United Kingdom</i>	United Kingdom	120
<i>Italian National Civic Service</i>	Italy	60
<i>Internationella Arbetslag (IAL)</i>	Sweden	250
TOTAL		6760

Source: Own elaboration based on Interviews; email/phone communication requesting data on relevant EU and national schemes.

³⁰ Joint Report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field, [EU Youth Report](#), 2012.

3. Overview of the main-cross-border volunteer schemes in the EU

As mentioned above, a large share of cross-border volunteering within the EU operates through EU funded schemes. However, some Member States, such as Germany and Italy have a long standing tradition in organising voluntary work, including sending volunteers abroad within and outside the EU. Many countries have strong bilateral co-operation, or foster multilateral exchanges. There are also national voluntary initiatives which are difficult to identify and map out. International organisations such as the Red Cross also send volunteers abroad within the EU, although specific data on this is not available.

Main types of schemes fostering EU cross-border volunteering

- International schemes
- EU funded schemes
- State Funded volunteering schemes in selected Member States
- Bilateral schemes
- Local initiatives

The following section describes the most significant of each of these schemes (i.e. the initiatives that send the most volunteers abroad within the EU).

3.1. International schemes

There are many international schemes sending volunteers abroad although placements are often outside of EU. For example, International Red Cross and Red Crescent send no more than 100 volunteers a year abroad, mainly to Turkey and former Soviet republics. Throughout the EU in 2012, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent has a total of around 780,000 volunteers active, though figures specific to cross-border volunteering within the EU are not available.. Volunteers are active through national societies Professionals are employed in a range of areas of intervention, including disaster risk reduction and preparedness, humanitarian assistance and development cooperation.

3.2. EU funded schemes

The Youth in Action programme, particularly the European Voluntary Service (EVS), is an important source for youth volunteering in another country, and cited as the main source in some Member States³¹. The principle EU funded schemes are described below.

³¹ Joint Report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field, EU Youth Report, 2012.

European Voluntary Service (EVS)

The European Voluntary Service (EVS) is one of the Commission's initiatives which ran under the Youth in Action Programme 2007-2013 (now continuing under the auspices of Erasmus+). It was introduced to inspire a sense of active European citizenship, solidarity and tolerance among young Europeans through non-formal learning and intercultural dialogue, and to encourage the inclusion of all young people. Youth in Action had a total budget of EUR 885 million for the period 2007-2013, of which the EVS budget made up at least 23%³².

The programme offers opportunities to youth to carry out voluntary service for up to 12 months in another country in Europe³³, and focuses on themes such as culture, youth, sports, social care, cultural heritage, arts, civil protection, environment, development cooperation. Types of volunteer placement could involve service in day care centres, conservations projects, cultural events and theatres, various types of clubs, i.e. sport clubs, senior clubs etc.

Main characteristics of EVS³⁴:

- Open to young people aged 18 to 30 from within and outside the EU;
- Involving young people, either individually or in groups (usually for major youth, culture and sports events such as World Youth Festival Barcelona);
- Free of charge - volunteers receive a full reimbursement of travel costs, complete insurance cover and pocket money;
- Involves different actors such as NGOs, local or regional public bodies, European NGOs, profit making bodies active in the field of volunteering, youth, culture or sport.

The EVS relies on a strong partnership between sending volunteer organisations, host volunteer organisations and volunteers. To participate in the scheme and benefit from European funds project proposals are submitted either to the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) of the European Commission (DG Education and Culture) or to the Erasmus+ National Agencies established in each country participating in the Programme. Decisions on proposals to fund are made based on predefined criteria³⁵. Volunteer organisation wishing to participate in the EVS need to submit an 'Expression of Interest' to show their motivation and general interest in EVS activities, together with a copy of their registered statute. Accreditors are usually an executive agency (for a promoter that is a body active in the youth field at EU level; an international governmental organisation; a profit-making organisation active in the area of youth, sport and culture. Accreditation is also carried out by the relevant national agency or SALTO (a network of resource centres providing support to Youth in Action Programme) for all other project promoters.

³² European Voluntary Service [Factsheet](#), Brussels, 2006; Youth in Action now falls under the Erasmus+ programme.

³³ Joint Report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field, EU Youth Report, 2012, p. 97.

³⁴ DG EAC, [The impact of the European Voluntary Service](#), EVS results, leaflet.

³⁵ European Commission, [Youth in Action Programme Guide](#), 2013.

Criteria for accreditation includes satisfying conditions on motivation and previous experience in working with volunteers and demonstrating knowledge of the EVS Charter, funding rules and group insurance rules for volunteers. The volunteer organisation aims and objectives are also assessed, together with its administrative and financial capacities to carry out an EVS project. The host volunteer organisation needs to make transparent the volunteer's responsibilities and tasks, and demonstrate familiarity with learning aspects (learning opportunities, language trainings). Sending volunteer organisations in particular need to have the capacity to support volunteers in the pre-departure phase and to demonstrate the ability to stay in contact and support volunteers during the service period³⁶.

It takes about six weeks to process the Expression of Interest. Accreditation is given for a maximum of three years. At least two accreditors appointed by the Agency/SALTO (Commission staff, Agency/SALTO staff, external experts and former volunteers) evaluate Expressions of Interest and carry out interviews with those wishing to become EVS promoters. They also carry out assessments and additional research in order to be able to provide the accreditor with a recommendation.

An analysis of EVS data from 2007-2014 across Member States reveals that France, Germany, Italy, Hungary, Poland and Spain are the countries where most volunteers were hosted. Volunteer organisations from France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Romania, Spain and United Kingdom sent the largest number of volunteers. The table below provides information on the Member States that are most **engaged in cross-border volunteering** through the EVS scheme.

Table 3: Number of EVS volunteers in selected countries

Data from the EVS scheme in selected Member States aggregated for the period 2007-2014 ³⁷		
Country	Geographical scope	Number of volunteers hosted/sent for the 2007-2014 period
France	EU	Hosted: 3688 Sent: 2083
Germany	EU	Hosted: 4828 Sent: 2512
Italy	EU	Hosted: 2678 Sent: 2054
Hungary	EU	Hosted: 1465 Sent: 763
Poland	EU, mostly Spain, Germany, Poland, France, United Kingdom, Portugal and Romania	Hosted: 1888 Sent: 1947
Romania	EU	Hosted: 719 Sent: 1485
Spain	EU, mostly France, Poland and	Hosted: 3499

³⁶ [European Voluntary Service Accreditation Guidelines](#), Erasmus+, January 2014 (unchanged as compared to previous years).

³⁷ Data obtained from the DG EAC, June 2014.

Data from the EVS scheme in selected Member States aggregated for the period 2007-2014 ³⁷		
Country	Geographical scope	Number of volunteers hosted/sent for the 2007-2014 period
	Spain	Sent: 2863
United Kingdom	EU, mostly Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain	Hosted: 1027 Sent: 2051

Funding: The EVS programme is now funded under the Erasmus+ programme (2014-2020), which is the single integrated EU programme covering education, training and youth. It integrates former Lifelong Learning Programmes (Grundtvig, Leonardo, Erasmus and Comenius), International Higher Education Programmes (Erasmus Mundus, Tempus, Alfa, Edulink and bilateral programmes) as well as Youth in Action, aiming at increasing the focus on EU added value in these areas³⁸. The programme covers all ages (lifelong learning) and enables mobility and cross-border exchanges. Under Erasmus+ a total budget of EUR 14.7 million (40% increase compared to previous budget) was approved together with measures aiming at cutting red tape³⁹.

An estimated 10,000 volunteers will go abroad in 2014 and a yearly increase is expected throughout the programme lifecycle estimated to reach 20,000 volunteers in the year 2020⁴⁰.

Europe for Citizen's programme

The Europe for Citizen's programme is managed through the same executive agency as Erasmus+.

It's main aim is to contribute to citizens' understanding of the Union and to foster European citizenship and improve conditions for civic and democratic participation at Union level⁴¹. One of its specific objectives is to encourage the democratic and civic participation of citizens at Union level, by developing citizens' understanding of the Union policy making-process and promoting opportunities for societal and intercultural engagement and volunteering at Union level⁴².

Volunteering is given a prominent place within the 2014-2020 funding scheme, and will provide opportunities to fund mobility – either for sending volunteers abroad within the EU or building capacity of volunteer organisations.

³⁸ Regulation (EU) No 1288/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing 'Erasmus+': the Union programme for education, training, youth and sport and repealing Decisions No 1719/2006/EC, No 1720/2006/EC and No 1298/2008/EC.

³⁹ [Erasmus+ in detail](#), Commission presentation.

⁴⁰ Data obtained from the DG EAC, June 2014.

⁴¹ Council Regulation (EU) No 390/2014 of 14 April 2014 establishing the 'Europe for Citizens' programme for the period 2014-2020, OJ L 115/3, 17 April 2014.

⁴² Ibid, Art. 2.

EU Grundtvig programme

In order to combat social exclusion, advance mobility throughout Europe of an ageing population, as well as to help improve the knowledge and skills of ageing citizens, the European Commission introduced a Lifelong Learning Programme which ran 2007-2013.

GIVE – Grundtvig Initiative for Volunteering in Europe for Seniors was an initiative focused on volunteers over 50 years of age. It operated since 2009 as a scheme of grants to support Senior Volunteering Projects between national volunteer organisations located in two countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP).

One of the successful products of this action is SEVEN⁴³, an international network of volunteer organisations promoting senior volunteer exchanges. The project involved 29 partner volunteer organisations from 12 European countries. More than 300 volunteers participated in the European financed projects and many others volunteered under locally organised and financed initiatives with the Commission's support⁴⁴.

EU Aid Volunteers initiative

The EU Volunteers' initiative provides a practical training programme for humanitarian volunteers and matches the volunteers with humanitarian organisations.

3.3. State funded schemes

Several Member State also have national State schemes promoting volunteering including cross-border volunteering. Some have been set up relatively recently whilst others are more well-established. The countries with the schemes with the largest budgets available and the highest number of volunteers are Germany, Italy and France. Other countries such as Luxembourg and the Czech Republic also have schemes promoting cross-border volunteering. A selection of these schemes is described below.

German State funded schemes

German volunteers are involved in volunteering under two main categories of voluntary service. First are state subsidised programmes. These are, apart from EVS, *Freiwilliges Soziales Jahr* (FSJ – Voluntary Year of Social Service) and *Freiwilliges Ökologisches Jahr* (FÖJ – Voluntary Year of Ecological Service)⁴⁵. EVS is open to volunteers up to 30 years of age and is funded by the German National Agency for Youth in Action – Jugend für Europa. The FSJ and FÖJ are mostly domestic schemes open to young people under 27. They receive State funds of EUR 93 million per year. Their combined budget is approximately EUR 300 million.

⁴³ [SEVEN network](#).

⁴⁴ Senior European Volunteers Exchange Network – SEVEN, [Final Report, Public part](#), 2011.

⁴⁵ Voluntary social year ('Freiwilliges Soziales Jahr' - FSJ) adopted in 1964 and the voluntary ecological year ('Freiwilliges Ökologisches Jahr' - FÖJ) adopted in 1991. The national volunteering arrangements FSJ and FÖJ were regulated by two different laws as FÖJ was established later, but in 2008 they were merged in the Law on Support of Youth Voluntary Services (Gesetz zur Förderung von Jugendfreiwilligendiensten).

The services organised under these schemes are of flexible duration (6-24 months) and include service performed by conscientious objectors, who can do up to 12 months of voluntary service in Germany or up to 10 months abroad. All volunteers are subject to the statutory social security system and are paid contributions to health, long-term care, unemployment, pension benefits and accident insurance, borne by the project agencies or assignment projects. Volunteers receive pocket money and board and lodging are usually provided in kind, but may be paid⁴⁶.

The Federal Volunteers Service (BFD)⁴⁷ was opened as a new government commitment in 2011 to persons of all ages with completed compulsory schooling. So far it has 45 000 volunteers. Approximately 40% of BFD volunteers are older than 27.

BFD, FSJ and FÖJ are all full-time services of 40 hours a week. For volunteers over 27 years, part-time service of more than 20 hours is also an option. The service is open to volunteers of all ages but it is reported that due to budgetary restrictions the demand for places among older people is not met⁴⁸. Assignments vary from helping elderly and persons with disabilities to child related and youth services, e.g. child day centres, all-day schools etc. Other activities include assignments in organisations active in environmental protection or culture, sports and integration. BFD, FSJ and FÖJ often lead to long-term civic commitment in the community⁴⁹.

International youth volunteer service (IJFD) introduced in late 2010 allows young adults up to 26 to complete an education year abroad. The programme is implemented through more than 120 civil society organisations in the field of peace and reconciliation and environmental protection. So far it has more than 3 000 volunteers⁵⁰.

A second type of programmes are not state funded and are not 'regulated.' They include for instance Kulturweit, operated by the German Ministry of Development. Kulturweit that sends around 500 volunteers per year, a third within EU countries. Volunteers receive funds for training, pocket money and insurance⁵¹. Another organisation, ADiA - 'Alternative Service Abroad' does not receive funding. The private welfare sector alone, with its six major welfare organisations, AWO, DRK, Caritas, Diakonie, Zentralwohlfahrtsstelle der Juden and Paritätischer Gesmatverband, involves up to three million volunteers in total⁵².

Italian National Civic Service

The Italian National Civic Service was set up in 2001⁵³. It is managed by the National Bureau for Civic Service (Ufficio Nazionale per il Servizio Civile - UNSC) and involves young volunteers from 18 to 28 years of age.

⁴⁶ Observatory for Sociopolitical developments in Europe, [Volunteering in Europe - International exchange about concepts and benefits to society](#), 2014.

⁴⁷ Federal Volunteer Service Act (BDFG - Bundesfreiwilligendienstgesetz), 1 July 2011.

⁴⁸ Observatory for Sociopolitical developments in Europe, [Volunteering in Europe - International exchange about concepts and benefits to society](#), 2014.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Decreto del Presidente del Consiglio dei Ministri (DPCM) of 10 August 2001, Law No. 64/2001.

Volunteers are paid a monthly allowance, insurance and social security benefits by the UNSC. However, only 1% of national volunteers under this scheme go abroad – data from the GHK report indicate that in total, 116.317 young people undertook National Civic Service in the period 2006-2008, but only 1377 of them went abroad⁵⁴. The sending or hosting volunteer organisations participating in the programme submit projects to the State for funding approval. Volunteers are paid directly by the State, and can be placed in civic service projects in Italy or abroad, either in Europe or in developing countries. The maximum period of service is 12 months and is rendered full-time. It counts towards pension payments as equivalent to one year's work in a state or governmental office⁵⁵. Volunteers receive their monthly allowance of approx. EUR 435 a month and national insurance contribution. They also receive an extra amount of EUR 15 if they are doing their service abroad, plus another EUR 20 for food, per day⁵⁶.

French Voluntary Civil Service

'Service civique' was introduced in 2010 as a special form of volunteering⁵⁷. The programme had two objectives: to reinforce civic participation and national cohesion and to allow young people to participate in collective projects. The French Voluntary Civil Service⁵⁸ allows EU citizens to volunteer in the areas of civil defence and security, social cohesion and solidarity, international co-operation, development and humanitarian aid, for 6-24 months. The programme is open to all citizens but mainly focuses on people of between 16 and 25 years of age.

Volunteers receive pocket money exempt from taxes and social security contributions, basic health care insurance and advanced training. The volunteering time counts towards the volunteer's pension and might lead to obtaining diplomas or future education. The field of assignment are in culture and leisure, development assistance and relief projects, education, environment, emergency interventions, citizenship, health, solidarity and sport. However, possibilities for service abroad are limited and the assignments are seen as professional experience, mainly in the French embassies and commercial enterprises⁵⁹.

⁵⁴ [Committee of the Regions, Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe](#), page 145.

⁵⁵ Schröder, R., '[Development of International Youth Voluntary Service in the EU Comparison of programme and policy development in Germany, Italy, France, Czech Republic and Poland](#)', Association of Voluntary Service Organisations (AVSO), year?

⁵⁶ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', p. 145.

⁵⁷ Law of 10 March 2010 on Civic Service (*Loi du 10 mars 2010 relative au service civique*).

⁵⁸ Under Ministère des Droits des femmes, de la Ville, de la Jeunesse et des Sports, available at: <http://www.associations.gouv.fr/>.

⁵⁹ Schröder, R., '[Development of International Youth Voluntary Service in the EU Comparison of programme and policy development in Germany, Italy, France, Czech Republic and Poland](#)', Association of Voluntary Service Organisations (AVSO)?.

3.4. Bilateral cross-border volunteer schemes

Very little information on bilateral schemes between EU Member States was identified.

An example of such a scheme is the Franco-German Youth Office (FGYO) a volunteer organisation which serves to foster Franco-German co-operation. The FGYO's budget for 2013 is 22.8 million Euros, made up of equal contributions from the French and German governments. In addition to this is the special funding provided mainly by the two Ministries for Foreign Affairs to support exchanges with countries in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. The European Social Fund (ESF) also funds programmes for the young unemployed⁶⁰. This programme traditionally focuses on bilateral school exchanges and less on youth exchanges and voluntary activities. No data specific to cross-border volunteering was identified from this scheme.

⁶⁰ See OFAJ website: <http://www.ofaj.org/english-version>.

4. Civil society volunteer organisations involved in EU cross border volunteering

The table presents the main volunteer organisations engaged in cross-border volunteering, many of which send volunteers through EU funded programmes (such as EVS). Although not exhaustive, it represents the substantive part of the existing cross-border volunteer organisations in Europe.

Name	Type	Duration of placements	Geo focus of active-ties	Main topics and activities	Special requirements for volunteers	Age range
Co-ordinating Committee of International Voluntary Service (CCIVS)	Co-ordinating body since 1948. 144 member organisations in 100 countries.	Short-term and long-term	Global	Peace; Sustainable development; Inter-regional exchanges.	Non-specialised volunteers	No limit
The Alliance Network	International network since 1982. 21 full and 9 associate member organisations.	Mainly short-term	Europe	Inclusion of disadvantaged volunteers; Training and exchange for staff and volunteers; Development of medium- and long-term voluntary service	Non specialised volunteers	No limit (average under 30)
International Cultural Youth Exchange (ICYE)	International organisation since 1949. 27 national committees and 4 regional bodies. Member of CCIVS and AVSO.	6 - 12 months	Global	Training to improve the quality of long-term voluntary service; Seminars on issues such as youth mobility.	Non specialised volunteers	18 - 28

Name	Type	Duration of placements	Geo focus of activities	Main topics and activities	Special requirements for volunteers	Age range
European Federation of Intercultural Learning (EFIL)	International organisation since 1971. 23 members. Member of CCIVS and AVSO.	Long-term	Europe	Secondary school exchange; EVS; Training seminars	Non specialised volunteers	15 (min. for school exchange) – 30 (max. for EVS)
Service Civil International (SCI)	International organisation since 1920. 33 branches and groups. Member of CCIVS and AVSO.	Short-term (and some medium- and long-term)	Europe, Asia and North America	Peace; International understanding; Sustainable development; Respect for the environment.	Non specialised volunteers	No max. Min. 21 for South otherwise min. 18
Voluntariato Internazionale Donna Educazione Sviluppo (VIDES)	International organisation since 1987. Member of CCIVS.	1 month to 2 years	Global	Peace; Debt relief; Promotion of women; Street children; Globalisation and solidarity.	Non specialised volunteers	Min. 21 for long term Otherwise min. 17 Max. 35
Youth Action for Peace (YAP)	International organisation since 1923. 15 branches and groups.	Short-term and long-term	Europe (east and west), Latin America and Mediterra	Peace; Social change; Sustainable development; Environment.	Non specialised volunteers	Min. 18

Name	Type	Duration of placements	Geo focus of activities	Main topics and activities	Special requirements for volunteers	Age range
			nean			
Internationaler Versöhnungsbund	International network since 1914	Short-term and medium-term	Global	Ecumenism; Peace.	Non specialised volunteers, Christian	Min. 18
Association Itinéraire International, in France	French based association of civil society volunteer organisations.	Short-term and long-term	Europe	International mobility of young people as means of labour market integration.	Non-specialised volunteers	18-30
Lunaria	Association for social promotion, sends volunteers from Italy on international voluntary service and facilitates hosting of foreign volunteers.	Short-term	Europe		Non-specialised volunteers	Min. 18
Red Cross	Humanitarian network and civil society volunteer organisation active in 189 countries (including 28 EU MS). The Red Cross workforce are mostly volunteers offering services and support to vulnerable people in local communities.	Short-term and long-term	Global	Main topics for cross-border volunteering: health and social care, social inclusion, community services, migration and asylum, youth work, civil protection, non-discrimination and promotion of humanitarian values.	Non-specialised volunteers	Min. 18
French Platform for volunteering (Plate-forme francophone du volontariat)	Platform is made up of 30 associations representing major sectors of community life and voluntary commitment and over	Short-term	Europe	Humanitarian action and international solidarity, social and legal assistance, culture and recreation, the environment, training and education, youth and seniors, health care, sports ;	Non-specialised volunteers	Min. 18

Name	Type	Duration of placements	Geo focus of activities	Main topics and activities	Special requirements for volunteers	Age range
	300.000 volunteers in Federation Wallonia-Brussels					
Eurodiaconia	Diaconal organisation	Short-term	Europe	Eurodiaconia links diaconal actors to examine social needs, develop ideas and influence policies impacting Poverty and Social Exclusion, Social and Health Care Services and the Future of Social Europe.	Non-specialised volunteers	Min. 18
Diaconia Valdese	Diaconal organisation	Short-term	Europe	Social inclusion, Roma, healthy ageing and social care	Non-specialised volunteers	Min. 18
Axiga	Galician civil protection service	Short-term	Spain and Portugal	Civic emergency response	Specialised and non –specialised volunteers	Min. 18
Slovenian Cave Rescue Service	Cave Rescue Service of Slovenia (JRS) operates within the Speleological Association of Slovenia (JZS).	Short-term	Europe and Turkey	Cave rescuing	Specialised and non –specialised volunteers	Min. 18
Service Civil International (SCIINT)	The organisation consists of 45 branches and an ever growing number of partner organisations	Short-term and long tem	Global	Promotion culture of peace	Non-specialised volunteers	Min 18.
ASF – Action Reconciliation for Peace	Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste e. V. is a German registered charity organisation with currently approximately 600 members.	Short-term and long-term	Global	Post Word War II reconciliation and peace building	Non-specialised volunteers	19-25

5. Benefits of volunteering

There is a range of benefits that volunteering can bestow on the various stakeholders involved, including the volunteers themselves, hosting volunteer organisations, and society as a whole. As regards cross-border volunteering, the general benefits of volunteering are complemented by increased cultural awareness.

Benefits for volunteers

There is a wealth of research on benefits volunteering bestows on volunteers (not specific to cross-border). There is some evidence that volunteering contributes to improving employability of younger persons⁶¹. In Austria, for example, a survey on the Volume and Structure of Voluntary Work in Austria⁶² carried out on behalf of the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection by Statistics Austria, indicated that experience gained through voluntary work helps develop personal faculties such as flexibility, mobility and other characteristics that are increasingly demanded by the labour market⁶². In the United Kingdom, a recent study showed that volunteering can play a 'powerful role in enabling young people to develop the confidence, skills and capabilities to make positive and successful transitions to learning and work'⁶³.

Other studies show that volunteering has a significant but weak effect on employability in terms of entry into work⁶⁴. Spanish and French case studies show that one reason for weak links between volunteering and employability can be found in the lack of recognition given to non-formal and informal learning⁶⁵. A GHK study on employability of volunteers⁶⁶ corroborates previous findings⁶⁷ that volunteering increases human and social capital but certified skills bear the true added value for future employers⁶⁸.

Volunteering is a way to gain confidence, meet new people, make new friends and extend social networks. It can contribute to providing a 'sense of usefulness' and/or a 'sense of achievement', often linked to the desire of people to help others. The knowledge that one has made a difference to another person often leads to enhanced self-esteem. These benefits have been observed, for example, in Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Malta, Romania and the United Kingdom⁶⁹.

Volunteering is a valuable means for older people to remain engaged, to contribute to the common good, and to feel their skills and experience are useful and appreciated. It is also a contributing factor to active ageing⁷⁰. Volunteering offsets negative perceptions between generations, increases life opportunities and connects communities⁷¹. When helping the young, older people feel worthwhile,

⁶¹ Newton B., et al, 'Volunteering: Supporting transitions', V inspired, The National Young Volunteers' Service, May 2011.

⁶² GHK, 'Volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010, p. 139.

⁶³ Newton B., et al, 'Volunteering: Supporting transitions', V inspired, The National Young Volunteers' Service, May 2011.

⁶⁴ Ellis Paine, A., et al, 'Does Volunteering improve employability? Evidence from the British Household Panel Survey', 2013.

⁶⁵ SALTO YOUTH, 'Meet in EuroMed', Salto-Youth EuroMed's Magazine, Issue 14, June 2011.

⁶⁶ GHK, '[Study on the impact of non-formal education in youth organisations on young people's employability](#)', European Youth Forum, 2012.

⁶⁷ GHK, 'Volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010.

⁶⁸ Observatory for Sociopolitical developments in Europe, '[Volunteering in Europe – International exchange about concepts and benefits to society](#)', 2014.

⁶⁹ GHK, 'Volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010.

⁷⁰ United Nations Volunteers (UNV), 'State of the World's Volunteerism report', UNV 2011.

⁷¹ Age UK London, 'We just clicked!', MiCommunity Project Report, June 2012.

satisfied for sharing knowledge with younger generations and also feel as the active contributors to society⁷². A specific benefit of senior volunteering is the important interconnectedness between health and active learning in old age⁷³.

Other benefits to volunteers reported in different national reports across the EU include: learning about one-self, developing interests and skills, making productive use of one's free time, gaining civil education experience that can compliment school education, learning about civil empowerment and active participation in a society⁷⁴. Volunteering also offers opportunities for people to actively engage in activities they would not necessarily be able or willing to do in full-time employment. Young people also learn leadership and can participate politically in a way denied to them otherwise, as under-18 year olds generally cannot vote.

Benefits of youth cross-border volunteering were described in the Committee of the Regions Mobility Report. The main benefits to volunteers raised in this research include increased possibilities for informal learning and intercultural exchanges; learning a foreign language; development of generic skills applicable in their country of origin workplace, and enhancement of social competences and sense of solidarity⁷⁵. The 'Youth' Programme evaluation report also refers to the benefit of youth citizenship competences, encouraging political and social engagement and fostering a more positive attitude among young people towards the EU and its institutions⁷⁶.

Benefits for volunteer organisations

Cross-border volunteering provides participating sending and hosting volunteer organisations with a valuable intercultural experience, one that demands tolerance and understanding so that all involved maximise the benefits from the experience⁷⁷.

In addition, host volunteer organisations benefit from a larger work-force that enables greater service delivery. They also often benefit from more diversified human resources, including new skills, as well as enhanced energy and new ideas, motivation and commitment normally associated with volunteers. Moreover, managers of host volunteer organisations gain managerial experience of coping with a set of supervision and administrative circumstances that may be associated with volunteers coming from abroad. Regarding sending volunteer organisations, where volunteers remain in contact after their postings abroad, this can represent opportunities for continued interaction with non-national entities, with the possibility of drawing on the knowledge and experience gained by returned volunteers.

Benefits for society

Both in-country and cross-border volunteering encourage good citizenship. It increases citizen participation in social life and contributes to community well-being by strengthening people's sense of belonging, participation and overall happiness. Volunteering also enhances the resilience of

⁷² Granville, G., 'Understanding the experience of older volunteers in intergenerational school-based projects', The Beth Johnson Foundation, 2000.

⁷³ 'Population Reference Bureau (PRB), 'Volunteering and Health for Ageing Populations', in 'Today's Research on Aging', No. 21, August 2011; Cook, S. et al, 'Volunteering and Older Adults', Final report, Volunteer Canada, February 2013; Stiehr, K. et al., 'Research Report, Impact of transnational exchange experiences on senior volunteers and organisations', Institut für Soziale Infrastruktur, Frankfurt am Main, October 2010.

⁷⁴ GHK, 'Volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010, p. 139.

⁷⁵ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions, p.59.

⁷⁶ DG EAC, 'Qualitative Impact of the 'Youth In Action' Programme: Report of the 2010 Survey', Brussels, 2010.

⁷⁷ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', p.60.

communities in terms of 'collective capacity to engage and mobilise community resources to respond to, and influence, change'⁷⁸.

The sense of solidarity that volunteering promotes is particularly relevant for cross-border exchanges. Such exchanges help forge identification with European values and ideals. One evidence of this is higher participation rates in European Parliament elections among former EVS volunteers, a phenomenon observed also among in-country volunteers in national elections⁷⁹. Enhanced levels of understanding of other peoples' cultures and social values may extend beyond the volunteers directly involved to encompass their families and friends.

In addition, bringing together older and younger people through volunteering projects is an important feature of intergenerational cooperation and solidarity. Societal impact made by older volunteers has been measured in a 2010 study by the Institut für Soziale Infrastruktur⁸⁰ to show that 'transfer of voluntary work experiences across countries is more intense and more likely to happen if the exchange participants are experienced volunteers'⁸¹.

Contribution to EU economy

Information is limited on contributions volunteering can make at inter-country level within the EU. There are indications of contributions of volunteering at national level, but economic data on the economic contribution of volunteering in Member States is scattered, while at EU level Eurostat does not include data about the non-profit sector⁸².

Examples of contributions at national level are provided for in the European Volunteer Centre's 2006 Manifesto for volunteering in Europe⁸³ which indicates that in the United Kingdom, for every EUR 1 of public funding spent to support volunteering, volunteers generate EUR 30 worth of work. The economic value of formal volunteering in the United Kingdom has been estimated at more than EUR 65 billion per year, or 7.9% of GDP. This does not take into account informal volunteering. In Poland, around 5.4m citizens volunteered in 2004, or 18.3% of the population. The estimated economic value of volunteering, calculated by multiplying the number of full-time equivalent employees (volunteers) by the average wage in the particular sector, amounted to EUR 124 million⁸⁴. A more recent study from 2013 reveals that in Portugal more than 1 million citizens volunteers, or approximately 4% of the total working hours, amounting for about 1% of Portugal's GDP⁸⁵.

Johns Hopkins University published a report in 2013 with the latest findings from the implementation workforce in the country. For France, the share of volunteers in the total workforce represents 3.2%, equivalent to 1.4% of the country's GDP. The contribution to the Portugal's GDP is even more substantial, with non-profit organisations contribute with 76% of total value added in social services.

⁷⁸ Leigh, R. et al, 'State of the world's volunteerism report. Universal values for global well-being', UN 2011.

⁷⁹ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', year?

⁸⁰ Stiehr, K. et al., 'Research Report, Impact of transnational exchange experiences on senior volunteers and organisations', Institut für Soziale Infrastruktur, Frankfurt am Main, October 2010.

⁸¹ European Foundation for the Improvement of the Living and Working Conditions (Eurofund), 'Volunteering by older people in the EU', Luxembourg, Publication Office of the European Union, 2011.

⁸² GHK, 'Volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010, p. 43.

⁸³ European Volunteer Centre (CEV), '[Manifesto for Volunteering in Europe](#)', CEV and Volunteering England, 2006.

⁸⁴ European Volunteer Centre (CEV), '[Manifesto for Volunteering in Europe](#)', CEV and Volunteering England, 2006.

⁸⁵ The European Volunteer Measurement Project, '[The results are in: Statistics Portugal's survey on volunteer work for 2012](#)', 2013.

The GDP contribution of non-profit institutions 'outpaces the growth of economy overall' in these countries, except in Czech Republic.

Research from the Red Crescent⁸⁶ suggests that their volunteers contribute USD 1.1 billion worth of services in Central, Southern and Western Europe. It shows that the average annual economic value of Red Cross Red Crescent volunteers in Central, Southern and Western Europe is USD855 per volunteer. Data specific to cross-border volunteering within the EU is not available. The review contained significant differences for the economic value of volunteering in different regions of the world.

The cultural exchange inherent in cross-border volunteering has the potential to broaden horizons for individuals, civil society organisations and society as a whole⁸⁷. More research is needed however to understand the impact of cross-border voluntary service on groups of stakeholders. Moreover, while there are clear benefits associated with cross-border volunteering within the EU, a number of obstacles impede these initiatives from achieving their full potential. These are examined in more detail in the following sections.

⁸⁶ International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), 'The value of volunteers - Imagine how many needs would go unanswered without volunteers', Red Cross Red Crescent Academic Network, January 2011.

⁸⁷ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', p. 59.

Chapter 3 Barriers to cross-border volunteering

Key findings

- Chapter 3 examines administrative/legal barriers; financial barriers; as well as barriers linked to recruitment, training and recognition of volunteering.
- Barriers considered for the cost assessment were those that have a specific impact on cross-border volunteering, that may be susceptible to EU action and that have not already been subject to EU/Member State action. The focus was also on barriers likely to have the greatest impact on volunteers/civil society volunteer organisation and affect the largest proportion of those groups.
- The following barriers were considered to meet the selection/exclusion criteria above::
 - ✓ lack of legal recognition of volunteer status (with regard to access to services linked to legal residence status and loss of social security and unemployment benefits);
 - ✓ diversity in recruitment and lack of information on volunteer opportunities;
 - ✓ lack of uniform recognition of skills acquired;
 - ✓ lack of adequate training and pre-departure preparation for cross-border volunteers.

Obstacles to cross-border volunteering have been raised in a number of instances, including during the CEV Policy Conference held in Sarajevo in October 2013⁸⁸ that brought together volunteer organisations participating in volunteering mobility schemes from different sectors. The European Parliament also refers to many of these barriers and proposes actions in the Report on 'Recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU'⁸⁹.

The long list of barriers considered for this study is presented in the table below and briefly described in the subsequent section. As explained in the Methodology in Chapter 2 (section III), having identified all potential barriers to volunteering, we subsequently reduced that list to focus on those having an impact on cross border volunteering, that may be susceptible to EU Action, and that have not already been subject to EU/Member State action. The focus is also on barriers likely to have the greatest impact on volunteers and volunteer organisations, and on the largest proportion of those groups.

This methodological process followed for the purpose of carrying out a subsequent cost analysis. Nevertheless, barriers which have been excluded should not be interpreted as not being relevant to policy considerations. A more in depth study would need to be carried out to explore these issues further.

⁸⁸ European Volunteer Centre (CEV), Policy Conference, 'Cross-Border Volunteering in the European Year of Citizens – What is it for?', Sarajevo, 3-4 October 2013.

⁸⁹ European Parliament, Procedure file, Recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU, (2011/2293(INI)).

Long list of barriers	Selected for cost assessment (y/n)
<i>Administrative/legal barriers</i>	
6. Criminal record check requirements	N
7. Lack of legal certainty on insurance practices and discriminatory insurance practices (e.g. upper age limits/ disability)	N
8. Unclear legal and regulatory framework for volunteering	Y
Sub-barrier 1: Volunteering is not a legal ground for obtaining a residence permit in a receiving country	Y
Sub-barrier 2: Uncertainty and risks of forfeiting social security benefits	Y
Sub-barrier 3: Lack of clarity on legal status of volunteers leading to volunteer expenses being taxed as income tax in certain MS	N
9. The lack of mutual recognition of volunteer organisations between Member States	N
<i>Financial barriers</i>	
10. Lack of clarity regarding tax exemptions for employee volunteering	N
11. Lack of sustainable funding for cross-border volunteer organisations (EU funding programmes; red tape; other)	N
<i>Recruitment, training and recognition of volunteering</i>	
12. Lack of clarity with regard to recognition of the skills and competences gained through volunteering	Y
13. Information on volunteering opportunities is not adequately disseminated	Y
14. Inadequate training and preparation for volunteers (including cultural/linguistic issues)	Y
15. Lack of diversity in recruitment	N
16. Measuring volunteering - difficulties in obtaining comparable data to measure the contribution of volunteering	N

Administrative/legal barriers

1. Criminal record check procedures

Some Member States require individuals to obtain a criminal record check (disclosure) as a precondition for volunteering.

While this can have clear policy aims such as protecting children, it can also present a barrier to cross-border volunteering especially given the lack of a coordinated EU-wide police clearance process in Member States. This results in the following types of issues:

- Individuals have to obtain criminal checks but do not know how;
- Volunteers have to pay for the criminal record check themselves;
- Foreign criminal record checks are not accepted in the host Member State.

For example, in some Member States (United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark, the Netherlands), incoming foreign volunteers have to bring a criminal record check from their national police obtained at their own expense. This can be a hurdle as prices and procedures vary considerably even within the EU. In the United Kingdom, some civil society volunteer organisations do not recognise International Criminal Record Bureau checks. This mainly impacts on volunteers working with children and vulnerable adults. Volunteer organisations that were impacted by this barrier stated that the support given to volunteers entails dealing with the authorities and obtaining necessary certification.

However, based on consultations, it appears that this barrier is relevant only to a limited number of Member States, and even in those countries it has a limited impact on volunteering. It creates additional burdens and results in wasted resources, but does not necessarily result in reduced volunteering.

Lack of legal certainty on insurance practices and discriminatory insurance practices (e.g. upper age limits/ disability)

There is evidence to suggest that insurance (personal accident and liability) for volunteers is not provided by all volunteer organisations and different laws apply in Member States⁹⁰. This issue is exacerbated from a cross-border perspective as it leads to a **lack of legal certainty** as regards the rules applicable for individuals and volunteer organisations. This can mean that some organisations may be subject to insurance requirements as sending volunteer organisations but do not generally have the arrangements in place. In other cases, volunteers who are normally subject to insurance schemes in their home country may not have this insurance when they volunteer abroad. This may either require additional insurance to be sought or may discourage volunteers or volunteer organisations from participating across borders.

It is, however, worth noting that the European Commission EVS scheme (which constitutes a large proportion of EU cross border volunteering) provides insurance coverage. Therefore, this does not appear to be a significant issue for sending volunteer organisations under this scheme. Other organisations, such as the Red Cross, also have insurance cover for volunteers irrespective of where they operate. This barrier may be a greater problem for smaller schemes that cannot afford the insurance for their volunteers. However, large numbers of cases have not been identified. Also, it is unclear what the extent of the impact is where there are problems.

Discriminatory insurance practices (e.g. upper age limits/disability) relate, for example, to exclusions in insurance schemes, including age restrictions and types of activities covered, as well as refusal to grant insurance to persons with disability. According to the literature review, age limits for personal accident cover on some insurance policies has led some organisations to set upper age limits for many volunteer roles⁹¹.

Among the sample interviewed, this was not identified as being a significant barrier to cross-border volunteering. One sending volunteer organisation stated that insurance companies are free to set age limits, and in any case national legislation should regulate discriminatory practices.

⁹⁰ GHK, 'Study on volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010.p. 124.

⁹¹ GHK, 'Study on volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010.p. 124.

2. Legal and regulatory framework for volunteering

The lack of a clear legal and regulatory framework for volunteers operating across borders⁹² is considered a key challenge in the literature reviewed⁹³, with many Member States lacking a clear legal status of volunteers and regulatory framework of the volunteer organisations. Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Spain have specifically adopted laws on volunteering. However, the extent to which they apply to volunteers, volunteer organisations and the voluntary sector also differ. Regulatory frameworks (where in place) vary in scope and in their definitions of volunteers/volunteer organisations, which also creates a lack of legal certainty.

Different traditions and social, economic and cultural make-up of the Member States lead to various institutional set ups and differences in defining the scope of volunteering and laws regulating it. From a cross-border perspective, the unclear legal status for volunteers can have implications with regard to setting up residence, welfare benefit provisions or taxation of any income volunteers receive in the form of stipends or per diems (these related sub-barriers are described below).

Sub-barrier 1: Volunteering is not a legal ground for obtaining a residence permit in a receiving country

In some Member States, such as Belgium, the lack of legal status creates an obstacle to obtaining a residence permit in the host Member State, as volunteering work does not fall in the narrow categories set out for applying for residency.

This barrier is particularly relevant in a cross-border perspective where volunteers have to deal with administration in another Member State. It can have a host of implications arising from the fact that access to a range of services is linked to residency. For example, it may result in an inability to open a bank account, obtain health insurance and access other every day services. It can affect all volunteers and it mainly impacts long term cross-border volunteer placements.

Belgium was one of the countries where this issue was raised, as well as Italy. The types of practical impact this has includes time spent by staff of host volunteer organisations in tackling these administrative issues and accompanying the volunteer to the relevant authorities when the volunteer does not speak the host country language.

Sub-barrier 2: Uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits

Across Member States different rules apply to the provision of social security and unemployment benefits. In some such as?, people are able to volunteer and continue to receive their benefits. In others, they may be able to do so for a limited period of time (for example 20 hours per week), while in others such as? carrying out any volunteering work results in a loss in benefits.

Depending on the situation this can impact on cross-border volunteering in the same way as for volunteering at national level, while other scenarios can have a greater impact on cross-border volunteering.

⁹² Communication from the Commission on EU Policies and Volunteering: Recognising and Promoting Crossborder Voluntary Activities in the EU, COM(2011) 568 final, 20 September 2011; The EVY 2011 Alliance, 'Policy Agenda for Volunteering in Europe (PAVE)', report, 2011;

⁹³ GHK, 'Study on volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010.p. 124.

For example, while limitation in hours volunteered appears to be relatively neutral, it can have a more pronounced impact on cross-border volunteers as such volunteering tends to require full time and longer term commitments. It can thus preclude people from volunteering abroad.

Moreover, in some Member States, volunteers may lose out on social benefits in their home country upon their return after a certain time spent volunteering abroad⁹⁴. This specific problem is faced by volunteers either because the volunteering activity is regarded as employment (out-of-pocket money considered as a salary in which countries for examples?) or it is of a certain duration.

One interviewee mentioned that this was an issue for German volunteers coming to the United Kingdom. If German volunteer goes abroad for a certain number of months, social security and statutory pension benefits can be lost. Volunteers may choose not to go abroad for fear of losing out on entitlements (or having to pay back benefits, for example two years later). There are also last minute cancellations on this ground. The impact also depends on time spent abroad and usually affects long term volunteers. This factor also has the potential to exclude lower income volunteers.

Sub-barrier 3: Expenses/reimbursement of volunteers subject to income tax

Volunteers are often reimbursed genuine out-of-pocket expenses or provided a lump sum – based on the amounts spent by volunteers for the purpose of their volunteering. The expenses can cover, for example, travel, meals, or postage and phone calls⁹⁵.

Although every country has its own approach to tax arrangements, in most Member States the reimbursement of expenses for volunteers is exempt from taxation. Some countries establish a certain threshold above which the volunteer's expenses may be subject to tax. This can be an issue from a cross-border perspective where volunteers receive a higher allowance than is allowed under the host Member State threshold.

For example, there have been cases where volunteers in Belgium and France have had their expenses taxed as income. This arises as a specific cross-border problem where volunteers move from a non-taxing country to a taxing country and subsequently lose some of their expenses.

Case study: taxation of volunteer expenses - Belgium (I-04)

'In Belgium the Federal Law supporting volunteering from 2005 provides for covering expenses of volunteers for up to EUR30/day (with an upper limit of EUR1300/year).

For volunteers coming from abroad receiving expense money of more than this upper limit, this can be subject to tax.

As there is no legal framework in Belgium on cross-border volunteering, volunteers may be subject to fiscal control if they exceed this limit.

These controls are usually resolved in an informal manner. However, they involve time on the part of the host volunteer organisation, and mean that volunteer organisations may be reluctant to recruit international volunteers. A legal framework would facilitate this issue better.'

⁹⁴ European Volunteer Centre (CEV), Policy Conference, 'Cross-Border Volunteering in the European Year of Citizens – What is it for?', Sarajevo, 3-4 October 2013.

⁹⁵ Volunteer Now UK, Volunteers and expenses information sheet.

However, based on interviews ,it appears that volunteers are not checked that frequently by tax authorities (I-01) and while there is a risk that some volunteers are discouraged by this issue, it has not been raised as a major deterrent effect (I-01).

3. Lack of mutual recognition between Member States

The lack of mutual recognition of volunteer organisations between Member States can create barriers for these that mainly or fully work on a transnational basis. An example is where an organisation that exclusively conducts EU-wide activities is registered in France - and is therefore identified as a French organisation. Such an organisation could encounter difficulties organising events or campaigns in other Member States.

Member States are required to be involved in issues such as fund raising or registration. This leads to additional cost and time and the need to hand over work to other volunteer organisations that could be done by the association itself. This could be avoided if recognition of (EU) associations was better harmonised.

Grants used for funding events or campaigns are often provided to national organisations. There is a reluctance to provide grants to an EU organisation or organisation from a Member State where organisations from another Member State are active. This can impact organisations insofar as it involves time and resources spent by host volunteer organisations to organise events/campaigns via national volunteer organisations.

Cross-border volunteering is affected to a lesser extent than other organisation in this respect. This is because it is largely undertaken through sending and hosting organisations which are all established in their respective Member State.

Financial barriers

4. Lack of clarity regarding tax exemptions for employee volunteering

Expenses incurred through Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programmes (or other employee volunteering programmes) outside the Member States are often not tax deductible. This contrasts with national initiatives that are usually tax deductible. Overall, CSR policies are developed from a national perspective and do not take into account cross-border/European perspectives. This may impact EU cross-border volunteering initiatives by disincentivising companies from engaging in cross-border CSR projects within the EU.

However, feedback from the European Volunteering Employee Network members indicated that there are very few examples of cross-border volunteering of employees within Europe⁹⁶. Employee volunteering tends to occur from the EU to developing countries, but not within the EU⁹⁶. Reasons given for this were not related to tax issues however (cross-border volunteering within the EU was not generally seen as a priority).

⁹⁶ Interview with EVEN Network, 24 April 2014.

5. Lack of sustainable funding for organisations (EU funding programmes; red tape; other)

Volunteer organisations engaging in volunteering often face a lack of sustainable funding. While schemes such as EVS offer project funding in the form of lump sums, project funding does not necessarily help organisations to develop long-term operational capacity. Beyond project expenses there is rarely funding available for organisation's core budget. As a result, many smaller organisations may have a fragile project-to-project survival tactic which is not sustainable. Competition for available funds is fierce and applications for funding can be lengthy and bureaucratic (red tape) which can be a serious barrier for smaller volunteer organisations, taking up resources and time or excluding them from participation altogether.

While this has a policy aim (the Court of Auditors, for example, has underscored that some "red tape" requirements are useful safeguards against fraud), funding issues were raised as a significant challenge and a reason for not sending more volunteers abroad.

While funding issues can clearly operate as a significant barrier, this barrier has not been examined from a cost analysis perspective. This is partly because funding issues are not specific to cross-border volunteering, nor indeed to any area of volunteering. In reality, most sectors would argue that they would be able to increase their services with additional funding. The nature of this barrier is thus fundamentally different to other barriers which impede volunteering from a process and organisational perspective and result in increased administrative, legal and financial burdens.

Recruitment, training and recognition of volunteering

6. Lack of clarity with regard to recognition of skills and competences gained through volunteering

The lack of clarity with regard to recognition of skills and competences gained through volunteering was also raised as a significant issue in the literature reviewed. A barrier to this can be exacerbated in a cross-border context where skills learnt abroad are even less likely to be recognised upon returning to the country of origin. Formal recognition of skills is especially important for (disadvantaged) young people having difficulties in entering the labour market and/or pursuing formal education. According to one interviewee, someone with no diploma will hesitate to volunteer as it may not necessarily be seen as something useful.

'The recognition of skills varies from country to country. In Greece, contrary to Denmark for example, the skills acquired abroad in doing voluntary work are not recognised or accepted as a relevant experience. This leads to volunteers from Greece being discouraged from the long term volunteering, and therefore volunteers remain more active in the short term activities, such as sports events (for example, Olympic games)'.

The lack of formal recognition of skills can lead to employers not appreciating the added value of cross-border volunteering experience⁹⁷. Because there is no clarity regarding recognition, many

⁹⁷ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', p. 260.

potential participants do not believe that volunteering would strengthen their position in the labour market and may lead them to forego the volunteer experience⁹⁸.

As well as discouraging volunteers from going abroad, there are also indirect costs such as the potential for heightened exclusion, as volunteers from disadvantaged backgrounds are discouraged from participating.

In contrast, some interviews highlighted that volunteers can freely explain their skills in their CVs, and a formal framework for recognising skills is not necessarily the answer, as not many employers in the EU relate to the Europass CV. However, the volunteer passport (used in the EVS scheme) can be useful to the extent that it helps the volunteer record his/her experience, and reflect upon the value of the skills they have learned.

7. Training and preparation for volunteers (including cultural/linguistic issues)

Preparatory training for volunteers (pre-departure, arrival, mentoring) is particularly important for cross-border volunteers as they have to adapt to a new role and to a new culture.

Lack of training (or inappropriate training) and lack of proper mentoring in the short-term can lead to volunteers terminating early, resulting in a reduced impact of volunteering and waste of funds invested. In the long term, lack of appropriate training can result in the lack of continuity, such as no more requests being made for volunteers by host volunteer organisations or volunteers experiencing failure or lack of motivation to engage in another volunteering activity.

Language considerations are particularly relevant for volunteers going abroad within the EU. Volunteers can be deterred if they do not speak the language of the host country. This is a problem both at recruitment stage (host volunteer organisations may filter out volunteers based on their language skills even when this is not essential to the work, for example construction work) and in preparing volunteers with the adequate linguistic skills to go abroad. Some volunteer organisations received feedback from volunteers saying that language was a barrier to integration within the local community (I-08).

8. Insufficient positive action and information on volunteering opportunities

There is a perceived lack of information concerning volunteer opportunities in another EU country, as well as limited positive information on the benefits of volunteering.

The **lack of information** may be due to limited or no access to the information presented in certain types of media, language barriers or inadequate description of activities. This situation may also occur because a certain group of people isolate themselves from outside information or because some groups are not in a position to receive the information about cross-border volunteering

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. xiv.

opportunities⁹⁹. Some interviewees also felt that information is not sufficiently disseminated even on the EVS scheme.

One interviewee pointed out that online communication (social media) is used to promote cross-border volunteering, but profit making companies have more money than volunteer organisations for launching big campaigns, and therefore represent strong competition (although profit making companies tend to send volunteers outside the EU).

The information may also be available but may be inappropriate (for example, emphasizing young people's responsibilities (focused more on "giving back") rather than mutual benefits) or offering positions that should be filled by paid staff and not volunteers (thus exploitation potential). Information may be inaccessible due to group closure or unequal access to information. More **positive information** is needed highlighting the benefits of volunteering abroad.

This barrier manifests itself through people not coming forward to a volunteer organisation because of lack of data or information. Some volunteer organisations do not have as many applicants as they should. For example, one volunteer organisation interviewed had 15 placements to send abroad, but if they had more applications they would perhaps be able to make more suitable placements (rather than recruitment by default).

9. Diversity in recruitment of volunteers

The literature review highlighted a need to increase diversity in recruitment and do more to broaden the base of volunteers by reaching out to those currently under-represented in the volunteering population. This relates to including older volunteers, but also to including marginalized social groups such as those with fewer resources or legal immigrants.

Older workers

While certain countries such as Belgium, Denmark, Germany and Spain, have recorded an increased involvement of older people in volunteering many are still not tapping into the potential that the ageing population can bring.

Social inclusion

The lack of diversity is likely to be far more acute for cross border than for in country volunteering due to, for example, the costs involved in going abroad. Cross-border volunteering therefore has a far greater potential to widen further existing inequalities. Some interviewees saw this as a cross-border issue, as it results in gaps in the appreciation of Europe and experience of European citizenship.

⁹⁹ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', p. 73.

Case study of a third country national (recognised refugee in Denmark) (I-12 and I-23)

- In 2012, an Afghan recognised refugee in Denmark was due to come to Italy for an 11 month volunteering placement in an elderly care home in Turino under the EVS scheme.
- The prospective volunteer was from Afghanistan (originally from Pakistan), who had come to Denmark in June 1992. She had legal status but did not have Danish citizenship, and therefore no passport to travel on. The girl is still waiting for her citizenship, and had to forego EVS placement.
- She also had a residency card, but this card was lost by the Danish Authorities. She needed to prove that she was not entitled to an Afghan passport. The Afghan embassy in Hamburg refused to provide such proof and the case went to the Ministry of Justice.
- The partner in Denmark supported the volunteer in the process (March to December 2013 on the case – about 10 days)
- The host volunteer organisation Diaconia Valdese also supported the girl during 5 to 6 months (about 50 hours).
- Finally the volunteer was not able to carry out the placement, and no one took on the position (the EVS funding was specifically allocated for a volunteer with the partner volunteer organisation).

Other concerns raised during interviews were linked to Roma volunteers and certain intercultural difficulties. Roma volunteers are not well considered in their own countries and therefore not motivated to volunteer in another country.

Roma volunteers –case study with Phiren Amenca (I-21)

- **The volunteer organisation:** Phiren Amenca is an international network of 17 Roma and non Roma organisations active in 12 Member States. It has a common mission to work with young Roma on challenging stereotypes and address root causes of discrimination.
- **Volunteers:** Roma and non-Roma volunteers between 18-30 years old.
- **Number of volunteers:** approx. 40 a year, 20 Roma and 20 non-Roma.
- **Volunteer profile:** mainly university graduates, but also young NEET (not in education, employment or training).
- **Key benefits:** Personal development; breaking the cycle of discrimination; broadening horizons; general educational value on issues on Holocaust.
- **Funding:** the organisation itself is mostly privately funded. Volunteer placements are funded by EVS (close to 80%), but also by State funded schemes such as the French Service Civique and the German State funded programme. and self-organised initiatives in the Netherlands.
- **Type of placements:** Placements include youth work; social projects (such as working with the

elderly; immigration and refugee centres), or specifically related to Roma issues such as documentation; remembering, dialogue, capacity building (e.g. of EVS accredited host volunteer organisation: the Central Council of Documentation and Culture of German Sinti and Roma (Heidelberg)).

- **Training:** Phiren Amenca organises training for Roma and non-Roma volunteers, focussing on Roma empowerment, gender and discrimination issues.
- Key obstacles to Roma volunteering:
 - o Negative stereotypes and discrimination: Roma volunteers are sometimes refused by hosting volunteer organisations on the premise that they would be a “burden”.
 - o There are few Roma organizations engaged in volunteering and a mistrust of young Roma towards mainstream organizations due to negative experiences of discrimination.
 - o Language and training: EVS provides support for language training, but the training provided is often not sufficiently extensive for young people with few opportunities. There is need for extra mentoring, because many come from families with limited financial resources and do not have experience going abroad. Phiren Amenca have provided language training for volunteers and noticed the huge impact this has on making a volunteer placement a success. However, they are restricted in these efforts by funding.
 - o Funding for volunteers: Roma volunteers may also have additional needs (such as other expenses to allow prepare them for going abroad). National Agencies such as the German Agency have provided support, and the EVS has provision for exceptional costs, but this is limited.

Recommendations:

- EVS in particular should invest in quality volunteering and pre-departure preparation, rather than focus on the number of volunteers the scheme can send abroad.
- The individual assessment in EVS if a person is disadvantaged should be altered to take into account structural discrimination and its effects on a person's self-esteem.

10. Measuring: difficulties in obtaining comparable data to measure the contribution of volunteering

There is a general lack of comparable data measuring contribution of cross-border volunteering. This can lead to reduced options for advocacy, and lack of evidence with which to formulate and advocate for evidence based policies. This may also lead to a limited appreciation of contributions to the larger cause (one aspect of recognition). While this certainly has an impact on cross-border volunteering, this impact is nonetheless indirect and this issue was not considered for the cost assessment.

Chapter 4: Assessment of costs of barriers to cross border volunteering and potential benefits of eu action

Key findings

- The most significant share of costs stemming from barriers to cross-border volunteering in the EU have to do with a lower time contribution by volunteers than could potentially exist, although a number of administrative costs have also been identified
- As per the illustrative assessment presented in this study, costs associated to these barriers may range, approximately, between EUR25m and EUR135m p.a. depending on the scenarios, with a central estimate of about EUR65m p.a.
- These costs appear relatively minor (0,0010% of the Union's GDP in 2013, even under the highest-cost scenario), as cross-border volunteering remains a marginal phenomenon in the EU
- However, stronger EU action could help avoid part of these costs while increasing the visibility of cross-border volunteering and its socioeconomic contribution, thus fostering a more efficient model for cross-border volunteering and enhancing participation

1. Introduction

This section assesses the economic costs resulting from a selection of barriers to EU cross-border volunteering as identified in Chapter 3 of this report. It also provides a high-level assessment of the potential net benefits of further EU action to help mitigate the negative impacts of those barriers.

Barriers Chosen for Cost Assessment

- Volunteering not a legal ground for obtaining a residence permit in a hosting country;
- Uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits;
- Lack of clarity regarding recognition of skills and competences gained through volunteering;
- Information on cross-border volunteering opportunities not adequately disseminated;
- Lack of adequate training and preparation for cross-border volunteers.

For each of the barriers, the most significant direct and indirect costs are identified, and quantified to the extent possible. The assessment pays special attention to the expected distribution of estimated costs by grouping them according to the target group to which they are expected to accrue (with a focus on volunteer organisations as well as public authorities).

Quantitative estimates of potential benefits stemming from further EU action are provided in all instances where sufficient data and information are available. These estimates are presented as net benefits, i.e. net of associated administrative costs linked to EU action¹⁰⁰.

The present section is structured as follows:

- Section II discusses the methodological approach adopted in this assessment
- Section III presents an assessment of costs of barriers to cross-border volunteering and of potential benefits of EU action with regard to each of the barriers under consideration
- Section IV concludes

2. Cost assessment methodology

This section discusses the methodological approach adopted for the assessment of costs and benefits associated with barriers to cross-border volunteering in the EU, as well as with potential measures to address those barriers.

The main aspects covered in this section are as follows:

- Identification of uncertainties
- Contextual information for the dimensioning of costs and benefits
- Approach to the calculation of barrier-related costs
- Approach to the calculation of benefits of further EU action

2.1. Assessment of costs and benefits: dealing with uncertainty

When attempting to carry out cost assessments, particularly in the social sphere, data is often scarce, there can be a lack of comparability of data or there can be range of uncertainties as to the data.

Since these uncertainties can affect the accuracy of results, it is crucial to clearly identify them and their various dimensions, and to understand their potential implications with respect to the conclusions of the cost-assessment¹⁰¹. To do so, key uncertainties have been mapped and their relevance assessed. Three main dimensions have emerged as particularly noteworthy in this regard: framing of the topic, data availability and uncertainties associated with some of the research methods used in this study.

What follows is an overview of key issues belonging to each of those areas as well as the methodological approach adopted here to account for multi-dimensional uncertainty.

¹⁰⁰ The European Commission Standard Cost Model (SCM) is applied to calculate administrative costs.

¹⁰¹ In line with the Technical Specifications' acknowledgement of the need to account for multi-dimensional uncertainty assessment, this study draws on: Petersen, A.C. et al, 'Guidance for Uncertainty Assessment and Communication', 2nd Edition, PBL, 2013.

2.1.1.Framing of the topic

Taking into account the remit of this study, and in line with wider EU impact assessment approaches, only a selected number of barriers are assessed and for each barrier only certain costs are assessed.

Concerning the impacts (i.e. costs and benefits) under consideration, our approach focuses on those which are expected to be of greater magnitude and can be most directly linked to the relevant barrier or to EU-level action to address these barriers. Only those target groups expected to be more directly affected have been considered. It is, however, acknowledged that uncertainty exists regarding the incidence and magnitude of more indirect or diffuse impacts¹⁰², such as impacts on business activity more generally or benefits relating to social inclusion.

2.1.2.Adequacy of the knowledge base

While there is a wide range of information on volunteering, research and consultations have shown that data relating to volunteering at the national level (particular data relevant to determining costs) is scarce, methodologies for collecting data vary and there is generally a lack of homogeneity between data in Member States. The situation with respect to data relevant to cross-border volunteering is even worse, with virtually no data available at all and again with different approaches used where data is available.

2.1.3.Uncertainties associated with chosen research methods

Due to the diverse needs of the study and the lack of usable data, a range of research methods and techniques, such as desk research, in-depth interviews and a stakeholder survey were employed.

Without such an approach, it would not have been possible to carry out any cost assessments. However, some of the techniques carry inherent uncertainties. In particular, stakeholder consultations have been used to gather evidence of problems and possible costs (or factors relevant to costs), and on the basis of that information certain assumptions necessary for the cost assessment have been developed, e.g. the proportion of volunteers that would have engaged in cross-border volunteering in the absence of barriers.

A balanced sample of stakeholders was consulted but the consultation was nevertheless limited by the timeframe and scope of the study. In addition, the consultations provided a combination of objective and subjective information. As such, assumptions entail a certain degree of uncertainty.

Similarly, expert judgment has been partly used as the basis for some of the assumptions (e.g. regarding administrative burdens). Although useful to bridge some of the above mentioned knowledge gaps, expert judgment is also a source of uncertainty insofar as it may be difficult to question its validity in practice.

Whilst these uncertainties are unavoidable, the risks of the uncertainties have been reduced or have been identified through the following process:

- Obstacles to fill existing knowledge gaps (which in this case mainly relate to the number of cross-border volunteers in the EU and their economic contribution and, to a lesser extent, to the potential resource implications of some of the EU-level policy options under consideration) are acknowledged; assumptions used to bridge these knowledge gaps are duly indicated throughout the report;

¹⁰² See point below on uncertainties which are not amenable to quantitative analysis.

- Wherever possible, results are presented in the form of estimated ranges to take into account the levels of uncertainty. Here there is a particular emphasis on those which are likely to affect the main outcomes of the study. These ranges have been developed to capture the significant levels of uncertainty regarding the magnitude and incidence of many of the barrier-related impacts, as well as with the expected effectiveness of (and thus expected benefits from) EU-level action to address barriers to cross-border volunteering;
- The uncertainties are not amenable to quantitative analysis are presented, as well as their implications for the conclusions of the analysis are explained. These mostly have to do with more indirect or diffuse impacts, the in-depth assessment of which is generally beyond the resource scope of this study;
- Peer review including with the expert panel has been used to ensure that those assumptions stemming from expert judgement and/or extrapolation from other policy areas are as realistic as possible.

2.2. Contextual information: number of cross-border volunteers in the EU and their economic contribution

2.2.1. Calculation of the total number of cross-border volunteers in the EU

Estimating the different impacts considered in this assessment requires knowledge of the approximate number of cross-border volunteers active in the EU every year, as this is crucial for assessing such impacts. The table below presents relevant data on the number of annual cross-border volunteers involved in the most significant schemes across the EU (the raw data is provided in Annex IV).

Table 4: Estimated number of annual cross-border volunteers within the EU

	Country	No. of cross-border volunteers*
European Voluntary Service (EVS) Scheme	EU	4000 ¹⁰³
State Funded Schemes		
<i>FSJ- Voluntary Year of Social Service</i>	Germany	1,500
<i>FÖJ - Voluntary Year of Ecological Service</i>	Germany	450
<i>French Civic Service</i>	France	100
<i>International Voluntary Service United Kingdom</i>	United Kingdom	120
<i>Italian National Civic Service</i>	Italy	60
<i>Internationella Arbetslag (IAL)</i>	Sweden	250
TOTAL		6,760

Source: Milieu elaboration based on Interviews; email/phone communication requesting data on relevant schemes.

The data table 1 above reflects the main share of cross-border volunteering initiatives identified in the EU. As shown above, many volunteers that engage in cross-border activities appear to do so under the European Voluntary Service (EVS), a particular type of volunteering scheme promoted by the

¹⁰³ Note on EVS data and projections: under the Erasmus+ programme (2014-2020), an increase of the number of volunteers sent under EVS is expected. An estimated 10 000 volunteers will go abroad in 2014 and a yearly increase is expected throughout the programme lifecycle estimated to reach 20 000 volunteers in the year 2020 (Data obtained from DG EAC, June 2014).

European Commission that allows young people to develop full-time voluntary activities in EU countries other than their country of residence. State funded schemes are also an important source of funding for cross-border volunteering activities. Data on the number of volunteers funded by these schemes has been obtained for the main State Funded schemes sending volunteers cross-border at EU level: Germany, France, United Kingdom, Italy and Sweden.

It should be emphasised that the schemes above do not reflect all cross-border volunteering schemes. However, research indicates that the vast majority of EU cross-border volunteering is carried out through these schemes. At the same time, due to a lack of consistent disaggregation of data between EU volunteering and volunteering in non-EU countries, it is acknowledged that there is some over counting in the case of some State Funded schemes (this applies for e.g. to data collected on the VSO scheme in the UK).

Taking into account these factors, it is estimated that approximately 7,000 cross-border volunteers are active every year in the EU. This appears to be a very small share of total volunteering in the EU: according to several studies, it is estimated that there are about 100 million volunteers¹⁰⁴ per year in the EU. Nevertheless, it is important to note that cross-border volunteers contribute on average more hours per year than local volunteers: data suggests that, in Europe, in-country volunteers work on average about four hours per week¹⁰⁵ (cross-border volunteers, in turn, tend to work full-time according to consulted stakeholders).

2.2.2. Calculation of the value of cross-border volunteering in the EU

Like the number of cross-border volunteers, estimating the economic contribution of volunteers is crucial to assess barrier-related impacts. To do so, this study uses the “replacement cost” approach, as per International Labour Organisation’s ‘Manual on the measurement of volunteer work’. This method estimates the value of volunteering by analysing what it would cost to hire someone to do the work that volunteers perform for no pay¹⁰⁶.

Applying the replacement cost approach requires knowledge of the following:

- The approximate number of hours volunteered during a reference period by all EU cross-border volunteers;
- The average wage to be used to estimate the value of these hours¹⁰⁷.

¹⁰⁴ European Parliament Report on the role of volunteering in contributing to economic and social cohesion (2007/2149(INI)), Committee on Regional Development, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A6-2008-0070+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>.

¹⁰⁵ European Foundation for the Improvement of the Living and Working Conditions (Eurofund), ‘Second European Quality of Life Survey. Participation in volunteering and unpaid work’, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2011.

¹⁰⁶ Since this method does not take into account the more intangible socioeconomic benefits of volunteering, resulting estimates are likely to result in an underestimation. However, in-depth assessment of these intangible impacts is not possible in the context of this study due to resource limitations.

¹⁰⁷ The optimum approach would be to identify the occupation that comes closest to the type of work that each volunteer performs and use the wage associated with that occupation to value the volunteer work. This approach requires information not only on the number of volunteers and the hours that they work, but also on the jobs that each one does, and the average wages associated with the various occupations. Since such data is not available, the average wage in the social sector in the EU will be used.

Methodological aspects regarding each of these parameters are briefly discussed below.

Total number of hours volunteered

According to the stakeholder survey, the majority of cross-border volunteers tend to dedicate full-time to their assignment¹⁰⁸. For calculation purposes, it will be assumed here that this is the case for all cross-border volunteers.

Available information on the length of cross-border volunteering placements reveals that the majority of cross-border volunteers remain between 6 and 12 months in their placements. To account for the considerable level of uncertainty stemming from the lack of accurate information in this regard, three scenarios are proposed for average length of placements: 6 months, 9 months and 12 months. As shown in **table 5** below, assuming full-time commitment and 7,000 cross-border volunteers, the annual time contribution of cross-border volunteers is estimated to range between 5.8M and 11.7m hours (i.e. between 840 and 1,680 hours per volunteer) depending on the scenarios.

Average wage

Given the absence of detailed information on the skills level and the specific tasks that cross-border volunteers perform, the EU average wage of workers in the social sector will be used to estimate the value of cross-border volunteers' work. This approach is in line with the recommendation of the United Nations 'Handbook on Non-profit Institutions in the System of National Accounts'. Data from Eurostat¹⁰⁹ show that average annual gross earnings in the 'human health and social work activities' sector amounted to EUR25,000 per worker in 2010¹¹⁰. It is important to note, however, that average annual gross earnings per sector vary considerably by country, and that notable differences exist between EU-15¹¹¹ and EU-28 countries. For instance, average annual gross earnings in the social sector in EU-15 countries amounted to EUR34,800 in 2010¹¹².

In order to estimate the hourly wage in the social sector, the annual average earnings have to be divided by the total number of hours worked. According to statistics from the OECD¹¹³, the average annual hours actually worked per worker in the EU were 1,679 hours¹¹⁴ in 2012, implying that the

¹⁰⁸ In line with statistics from the OECD for EU workers, it will be assumed here that cross-border volunteers who volunteer full-time work 1,680 hours per year.

¹⁰⁹ Data at NACE Rev. 2 level for 2010 has been used as it is the most recent data for a high number of EU Member States. Data at NACE Rev. 2 level for 2011 is also available but for a more limited number of Member States.

¹¹⁰ Average annual gross earnings, Economic activity 'Human health and social work activities' (NACE Rev. 2). This group of economic activity is assumed to be representative of the activities belonging to the social sector. Countries for which data is available and that have been considered to calculate average gross earnings in the sector are the following: Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Spain, France, Latvia, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

¹¹¹ Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom

¹¹² Data available for the following EU-15 countries: Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Spain, France, Netherlands, Portugal, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

¹¹³ Source: OECD Stat

¹¹⁴ This number is the average of the data for 21 Member States available in the database of the OECD (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy,

average gross salary per worker in the social sector is around EUR15 per hour (EUR21 per hour in the case of EU-15 countries). Therefore, it will be assumed here that the economic value of cross-border volunteers' activities is EUR15 per hour volunteered.

Annual economic value of EU cross-border volunteering

The total annual economic value of EU cross-border volunteering activities is obtained by multiplying the estimated total number of hours volunteered per year by cross-border volunteers by the estimated average annual salary of workers in the social sector. As shown in the table below, these values are expected to range between EUR88.2m and EUR176.4m p.a. (or between EUR12,600 and EUR25,200 per volunteer p.a.).

Table 5: Summary of calculation of the economic value of EU cross-border volunteering activities

Concept	Economic contribution		
	6 months p.a.	9 months p.a.	12 months p.a.
Estimated number of hours volunteered per year by EU cross-border volunteers	5,880,000 hours/year	8,820,000 hours/year	11,760,000 hours/year
Estimated number of cross-border volunteers	7,000		
Estimated average annual hours volunteered per cross-border volunteer	840 hours/year	1,260 hours/year	1,680 hours/year
Estimated average hourly gross earnings per worker in the social sector	EUR15/hour		
Average annual gross earnings per worker in the social sector	EUR25,000/year		
Average annual hours actually worked per worker	1,680 hours/year		
Estimated annual economic value of cross-border volunteering activities in the EU	EUR88,200,000	EUR132,300,000	EUR176,400,000
Estimated annual economic value of cross-border volunteering activities per volunteer in the EU	EUR12,600	EUR18,900	EUR25,200

Source: Milieu elaboration based on OECD Stats, Eurostat, interviews and stakeholder survey (Q. 1, Q.2).

This study assesses the costs due to existing barriers to cross-border volunteering activities in the EU. Based on these findings, identifies potential relevant areas for further legislative action at EU level.

Calculation of barrier-related costs

Reference values presented in **section 2** above have been used as a starting point for the assessment of barrier-related costs. Stakeholder consultations have in turn served to determine the estimated magnitude (i.e. extent or resource implications of a given barrier-related impact), incidence (i.e. share of volunteers affected by a given barrier on an annual basis) and distribution of barrier-related impacts to the extent possible (i.e. who bears the costs).

Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom)

To account for uncertainty, scenarios have been developed. Using the arithmetic average of estimates provided by stakeholders (mostly via a stakeholder survey) as a central assumption (medium scenario) and apply a $\pm 50\%$ factor to produce alternative scenarios (high and low).¹¹⁵

Administrative costs have been assessed applying the EU Standard Cost Model (SCM). Amounts are expressed as net additional administrative costs on an annual basis. The table below presents the tariff values used to calculate administrative costs accruing to the different target groups.

Table 6: Tariff values of different target groups (2010)

	Hourly wage	Hourly wage + 25% overhead costs
Social sector ¹¹⁶ (applied to valuation of volunteering work and to calculate administrative costs for volunteer organisations)	EUR15	EUR19
Public Authorities at local level ¹¹⁷ (civil servants working at the local level: provision of information and basic services to citizens)	EUR17	EUR22
Member State Authorities ¹¹⁸ (civil servants working at Ministry level: liaison with EU-level authorities)	EUR33	EUR41
EU level authorities ¹¹⁹ (officials working at EU institutions)	EUR54	EUR67

Source: Eurostat

For each of these combinations of scenarios, barrier-related costs are estimated as the product of the monetised impact of a given barrier on a per volunteer basis by the estimated number of volunteers affected each year.¹²⁰

2.3. Calculation of benefits of further EU action

The assessment of the potential net benefits of further EU action to address the barriers under consideration in this study proceeds in three steps. Firstly, it seeks to estimate the potential impact of such action, mainly in terms of cost avoidance. Secondly, it attempts to provide a rough estimate of potential costs associated with the implementation of EU actions –these being mainly administrative costs. Thirdly, it compares both sets of values in order to present high-level estimates of net benefits of EU action. The first two steps are discussed in greater detail below.

¹¹⁵ Figures have been rounded.

¹¹⁶ Eurostat, 'Average annual gross earnings by economic activity', NACE Rev. 2, Human health and social work activities, 2010.

¹¹⁷ Eurostat, 'Average annual gross earnings by economic activity', NACE Rev. 2, Public Administration and defense, 2010.

¹¹⁸ Eurostat, 'Average annual gross earnings by occupation', ISCO 88 (Legislators, senior officials and managers), 2010.

¹¹⁹ As provided by European Commission services for prior studies.

¹²⁰ It must be noted that these are high-level average values which do not appropriately account for asymmetric impacts. It must also be noted that, for greater simplicity in the presentation of results, values have not been discounted.

2.4. Potential benefits (cost avoidance)

With regard to cost avoidance, it is important to note that EU-level action is, as a general rule, unlikely to fully offset all barrier-related costs. Furthermore, given the non-binding nature of most EU actions envisioned, there is significant uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of such action in terms of cost avoidance. Therefore, three different scenarios are considered, relating, respectively, to a reduction of 25%, 50% and 75% of costs. Benefits (as measured by avoided costs) also vary significantly in line with the assumptions used to assess the actual economic costs of the barrier. Based on these factors three scenarios are developed:

- “Low costs scenario”. In this case, the lower estimate bound for barrier-related costs has been taken as reference value to estimate the effect of the EU-action in terms of cost reduction.
- “Medium costs scenario”. This scenario mirrors the approach described above but captures central estimate values.
- “High costs scenario”- Applies the same approach, in order to act as proxy for the upper estimate bound.

The **Data table 5** below indicates which estimates will be taken as reference values to calculate the low, medium and high cost scenarios.

Table 7: Reference values used to calculate low, medium and high cost scenarios

	Estimated Cost (EUR/year) *		
Variable A/Variable B	Value 1 (low)	Value 2 (medium)	Value 3 (high)
Value 1 (low)	Low Cost Scenario		
Value 2 (medium)		Medium Cost Scenario	
Value 3 (high)			High Cost Scenario

By adding the expected cost avoidance linked to the (partial) mitigation of each of the impacts, it is possible to estimate the potential benefits of EU action under each of the abovementioned combination of scenarios. **Section III** presents a detailed explanation on how this methodology is applied in practice throughout the report.

2.5. Costs linked to EU action (administrative)

Estimates for administrative costs stemming from EU action are based on information gathered in previous studies on information-related policy measures as well as on correspondence with public sector officials. Values presented must however be considered for illustrative purposes only, as their main aim is to provide an indication of the estimated order of magnitude of these costs. In addition, it should be noted that the actions assessed are considered the minimum actions needed to address the different barriers, and that further costs would be incurred in case more sophisticated actions were taken by EU authorities.

3. Assessment of costs of barriers to cross-border volunteering and of potential benefits of EU action

This section applies the methodology discussed in the previous chapter to assess possible costs of barriers and potential benefits of EU action.

3.1. Assessment of barrier 3 (sub-barrier 3): volunteering is not a legal ground for obtaining a registration certificate in a receiving country

3.1.1. Assessment of costs

The lack of legal status for obtaining residence permits by volunteers in host Member States can be a barrier to cross-border volunteering. Since European citizens are entitled to legal residence for up to three months before having to register with local authorities, this barrier affects placements longer than three months. This can affect the length of their cross-border activities when residency requirements do not recognise volunteer work as a legal status for granting residency status.

Although consulted stakeholders did not consider this barrier to be a reason for prospective volunteers to give up or cancel cross-border volunteering activities, it was pointed out that it can reduce the length of volunteering placements, thus diminishing potential benefits derived from these activities. In addition, this barrier has also been found to generate administrative costs for both volunteer organisations and public authorities (e.g. provision of information and support to affected volunteers). The box below outlines the main costs related to this barrier. These costs are assessed next.

Costs derived from lack of legal ground for obtaining a residence permit in hosting country

- a) Reduced time contribution by cross-border volunteers due to shorter length of placements.
- b) Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations.
- c) Administrative costs incurred by public authorities.

a) Reduced time contribution by cross-border volunteers due to shorter length of placements

Information provided by consulted stakeholders suggests that difficulties in obtaining residence permits in host countries might result in between 3% and 9% of cross-border volunteers opting for shorter placements than they would otherwise have in the absence of the barrier. Therefore, this barrier might undermine the potential of the sector by reducing volunteers' time contribution and associated benefits. There is not precise information on the length of time that volunteers reduce their placement by. However, based on discussions with stakeholders it will be assumed that between 3% and 9% of cross-border volunteers reduce the length of their placements by an average of between 3 and 6 months. For estimation purposes, it will be assumed that during those months volunteers would have been dedicated full-time to volunteering work. Estimates corresponding to each of these scenarios are presented in the table below.

Table 8: Estimated annual costs of reduced time contribution by cross-border volunteers due to shorter length of placements

	Estimated Cost (EUR/year) *		
	3% of cross-border volunteers affected	6% of cross-border volunteers affected	9% of cross-border volunteers affected
Scenario 1: reduction of 3 months	1,300,000	2,600,000	4,000,000
Scenario 2: reduction of 6 months	2,600,000	5,300,000	7,900,000

* Assuming that volunteers work on average 140 hours per month (in line with data from OECD)

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder survey (Q.5). Rounded figures.

b) Administrative costs incurred by civil society volunteer organisations

Volunteer organisations typically spend time helping and advising volunteers regarding problems related to obtaining residence permits. In line with the previous sub-section and based on stakeholder inputs, it will be assumed here that between 3% and 9% of volunteers are affected by this barrier, and that organisations devote between 3 and 9 hours per volunteer affected p.a. to provide them with relevant information and support.

As per the methodology presented in Chapter 2 (Section 3), it is estimated that the total administrative costs incurred by EU volunteer organisations to deal with this barrier range between EUR12,000 and EUR108,000 per year, depending on the assumptions. Calculations for each of the scenarios are presented in the table below.

Table 9: Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations

	Estimated Cost (EUR/year) *		
	3% of cross-border volunteers affected	6% of cross-border volunteers affected	9% of cross-border volunteers affected
Scenario 1: 3 hours/volunteer affected	12,000	24,000	36,000
Scenario 2: 6 hours/volunteer affected	24,000	48,000	72,000
Scenario 3: 9 hours/ volunteer affected	36,000	72,000	108,000

*Assuming an hourly wage rate in the social sector (including overhead costs of 25%) of EUR19 (see Section II.3)

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder survey (Q.4, Q.6). Rounded figures.

c)

Administrative costs incurred by public authorities

Public authorities also devote resources to respond to cross-border volunteers' queries and assist them with regard to residence permits. Given the lack of available data, it will be assumed here that public authorities (typically at the municipal level¹²¹) spend at least as many hours as volunteer organisations dealing with these issues per volunteer affected¹²². Nevertheless, as shown in the calculations presented in the table below, the actual administrative costs incurred by public authorities are expected to be slightly higher than those incurred by volunteer organisations, as labour costs in the public administration are assumed to be higher than in the social sector: around EUR22 per hour, according to data from Eurostat and the OECD¹²³. This barrier is estimated to represent a burden for public administrations of between EUR14,000 and EUR125,000 per year, depending on the scenarios.

Table 10: Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by public authorities

	Estimated Cost (EUR/year) *		
	3% of cross-border volunteers affected	6% of cross-border volunteers affected	9% of cross-border volunteers affected
Scenario 1: 3 hours /volunteer affected	14,000	28,000	42,000
Scenario 2: 6 hours/ volunteer affected	28,000	55,000	83,000
Scenario 3: 9 hours/ volunteer affected	42,000	83,000	125,000

*Assuming an hourly wage rate in the public administration (including overhead costs of 25%) of EUR22 (see Section II.3)

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder survey (Q.4, Q.6). Rounded figures.

3.1.2. EU action: assessment of potential benefits

In view of the cost implications that this barrier might have for cross-border volunteering, this section will assess the potential net benefits that further action at EU level could bring about. As the issuance of residence permits belongs to the realm of competence of national (or subnational) authorities, EU action to help remove this barrier is assumed to be limited to the provision of information to competent authorities about the existence of this barrier and its effects, as well as to the coordination of Member States' actions to remove this barrier. The aim here is to ensure either that authorities are better equipped to recognise volunteering as a valid reason for registration, or to change relevant forms to enable speedy recognition without the need for further intervention.

a)

¹²¹ The reader is referred to section III for a detailed discussion on the underlying assumptions for the calculation of costs to public authorities.

¹²² Therefore this is a lower-bound estimate of the administrative costs incurred by public authorities, as other costs for public administrations might derive from this barrier.

¹²³ See Section III for further details on calculations.

Potential benefits for volunteers, volunteer organisations and public authorities

EU action to address this barrier may help reduce the costs analysed in the previous section; namely:

- Forgone time contribution by volunteers due to shorter length of placements;
- Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations to assist cross-border volunteers;
- Administrative costs incurred by public authorities with regard to queries from cross-border volunteers.

As discussed in the methodology section, EU level action is, however, unlikely to fully offset all of these costs. Even where volunteering is used as a criterion for registration, there will still be some level of administrative burden when submitting and processing an application. Moreover, whilst this might be achieved in one Member State, it is not guaranteed for all.

Given uncertainties regarding the effectiveness of such action in terms of cost avoidance, three different scenarios are considered, relating, respectively, to a reduction of 25%, 50% and 75% of costs. In the same vein, benefits (as measured by avoided costs) vary significantly in line with the assumptions used to assess the actual economic costs of the barrier. Therefore, three reference scenarios are considered. These are used consistently throughout the report but, for conciseness, are discussed in detail only with respect to this barrier.

- 'Low costs scenario'. In this case, the reference value corresponds to the lower-bound estimate from table 5 (i.e. there are 3% of cross-border volunteers affected who reduce their placement by 3 months). In the case of Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations, the reference value corresponds to the lower estimate from table 6 (i.e. 3% of cross-border volunteers are affected and organisations devote 3 hours per case to provide support). Regarding the administrative costs incurred by public administrations, the reference value corresponds to the lower estimate from table 7 (i.e. 3% of cross-border volunteers are affected and public authorities devote 3 hours per case to provide support). Once these values are identified, the benefit of a reduction of 25%, 50% and 75% of these costs, respectively, is estimated.
- 'Medium costs scenario'. This scenario mirrors the approach described above but captures central estimate values from tables 5, 6 and 7. It has to be noted that in this case, since there are only 2 scenarios for reduced time contribution in table 5, a 3 month-reduction affecting 6% of cross-border volunteers has been taken as the reference value.
- 'High costs scenario (hereinafter high scenario)': applying the same approach, in this case the reference values correspond to the upper-bound estimates from table 5, 6 and 7, respectively.

This approach is replicated throughout the report.

By adding the expected cost avoidance linked to the (partial) mitigation of each of the impacts, it is possible to estimate the potential benefits of EU action. Assuming an offset level of 25%, the annual benefits of EU action are estimated to range between around EUR332,000 (in the low scenario) and EUR2m (in the high scenario). In a medium offset level (50%) scenario, the annual benefits of EU action are expected to range between EUR663,000 and EUR4.1m. In a high offset level (75%) scenario, the annual benefits of EU action are estimated to range between approximately EUR1m and EUR6.1m.

Table 11: Estimated annual benefits of EU action**Table 9a: Low costs scenario**

	Estimated Benefit (EUR/year)		
Costs	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Shorter length of placements	325,000	650,000	975,000
Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations	3,000	6,000	9,000
Administrative costs incurred by public authorities	4,000	7,000	11,000
TOTAL	332,000	663,000	995,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on stakeholder survey. Rounded figures.

Data table 9b: Medium costs scenario

	Estimated Benefit (EUR/year)		
Costs	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Shorter length of placements*	650,000	1,300,000	1,950,000
Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations	12,000	24,000	36,000
Administrative costs incurred by public authorities	14,000	28,000	41,000
TOTAL	676,000	1,352,000	2,027,000

*This scenario assumes a reduction of length of placements of 3 months affecting 6% of cross-border volunteers

Source: Milieu elaboration based on stakeholder survey. Rounded figures.

Data table 9c: High costs scenario*

	Estimated Benefit (EUR/year)		
Costs	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Shorter length of placements	1,980,000	3,950,000	5,930,000
Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations	27,000	54,000	81,000
Administrative costs incurred by public authorities	31,000	63,000	94,000
TOTAL	2,038,000	4,067,000	6,105,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on stakeholder survey. Rounded figures.

b) *Administrative costs for public authorities*

This section presents an overview of the main administrative costs likely to accrue to public authorities (EU-level and Member State level) as a result of further EU action to address registration barriers. Knowing the order of magnitude of these costs is important to ascertain the net benefits of EU action. It is important to note that the estimations presented here account for the minimum costs that public authorities would need to incur in order to address this barrier.

Administrative costs incurred by EU-level authorities notably include those associated with communicating with and informing Member States on the need to tackle this problem at the national level. There is insufficient information to develop detailed assumptions for costings. However, the figures below have been provided to illustrate potential costs. Depending on priorities and resources available, these figures could be greater but we have sought to illustrate minimum potential costs.

It is assumed that 10 days of work by EU officials will be required for the preparation and organisation of a coordination meeting with Member State competent authorities, and 2 days to attend and conduct the meetings (assuming that 2 EC officials will be present in a day-long meeting). This initial coordination meeting is considered as a one-off occurrence (over a period of 10 years). Furthermore, it is assumed that one meeting will be held every two years in order to assess progress and provide information updates, which is assumed to require 4 days for preparation and organisation and 2 days to attend and conduct the meetings¹²⁴.

On the basis of these data and assumptions, the table below presents annual cost estimates for EU authorities. It should be noted that the first column shows the number of days required per action (e.g. organising and preparing an informative meeting requires 10 days of work by EU officials). Nevertheless, as the frequency of these actions vary (e.g. the organisation and preparation of an informative meeting are held once every 10 years, whereas follow up meetings are held every 2 years), the second column shows the number of days that would be required per year per action (over a 10-year period). Following this methodology, it is possible to estimate the annual administrative costs incurred by EU authorities. This methodology is applied in following similar sections in this report.

Table 12: Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by EU-level Authorities*

Actions required	Time (days) required per action**	Annual equivalent days required per action	Total annual Administrative Cost incurred by EU-level authorities***
Organisation and preparation of an informative meeting with Member States authorities	10	1	EUR500
Holding an informative meeting with Member States authorities	2	0.2	EUR100
Organisation and preparation of a follow-up meeting	4	2	EUR1,000
Holding a follow-up meeting with Member States authorities	2	1	EUR500
TOTAL	18	4.2	EUR2,100

*Assuming an hourly wage rate of EU-level officials (including overhead costs of 25%) of EUR67 (see Section II.3).

**It is assumed that a working day is equivalent to 8 hours.

*** The figures are calculated by multiplying the annual equivalent days required per action (second column) by the working hours per day (i.e. 8 hours) and the average hourly wage rate of EU-level officials (i.e. EUR67/hour). The figures have been rounded.

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures

¹²⁴ This implies that, over a period of 10 years, 5 meetings will be held, which is assumed to require a total of 20 days of work by EU officials for preparation and organisation and 10 days to attend and conduct the meetings.

With regard to administrative costs that are expected to be borne by Member State authorities, we have retained the following assumptions: 2 days of work per Member State competent authority to attend the initial coordination meeting, 2 days to become acquainted with the topic, 5 days to convey relevant information to local authorities dealing with residence permits (every 2 years), and 2 days to attend the progress assessment and information sessions (every 2 years)¹²⁵. The table below presents the corresponding estimates of costs to Member State authorities.

Table 13: Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by Member State Authorities*

Actions required	Time (days required per action per CA)**	Annual equivalent days required per action per CA	Total Administrative cost per CA (Member State level) ***	Total Administrative costs incurred by EU28 Member State Authorities
Attending information sessions	2	0.2	EUR70	EUR2,000
Familiarisation with the information obligation	2	0.2	EUR70	EUR2,000
Provision of information to local authorities	5	2.5	EUR830	EUR23,200
Attend the follow-up sessions at EU level	2	1	EUR330	EUR9,200
TOTAL	5	3.9	EUR1,300	EUR36,400

*Assuming an hourly wage rate of Member State level officials (including overhead costs of 25%) of EUR41.5 (see Section II.3)

**It is assumed that a working day is equivalent to 8 hours.

***The figures are calculated by multiplying the annual equivalent days required per action (second column) by the working hours per day (i.e. 8 hours) and the average hourly wage rate of Member State level officials (i.e. EUR41.5/hour). The figures have been rounded.

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

Based on the series of estimates presented in this section, the aggregated administrative costs associated with further EU action to help reduce uncertainty with regards to residence permits for cross-border volunteers is estimated to be in the region of EUR40,000 per year. It must be noted that this estimate corresponds to minimal assumptions regarding the resources required for the implementation of relevant measures. More ambitious implementation modalities (e.g. more frequent meetings, preparation of printed information material, etc.) would result in significantly higher costs.

c) Net benefits

Based on the tentative analysis of costs and benefits presented above, this section attempts to estimate the overall net benefits of EU action to address this barrier. The table below presents these estimates for each of the three cost scenarios (low, medium and high cost, respectively, as discussed in section III) and the three scenarios for effectiveness of the EU intervention in reducing barrier-related costs (low, medium and high offset, respectively).

¹²⁵ Local authorities might opt for changing the registration certificate forms, which may also come at a cost. Nevertheless, it is assumed here that changes on certificate forms will be undertaken when other changes in these forms are needed.

On the basis of the assumptions discussed earlier in this section, annual net benefits of more ambitious EU action to address this barrier can be tentatively estimated to lie within a broad range of between EUR0.3m and EUR6m depending on the scenarios, with a central estimate of nearly EUR1.5m.

Table 14: Estimated annual net benefits of EU action

	Estimated Net Benefits (EUR/year)		
	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Low cost scenario	290,000	620,000	960,000
Medium cost scenario	600,000	1,300,000	2,000,000
High cost scenario	2,000,000	4,000,000	6,100,000

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

3.2. Assessment of barrier 3 (sub-barrier 2): uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits

3.2.1. Assessment of costs

Data and information gathered through interviews and the stakeholder survey appear to confirm the hypothesis that uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits acts as a barrier to cross-border volunteering. This barrier is associated with a number of direct and indirect costs. The following table lists the main costs identified and that will be analysed in this section.

Costs derived from uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits
a) Forgone time contribution by volunteers
b) Indirect costs linked to drop-off phenomena and last-minute cancellations
c) Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations
d) Administrative costs incurred by public authorities

a) Direct costs: Forgone time contribution by volunteers

Evidence gathered through stakeholder consultations suggests that one of the likely effects of uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits is the reduction in the total number of volunteers engaging in volunteering activities abroad (compared to all those who might have engaged in the absence of the barrier). Based on the evidence gathered through the stakeholder survey, it can be assumed that between 5% and 15% of potential cross-border volunteers refrain from embarking on cross-border volunteering activities as a result of this barrier. Three different scenarios are therefore proposed for forgone time contribution: 5%, 10% (central estimate) and 15%. An additional assumption is that those volunteers that give up are not replaced by other volunteers, and that this barrier thus undermines the potential of the sector.

In addition, according to stakeholders consulted in the context of this study, this barrier also has negative implications later in the cross-border volunteer involvement process, as volunteers having initially enrolled in cross-border projects sometimes end up cancelling their participation shortly before these projects begin. Based on the results of the survey, three different scenarios are considered regarding the rate of last-minute cancellations: 2%, 4% and 6%. Different scenarios regarding the economic contribution of EU cross-border volunteering are also considered (as discussed in section II)¹²⁶. The tables below present the different scenarios with regard to this barrier's implications in terms of forgone time contribution by volunteers.

Table 15: Estimated annual cost of impact of uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits in terms of potential volunteers refraining from participating in cross-border volunteering

Volunteers refraining from participating in cross-border volunteering	Estimated Cost (EUR/year)		
	Reduced economic contribution 1 (6 month p.a.)	Reduced economic contribution 2 (9 months p.a.)	Reduced economic contribution 3 (12 months p.a.)
Scenario 1: 5% of potential volunteers	4,600,000	7,000,000	9,300,000
Scenario 2: 10% of potential volunteers	9,800,000	14,700,000	19,600,000
Scenario 3: 15% of potential volunteers	15,600,000	23,300,000	31,100,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder survey (Q.7). Rounded figures.

As shown above, due to its deterring effects on potential volunteers, this barrier is estimated to reduce the potential economic benefits from cross-border volunteering by between EUR4.6m and EUR31.1m per year.

In addition, last-minute cancellations due to this barrier are estimated to represent a reduction of the economic benefit of cross-border volunteering activities of between EUR1.8m and EUR11.3m per year (see table 13 below).

Table 16: Estimated annual cost of impact of uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits in terms of last-minute cancellations

Last-minute cancellations	Estimated Cost (EUR/year)		
	Reduced economic contribution 1 (6 month p.a.)	Reduced economic contribution 2 (9 months p.a.)	Reduced economic contribution 3 (12 months p.a.)
Scenario 1: 2% of potential volunteers	1,800,000	2,700,000	3,600,000
Scenario 2: 4% of potential volunteers	3,700,000	5,500,000	7,400,000
Scenario 3: 6% of potential volunteers	5,600,000	8,400,000	11,300,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder survey (Q.8). Rounded figures.

¹²⁶ In line with the explanation in Section II.2.2, it is assumed here that volunteers that refrain from participating in cross-border volunteering due to this barrier would have had placements of between 6 and 12 months (on average).

b) Indirect costs linked to drop-off phenomena and last-minute cancellations

In addition to affecting the actual number of cross-border volunteers, the drop-off phenomena and last-minute cancellations discussed above may also generate indirect costs. Based on stakeholder consultations, the most significant indirect costs relate to the fact that volunteer organisations are expected to have already spent a certain amount of time managing the volunteer's file by the time he or she decides to cancel. Based on the information gathered through the stakeholder survey, this is assumed to be between 6 and 18 hours per volunteer p.a. (including file management, recruitment and pre-departure training of volunteers).

The table below summarises our estimates for the abovementioned indirect costs. As previously discussed, several scenarios are considered.

Table 17: Estimated annual indirect costs linked to last-minute cancellations

Organisational costs	Estimated Cost (EUR/year)		
	<i>2% of potential volunteers affected</i>	<i>4% of potential volunteers affected</i>	<i>6% of potential volunteers affected</i>
Scenario 1: 6 hours/volunteer affected	16,000	33,000	51,000
Scenario 2: 12 hours/volunteer affected	33,000	67,000	102,000
Scenario 3: 18 hours/volunteer affected	49,000	100,000	153,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder survey (Q.3, Q.8). Rounded figures.

Other costs have been pointed out by consulted stakeholders in connection to drop-off phenomena and last-minute cancellations. For example, volunteer organisations will have typically incurred non-reimbursable accommodation-related costs prior to cancellation, as rent is typically paid in advance¹²⁷. In addition, high drop-off rates may have cascading effects leading to the cancellation of affected volunteering projects altogether, in particular in the case of small-size organisations. All other things equal, benefits from those projects will be forgone as a result. No quantitative estimates for these effects can however be produced on the basis of currently available information.

c) Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations

A third type of cost derived from this barrier and identified during interviews relates to the resources spent by organisations in dealing with social security and unemployment benefits issues affecting cross-border volunteers; e.g. providing support and information to volunteers. Based on consultations with stakeholders, it can be assumed that between 10% and 30% of volunteers are affected by this barrier and that organisations spend between 4 and 10 hours per volunteer affected p.a. Scenarios have been developed with different values for numbers of volunteers affected and hours spent by volunteer (see table below). Depending on assumptions, annual administrative cost incurred by volunteer organisations would range, approximately, between EUR50,000 and EUR400,000.

¹²⁷ For example, assuming rent costs of EUR500 per volunteer, a rate of last minute cancellations of between 2% and 6% would imply between EUR71,000 and EUR223,000 of non-refundable costs spent on accommodation per year.

Table 18: Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations

	Estimated Cost (EUR/year) *		
	10% of cross-border volunteers affected	20% of cross-border volunteers affected	30% of cross-border volunteers affected
Scenario 1: 4 hours/volunteer affected	50,000	110,000	160,000
Scenario 2: 7 hours/volunteer affected	90,000	190,000	280,000
Scenario 3: 10 hours/volunteer affected	130,000	270,000	400,000

*Assuming an hourly wage rate in the social sector (including overhead costs of 25%) of EUR19.

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder survey (Q.9). Rounded figures.

d) Administrative costs incurred by public authorities

Similar to the costs incurred by volunteer organisations, public authorities are also assumed to devote time to tasks that derive from the existence of this barrier, such as answering questions from cross-border volunteers and volunteer organisations. No information is available on how much time is spent on this by authorities. For the purposes of this study, the time spent by volunteer organisations therefore is used as a proxy for authority costs. Cost estimates are presented in the table below, according to which the total administrative cost incurred by public authorities in the EU would range, approximately between, EUR60,000 and EUR460,000 per year.

Table 19: Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by public authorities

	Estimated Cost (EUR/year) *		
	10% of cross-border volunteers affected	20% of cross-border volunteers affected	30% of cross-border volunteers affected
Scenario 1: 4 hours/volunteer affected	60,000	120,000	180,000
Scenario 2: 7 hours/volunteer affected	110,000	220,000	320,000
Scenario 3: 10 hours/volunteer affected	150,000	310,000	460,000

*Assuming an hourly wage rate in the public administration (including overhead costs of 25%) of EUR22.

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

3.2.2.EU Action: Assessment of potential benefits

This sub-section seeks to assess the potential net benefits that coordinated intervention at EU level with respect to this barrier could bring about. In the current context, particular conditions typically apply to different home and host countries, as all countries are free to decide who is to be insured under their internal legislation, which benefits are granted and under what conditions. It is assumed that action at EU level to improve access to, and clarity of, information available to citizens regarding

social security and unemployment benefits for cross-border volunteers could contribute to mitigating the negative impact of this barrier.

Direct benefits for volunteers, volunteer organisations and public authorities

EU action aimed at increasing and improving the information available to cross-border volunteers with regard to social security conditions applicable during and after their volunteering placements is expected to bring about some direct benefits: it would reduce the costs assessed earlier in this section; namely:

- Forgone time contribution by volunteers;
- Indirect costs linked to drop-off phenomena and last-minute cancellations;
- Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations in providing support and advice to cross-border volunteers;
- Administrative costs incurred by public authorities in providing information to cross-border volunteers.

As discussed in section II, three different cases will be considered: low offset (i.e. reduction of 25% of the costs as a result of EU action), medium offset (50%) and high offset (75%). Three different scenarios are considered to reflect uncertainty as to costs related to this barrier: low, medium and high scenarios. Corresponding estimate ranges are presented in the series of tables below.

Table 20: Estimated annual benefits of EU action

Low costs scenario

	Estimated Benefit (EUR/year)		
	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Forgone time contribution: Non-participation	1,200,000	2,300,000	3,500,000
Forgone time contribution: Last-minute cancellations	500,000	900,000	1,400,000
Indirect costs of last-minute cancellations	4,000	10,000	10,000
Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations	13,000	25,000	40,000
Administrative costs incurred by public authorities	15,000	30,000	50,000
TOTAL	1,732,000	3,265,000	5,000,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on stakeholder survey. Rounded figures.

Medium costs scenario

	Estimated Benefit (EUR/year)		
	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Forgone time contribution: Non-participation	3,700,000	7,400,000	11,000,000
Forgone time contribution: Last-minute cancellations	1.400.000	2.800.000	4,100.000
Indirect costs of last-minute cancellations	20,000	30,000	50,000
Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations	50,000	100,000	140,000
Administrative costs incurred by public authorities	60,000	110,000	170,000
TOTAL	5,230,000	10,440,000	15,460,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on stakeholder survey. Rounded figures.

High costs scenario

	Estimated Benefit (EUR/year)		
	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Forgone time contribution: Non-participation	7,800,000	15,600,000	23,300,000
Forgone time contribution: Last-minute cancellations	2,800,000	5,700,000	8,500,000
Indirect costs of last-minute cancellations	40,000	80,000	110,000
Administrative costs incurred by volunteer organisations	100,000	200,000	300,000
Administrative costs incurred by public authorities	120,000	230,000	350,000
TOTAL	10,860,000	21,810,000	32,560,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on stakeholder survey. Rounded figures.

a) *Administrative costs for public authorities*

EU action to address this barrier is likely to entail administrative costs for public authorities, both at EU and Member State level. Administrative costs incurred by EU-level authorities notably include those associated with liaising with and informing Member States (e.g. on information requirements)¹²⁸ as well as coordination tasks. The objective here is to ensure that authorities provide clear information and guidance on whether volunteers will lose entitlements in the event that they volunteer abroad. Whilst this action will reduce most of the cost areas, it is recognised that with respect to general cancellations, in cases where information indicates that entitlements will be lost, there will be no improvement.

Based on the available information, it is not possible to establish an accurate assumption of the amount of time that will be required to carry out this work. For the purposes of this study, and for illustrative purposes only, we have based calculations on an estimate: 12 days of work to inform Member States by EU-level authorities. These are broken down as follows: 10 days p.a. to organise information sessions and 2 days p.a. to conduct the sessions as such. In addition, 5 days of work (over a period of 10 years) are assumed to be necessary to define the information to be subsequently reported by Member States (e.g. by preparing a reporting template)¹²⁹; and 2 days per Member State per year (i.e. 56 days p.a.) to sort and assess the information submitted by Member State authorities prior to disseminating it to the public. The dissemination of this information is estimated to require around 2 days per Member State per year.

It should be noted that more ambitious implementation modalities (e.g. more frequent meetings, preparation of printed information material, etc.) would result in higher costs.

On the basis the estimates, the table below presents the estimated costs for EU authorities.

Table 21: Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by EU-level Authorities*

Actions required	Time (days) required per action**	Annual equivalent days required per action	Total Annual Administrative cost incurred by EU level authorities***
Organisation and preparation of informative meeting with MS authorities	10	10	EUR5,400
Holding informative meeting with MS authorities	2	2	EUR1,100
Definition of information to be reported by MS (creation of templates)	5	0.5	EUR500
Monitoring the information submitted	56	56	EUR30,000
Dissemination of information	56	56	EUR30,000
TOTAL	129	124.5	EUR67,000

*Assuming an hourly wage rate of EU-level officials (including overhead costs of 25%) of EUR67

**It is assumed that a working day is equivalent to 8 hours.

***The figures are calculated by multiplying the annual equivalent days required per action (second column) by the working hours per day (i.e. 8 hours) and the average hourly wage rate of EU-level officials (i.e. EUR67/hour). The figures have been rounded.

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

¹²⁸ It is assumed that information sessions will be organised to this end.

¹²⁹ It is assumed that this task is undertaken every 5 years.

Costs derived from the implementation of these measures that are expected to be borne by Member State authorities relate to the need to attend information sessions organised by EU-level authorities, become acquainted with information requirements, and retrieving and submitting related information on national policies and legislation with regards to social security conditions applicable during and after cross-border volunteering activities. We have retained two days per Member State competent authority per year as working assumption for each of these tasks¹³⁰. The table below presents the corresponding cost estimates for Member State authorities.

Table 22: Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by Member State Authorities*

Actions required	Time (days) required per action per CA **	Annual equivalent days required per action per CA	Total Administrative cost per CA (Member State level) ***	Total Annual Administrative costs incurred by EU28 Member State Authorities
Attending information sessions	2	2	EUR700	EUR20,000
Familiarisation with the information obligation	2	2	EUR700	EUR20,000
Retrieving relevant national information from existing data and submitting information to EU authorities	2	2	EUR700	EUR20,000
TOTAL	6	6	EUR2,100	EUR60,000

*Assuming an hourly wage rate for Member State level officials (including 25% of overhead costs) of EUR41.5

**It is assumed that a working day is equivalent to 8 hours.

*** The figures are calculated by multiplying the annual equivalent days required per action (second column) by the working hours per day (i.e. 8 hours) and the average hourly wage rate of EU-level officials (i.e. EUR41.5/hour). The figures have been rounded.

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

Based on the series of estimates presented in this session, the aggregated administrative cost associated with further EU action to help reduce uncertainty with regards to social security and unemployment benefits for cross-border volunteers is estimated to be in the region of EUR127,000 per year. It must be noted that this estimate corresponds to minimal assumptions regarding the resources required for the implementation of relevant measures.

b) Net benefits

Based on the analysis of costs and benefits presented above, this section attempts to estimate the overall net benefits of EU action to address this barrier, as measured by the difference between estimated benefits (avoided costs) and estimated administrative costs for EU and Member State Authorities stemming from EU action. As previously discussed, three different scenarios will be considered for both barrier-related costs and expected effectiveness of EU action. Corresponding estimates are presented below.

¹³⁰ In some cases, Member States might opt for designing and publishing information material, which would entail significant additional costs. Nevertheless, these costs are not assessed here.

On the basis of the assumptions discussed earlier in this section, the annual net benefits of more ambitious EU action to address this barrier can be tentatively estimated to lie within a broad range of between EUR1.6m and EUR32.4m depending on the scenarios, with a central estimate of approximately EUR10m.

Table 23: Estimated annual net benefits of EU action

	Estimated Net Benefits (EUR/year)		
	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
High cost scenario	1,600,000	3,100,000	4,900,000
Medium cost scenario	5,100,000	10,300,000	15,300,000
High cost scenario	10,700,000	21,700,000	32,400,000

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

3.3. Assessment of barriers 7, 8 and 9: recognition-, information- and training-related barriers

3.3.1. Assessment of costs

Barrier 7: Lack of clarity with regard to recognition of the skills and competences gained through volunteering

The literature reviewed and the information provided by some interviewees suggests that potential volunteers refrain from engaging in cross-border volunteering activities for reasons related to the lack of recognition of skills and competences gained through volunteering¹³¹. Based on the information gathered through the stakeholder survey, it is assumed that between 5% and 15% of potential cross-border volunteers are not engaging in cross-border volunteering activities as a result of this barrier. As per the assumptions discussed earlier in this chapter (section II), this barrier is considered to result, approximately, in between 400 and 1,200 fewer volunteers p.a.¹³², or between about EUR4.6m and EUR31.1m lower economic contribution of cross-border volunteering activities per year. Detailed calculations are presented in the table below.

¹³¹ In addition, some interviewees claimed that this might have a higher impact on people from disadvantaged groups.

¹³² Based on the assumption of 7,000 volunteers participating in EU cross-border activities per year, it is estimated that the inexistence of this barrier would imply a 5% to 15% increase of this number (i.e. between 368 and 1,235 volunteers more per year)

Table 24: Estimated annual cost of lack of recognition of the skills and competences gained through volunteering in terms of forgone time contribution by cross-border volunteers

Volunteers refraining from participating in cross-border volunteering	Estimated Cost (EUR/year)		
	Reduced economic contribution 1 (6 month p.a.)	Reduced economic contribution 2 (9 months p.a.)	Reduced economic contribution 3 (12 months p.a.)
Scenario 1: 5% of potential volunteers	4,600,000	7,000,000	9,300,000
Scenario 2: 10% of potential volunteers	9,800,000	14,700,000	19,600,000
Scenario 3: 15% of potential volunteers	15,600,000	23,300,000	31,100,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder survey (Q.10). Rounded figures.

Barrier 8: Information on cross-volunteering opportunities is not adequately disseminated

The literature reviewed and the information provided by interviewees suggests that the lack of adequate dissemination of cross-border volunteering opportunities has an impact on the number of volunteers engaging in these activities. In addition, the reduction in the number of volunteers might have an indirect effect on the suitability of placements to volunteers' profiles. These costs are discussed below.

Costs derived from information on volunteering opportunities not being adequately disseminated

- a) Reduced number of cross-border volunteers
- b) Indirect costs derived from reduced number of cross-border volunteers

a) Reduced number of cross-border volunteers

The evidence gathered through stakeholder interviews suggests that one of the effects of information on volunteering opportunities not being adequately disseminated is the reduction in the total number of cross-border volunteers engaging in volunteering activities abroad. Based on the information gathered through the stakeholder survey, it can be assumed that between 10% and 20% of potential cross-border volunteers are not embarking on cross-border volunteering activities as a result of this barrier. The table below presents three different scenarios, following the methodology described in previous sections (II). Assuming (as per section II) that each volunteer's contribution is equivalent to an amount of between EUR12,000 and EUR25,000 p.a., this barrier might undermine the sector's potential by reducing the total number of volunteers (approximately, between 800 and 1,800 fewer volunteers p.a.)¹³³; i.e. a reduction of the sector's economic contribution of approximately between EUR10m and EUR44m p.a.

¹³³ Based on the assumption of 7,000 volunteers participating in EU cross-border activities per year, it is estimated that the inexistence of this barrier would imply a 10% to 20% increase of this number (i.e. between 778 and 1,750 volunteers more per year)

Table 25: Estimated annual cost of information on volunteering opportunities not being adequately disseminated in terms of forgone time contribution by cross-border volunteers

Volunteers not participating in cross-border volunteering due to lack of information	Estimated Cost (EUR/year)		
	Reduced economic contribution 1 (6 month p.a.)	Reduced economic contribution 2 (9 months p.a.)	Reduced economic contribution 3 (12 months p.a.)
Scenario 1: 10% of potential volunteers	9,800,000	14,700,000	19,600,000
Scenario 2: 15% of potential volunteers	15,600,000	23,300,000	31,100,000
Scenario 3: 20% of potential volunteers	22,100,000	33,100,000	44,100,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder surveys (Q.11). Rounded figures.

b) Indirect costs of reduced number of cross-border volunteers

A reduced number of total cross-border volunteers may have an indirect effect on the suitability of placements to volunteers' profiles, an issue raised during stakeholder interviews. In other words, an increased number of volunteers would enable a better match between volunteers' skills and qualifications and the requirements of the cross-border volunteering sector¹³⁴. It is however not possible to quantify related costs on the basis of currently available information.

Barrier 9: Lack of adequate training and preparation for cross-border volunteers

Lack of adequate training and preparation for volunteers (e.g. pre-departure training and mentoring in order to adapt to a new role, a new culture or working environment, etc.) have been identified as a barrier to cross-border volunteering. Two drivers of direct costs have been identified: first, cases have been reported of interruption of cross-border volunteering activities due to training-related lack of adjustment; second, insufficient or inadequate training has been pointed out as a reason for sub-standard volunteer performance (e.g. mismatch between volunteers' profiles and required skills).

Costs derived from lack of adequate training and preparation for volunteers

- a) Forgone time contribution by cross-border volunteers
- b) Sub-standard performance by cross-border volunteers

c)

¹³⁴ Skills mismatches can also be due to training deficits, another of the barriers identified in this study. Therefore, causality is not easy to establish and mismatches are likely to be the result of both factors.

Forgone time contribution by volunteers

The lack of adequate training and preparation for EU cross-border volunteers (including language training) has been reported to be associated in some cases to early returns of volunteers to their home country. Although significant differences exist by type of volunteering activity, information provided by stakeholders suggests that, on average, between 3% and 9% of cross-border volunteers leave their placements earlier than expected due to training-related lack of adjustment. This barrier might thus undermine the potential of the sector and reduce the annual economic benefits derived from cross-border volunteering.

Based on available information, it is not possible to accurately estimate how early volunteers return from their placements. For illustrative purposes, however, the costs of this barrier have been estimated based on volunteers returning, on average, 3 months and 6 months before the end of their placement. Each of these scenarios, which reflect the considerable levels of uncertainty at work, is presented in the table below.

Table 26: Estimated annual costs of forgone time contribution due to lack of adequate training

	Estimated Cost (EUR/year)		
	3% of cross-border volunteers affected	6% of cross-border volunteers affected	9% of cross-border volunteers affected
Scenario 1: return 3 months earlier	1,300,000	2,600,000	4,000,000
Scenario 2: return 6 month earlier	2,600,000	5,300,000	7,900,000

Source: Milieu elaboration based on interviews and stakeholder surveys (Q.12). Rounded figures.

As shown above, the cost of forgone time contribution due to lack of adequate training is estimated to range, approximately, between EUR1.3m and EUR7.9m per year.

d) Sub-standard performance by volunteers

The lack of adequate training and preparation for EU cross-border volunteers (including language training) has been reported to be responsible for sub-standard performance of volunteers in some cases. According to the information gathered through the stakeholder survey¹³⁵, between 10% and 25% of volunteers do not perform at their full potential due to deficiencies in training.

No quantitative estimates for these effects can however be produced on the basis of currently available information. In order to estimate the economic impact of this effect, an in-depth study on the effects of training on volunteering performance would be warranted. This is, however, beyond the scope of this study.

¹³⁵ Stakeholder survey (Q.13).

3.3.2. Assessment of potential benefits (joint assessment for barriers 7, 8 and 9)

Scope of EU action

On the basis of research carried out for the present study, it can be assumed that the potential added value of EU-level action to address the barriers to cross-border volunteering that are discussed in this section (i.e. recognition of volunteering, information of volunteering opportunities and adequate training)) lies primarily with the centralisation and dissemination of relevant information. Given the strong inter-linkages between these barriers, it is also assumed that EU action would address them jointly. These assumptions are also in line with the principle of subsidiarity; e.g. EU authorities are well placed to gather and disseminate good practices regarding cross-border volunteers' training but actual training activities need to be tailored to the specific needs of each organisation, programme or project.

As will be further discussed in the section on costs to public authorities below, a wide range of actions are available to the EU to facilitate information to potential cross-border volunteers and foster training improvements. However, for this study, we have focused on a single EU action via an online platform which could fulfil the three objectives of:

- Allowing volunteer organisations to make available cross-border volunteering opportunities to an EU-wide audience;
- Gathering and disseminating relevant information and materials with regard to training requirements, recognition of skills as well as any other topic whose knowledge can help address the substandard performance issues described earlier in this chapter;
- Increasing the visibility of and raising awareness about cross-border volunteering and its socioeconomic benefits, so as to make EU endorsement of cross-border volunteering more explicit.

Potential benefits from EU action to address barriers related to recruitment, training and recognition of volunteering

Since EU action with regard to the abovementioned barriers is assumed to address them jointly, potential benefits of such action are likewise assessed jointly in this study. More precisely, it is assumed that barrier-related costs would to some extent be reduced as a result of more ambitious EU action as per the previous subsection. This applies to the following costs:

- Reduced number of cross-border volunteers due to lack of recognition of skills;
- Reduced number of cross-volunteers due to lack of information;
- Forgone time contribution of cross-border volunteers due to lack of adequate training.

As with previous barriers, three different scenarios will be considered in order to account for the level of uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of EU action to reduce the abovementioned costs: low offset (i.e. reduction of 25% of the costs derived from the barrier), medium offset (50%) and high offset (75%). Similarly, three different scenarios are presented for barrier-related costs (i.e. those costs to be reduced through EU action).

Assuming an offset level of 25%, the benefits of EU action are estimated to range between around EUR4m (in the low scenario) and EUR20.8m (in the high scenario). In a medium offset level (50%) scenario, the benefits of EU action are expected to range between EUR7.9m and EUR41.7m. In a high offset level (75%) scenario, the benefits of EU actions are estimated to range between EUR11.9m and EUR62.3m.

Table 27: Estimated annual benefits of EU action

Low costs scenario

	Estimated Benefit (EUR/year)		
	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Reduced number of cross-border volunteers due to lack of recognition of skills	1,200,000	2,300,000	3,500,000
Reduced number of cross-volunteers due to lack of information	2,500,000	4,900,000	7,400,000
Forgone time contribution of cross-border volunteers due to lack of adequate training	300,000	700,000	1,000,000
TOTAL	4,000,000	7,900,000	11,900,000

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

Medium costs scenario

	Estimated Benefit (EUR/year) *		
	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Reduced number of cross-border volunteers due to lack of recognition of skills	3,700,000	7,400,000	11,000,000
Reduced number of cross-volunteers due to lack of information	5,800,000	11,700,000	17,500,000
Forgone time contribution of cross-border volunteers due to lack of adequate training*	700,000	1,300,000	2,000,000
TOTAL	10,200,000	20,400,000	30,500,000

* It has to be noted that in this case, since there are only 2 scenarios for reduced time contribution in table 23, a 3 month-reduction affecting 6% of cross-border volunteers has been taken as the reference value.

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

High costs scenario

	Estimated Benefit (EUR/year)		
	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
Reduced number of cross-border volunteers due to lack of recognition of skills	7,800,000	15,600,000	23,300,000
Reduced number of cross-volunteers due to lack of information	11,000,000	22,100,000	33,100,000
Forgone time contribution of cross-border volunteers due to lack of adequate training	2,000,000	4,000,000	5,900,000
TOTAL	20,800,000	41,700,000	62,300,000

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

Administrative costs for public authorities

This section presents an overview of the main administrative costs likely to accrue to public authorities as a result of further EU action to address the three barriers to cross-border volunteering considered in this chapter. It focuses primarily on costs accruing to EU authorities. Costs to national and subnational level authorities can be expected to vary significantly depending on the scope and level of ambition of associated measures undertaken in Member States and, due to resource constraints and lack of relevant information, these are therefore not further assessed in this study.

The main administrative costs incurred by EU-level authorities to address the three barriers described above are expected to include: web hosting and maintenance of an ad hoc online portal for relevant organisations and stakeholders, with the objective of disseminating information on cross-border volunteering opportunities; gathering and disseminating information and materials online on training requirements and skills recognition; and communication and information actions to increase the visibility of cross-border volunteering and its socioeconomic benefits, so as to make EU endorsement of cross-border volunteering more explicit. On the basis of discussions with public sector officials as well as private sector experts, our assumptions regarding these costs are as follows:

It is assumed that 10 days (twice over a ten-year period) would be required to announce the creation of the online platform on cross-border volunteering opportunities and to inform relevant stakeholders of its purpose and functionalities. Five additional days per year would be required for information updates and the dissemination of information to new stakeholders. Costs of web hosting and maintenance of the online portal are assumed to be moderate but could not be quantified in this study due to the lack of available data.

With regards to the dissemination of useful information and materials on cross-border volunteering training requirements and recognition of skills it is assumed that no additional platform would need to be created, since existing Commission resources would be used for this purpose. No detailed information is available on the exact resources that would be required. However, the following assumptions are made to allow for a cost assessment for illustrative purposes. Ten days are assumed to be required during the initial set-up phase and ten additional days for a mid-term follow-up meeting (over a 10-year period); an additional 5 days of work p.a. are assumed to be required for maintenance and updates. In addition to provision of information, the EU could also provide funding

to cover the totality or part of the training costs of cross-border volunteers. Given the uncertainty on the costs that could be covered and the lack of precise data on the costs of training (which on addition is likely to depend on the type of activity), these estimates will not be included in the estimation of costs incurred by EU authorities. Nevertheless, based on another study and for illustrative purposes only, it can be assumed that the cost of training of one volunteer is of around 100 euros¹³⁶ per year. Consequently, the costs of training per year of the 7,000 cross-border volunteers would amount to around 700,000 euros.

Similar assumptions apply to communication and information actions to increase the visibility of cross-border volunteering and its socioeconomic benefits (i.e. 20 days of work are over a 10-year period), but the amount of time required for maintenance and updates is assumed to be smaller: 2 days p.a.

A summary of cost estimates for administrative costs to EU authorities is presented in the table below.

Table 28: Estimated annual administrative costs incurred by EU-level Authorities*

Actions required	Time (days) required per action**	Annual equivalent days required per action	Total Administrative cost incurred by EU level authorities***
Information to stakeholders on creation and purpose of the platform on cross-border volunteering opportunities	10	2	EUR1,100
Information updates and dissemination of information on cross-border volunteering opportunities to new stakeholders	5	5	EUR2,700
Gathering and dissemination of useful information and materials with regard to cross-border volunteering training requirements, recognition of skills, etc.	10	2	EUR1,100
Maintenance and update of online information and materials on training requirements, recognition of skills, etc.	5	5	EUR 2,700
Information on cross-border volunteering and its socioeconomic benefits	10	2	EUR1,100
Maintenance of information on cross-border volunteering and its socioeconomic benefits	2	2	EUR1,100
Total	40	18	EUR 9,800

*Assuming an hourly wage rate of EU-level officials (including overhead costs of 25%) of EUR67.

**It is assumed that a working day is equivalent to 8 hours.

*** The figures are calculated by multiplying the annual equivalent days required per action (second column) by the working hours per day (i.e. 8 hours) and the average hourly wage rate of EU-level officials (i.e. EUR67/hour). The figures have been rounded.

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

¹³⁶ According to Grossman, J. B. et al, 'Making the Most of Volunteers', Public/Private Ventures, July 2002., the cost of infrastructure for a volunteer program costs approximately \$300 per year per volunteer, which includes the costs of screening, training and general management. It could be assumed here that the costs of training account for a third of infrastructure costs. Based on this study and for illustrative purposes only, it could be assumed that the cost of training of one volunteer would be of around 100 euros per year. Consequently, the costs of training of the annual 7,000 cross-border volunteers would amount to around 700,000 euros per year.

Net benefits

Based on the analysis of costs and benefits presented above, this section attempts to estimate the potential net benefits of further EU action. Three scenarios will be considered for both barrier-related costs and expected effectiveness of EU action. Corresponding estimates are presented below.

On the basis of the assumptions discussed earlier in this section, net benefits of more ambitious EU action to address barriers related to information, training and recognition of volunteering can be tentatively estimated to lie within a broad range of between EUR4m and EUR62M p. depending on the scenarios, with a central estimate of approximately EUR20m per year.

Table 29: Estimated annual net benefits of EU action

	Estimated Net Benefits (EUR/year) *		
	Low offset (25%)	Medium offset (50%)	High offset (75%)
High cost scenario	4,000,000	8,000,000	12,000,000
Medium cost scenario	10,000,000	20,000,000	30,000,000
High cost scenario	21,000,000	42,000,000	62,000,000

Source: Milieu elaboration. Rounded figures.

3.4. Indirect benefits of more assertive EU action to address barriers to cross-border volunteering

In addition to the benefit categories discussed so far in this study, more ambitious EU action to address barriers to cross-border volunteering can be expected to result in broader socioeconomic benefits. Similar to the conclusions of a recent assessment by the European Parliament of a Statute for European mutual societies¹³⁷, stepping up EU efforts to remove those barriers is likely to increase visibility of cross-border volunteering and improve knowledge and understanding of cross-border volunteering activities and their socioeconomic contribution by the society at large. These factors, combined with more explicit EU endorsement, can in turn be expected to result in higher levels of participation in cross-border volunteering activities as well as a broader range of areas or sectors covered by these activities. Moreover, some actions are likely to improve participation of disadvantaged groups. In the same vein, they could contribute to a more efficient model for conducting these activities; for e.g. by obtaining economies of scale and increasing legal certainty. Further benefits to be expected relate to increased social cohesion, higher human capital mobility, and more and better services provided by cross-border volunteers to society.

Although the above-mentioned benefits can be expected to be additional to those discussed earlier in this chapter and thus contribute to bring the EU cross-border volunteering sector closer to its full potential, based on data and information available at the time of writing it does not appear possible to produce quantitative estimates of the extent of such a contribution.

¹³⁷ European Parliament, European Added Value Assessment, A Statute for European mutual societies, An assessment accompanying the European Parliament's Legislative own-Initiative Report (Rapporteur Luigi Berlinguer MEP), EAVA 1/2013, 21 January 2013.

Chapter 5 EU actions

Key findings

- The Charter on the Rights and Responsibilities of Volunteers, endorsed and promoted by the European Parliament, represents a comprehensive and wide stakeholder consensus on basic rights and obligations of volunteers and EU civil society volunteer organisations.
- Possible areas of further EU engagement include funding programmes, research for an evidence-based policy making and priority setting in funding programmes, information events and engaging in dialogue with civil society volunteer organisation representatives.

Apart from the suggestion for an EU Statute for Associations (discussed in Chapter 6 below), there is no express regulation on volunteering at EU level. Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Spain have specifically adopted laws on volunteering. However, the extent to which these laws apply to volunteers and volunteer organisations differ. Despite legal frameworks being in place, there is limited information to determine if they have had any positive impact on volunteering, both from the perspective of the individual volunteer or the volunteer organisations ¹³⁸.

The Charter on the Rights and Responsibilities of Volunteers was drafted and presented during the European Year of Volunteering in 2011, following extensive consultations with all partners and stakeholders in the volunteering sector, including volunteers themselves. Given the current patchwork of volunteering rules across Member States, the idea behind the Charter was to encourage Member States to put in place and update their laws and policies on volunteering, taking into account the important contribution volunteering makes to social inclusion and active citizenship in Europe. The Charter is not legally binding, but represents a comprehensive expression of a wide stakeholder consensus on basic rights and obligations of volunteers and EU volunteer organisations.

The European Parliament has endorsed and promoted the application of the Charter. In the Scurria report¹³⁹ Member States are encouraged to use the Charter as a benchmark: '[It] welcomes the fact that some Member States have adopted or revised laws in this area with a view to creating a favourable environment for volunteering and recommends other Member States to do likewise, with a focus on strengthening volunteers' rights using the European Charter for the Rights and Responsibilities of Volunteers'.

Other key areas where the EU can act to promote cross-border volunteering relate to funding programmes, information events; research to allow more evidence-based policy making and priority setting in funding programmes; elaborating tools for reflecting upon and demonstrating cross-border volunteering skills; and engaging in dialogue with volunteer organisation representatives.

The 2012 and 2013 Scurria reports make a number of legislative and non-legislative recommendations for promoting cross-border volunteering recommendations. The recommendations relevant to cross

¹³⁸ GHK, 'Volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010.

¹³⁹ European Parliament Resolution of 10 December 2013 on volunteering and voluntary activity in Europe (2013/2064(INI)), December 2013, P7_TA(2013)0549.

border volunteering and calling for EU action were analysed in the table in **Annex III**, focusing specifically on EU actions taken subsequently to the Scurria recommendations as well as scope for further EU action. A summary of the key recommendations relevant to the barriers raised in this report are summarised below:

Key recommendations for further EU action for promoting cross-border volunteering

Social inclusion:

- The EU should re-instate a funding programme as part of the life-long learning Erasmus+ programme that enables and funds cross-border volunteering for over 30s (Erasmus + has not renewed the funding for the Grundtvig programme).
- Support volunteer organisations targeting young people with fewer opportunities.

Information and training:

- Projects should be funded under the Europe for Citizens funding Programme to ensure training for volunteer managers.
- Information on funding opportunities under this programme should be disseminated.
- EU should resort to social media to promote volunteering opportunities, including awareness of the European Youth Portal.
- The European Youth Portal should be updated more proactively.
- EVS in particular should invest further in pre-departure preparation, particularly for marginalised/disadvantaged groups.

Measuring volunteering:

- A standardised methodology for research into volunteer work should be established and its adoption should be ensured via an appropriate regulation for the purpose of regular research conducted by the Member States.

Recognition of volunteering

- The Commission Recommendation to the Council - of 20 December 2012 on the validation of non-formal and informal learning should be fully implemented in advance of target date of 2018 and ensure volunteering is recognised.

Dismantling barriers to volunteering:

- A number of solutions have been suggested in this study – see Chapter 4 (cost assessment); Chapter 6 (dialogue between EU institutions and Civil Society), and Annex III for legal/policy recommendations. The Commission should consider the feasibility and effectiveness of these options as well as wider solutions.

Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society:

- A European Parliament Intergroup on volunteering could be set up.
- Development of a stakeholder engagement plan including setting up a Steering group.

Promoting volunteering:

- The Commission should organize information events on possibilities offered by different funding lines including Erasmus + and Europe for Citizen's programme.

Chapter 6: Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society

Key findings

- The 2013 Scurria report called for a ‘European Statute on associations to be adopted in order to help ensure that volunteer organisations are given proper legal and institutional recognition’
- Stakeholder consultations revealed that volunteer organisations perceive the Statute primarily as a tool to resolve the issues related to the recognition of these organisations and improve dialogue with the EU institutions.
- A Statute may not be the most appropriate, nor the most feasible and proportionate tool for achieving this objective.
- Given the likely costs and difficulties of adopting the Statute, a more feasible and efficient approach may be to adopt a combination of instruments – a Voluntary Code, which could set the minimum and higher standards on volunteering on a voluntary basis, as well as a stakeholder engagement plan to commit EU institutions to further engage with volunteer organisations.

1. Introduction

As observed earlier in the report, volunteer organisations engaging in cross-border volunteering can encounter barriers such as unclear legal and regulatory frameworks for volunteering. Many of these barriers have been recognised for some time, and a range of solutions have been put forward, including those contained in the Scurria report (2013). One such recommendation, which was also supported by the European and Economic Social Committee (EESC) and numerous volunteer organisations, is the creation of a European Statute for Associations.

In the following sections, we examine the historical background for EU Statutes, including initiatives to introduce a European Statute for Associations, and the problems such Statutes aim to resolve. The following section evaluates the potential benefits the Statute would bring to volunteer organisations, together with associated costs and benefits.

2. Historical Background to EU Statutes

Proposals relating to EU Statutes date back as far as the 1970s when the European Commission submitted a proposal for a Regulation on the Statute for a European public limited liability company. This was followed by a number of revised proposals before the adoption of a Council Regulation on the Statute for a European company in 2001¹⁴⁰.

¹⁴⁰ Council Regulation (EC) No 2157/2001 of 8 October 2001 OJ L294/1.

Similarly, the Council adopted a Regulation on the European Economic Interest grouping in 1985, which established the terms and manner in which groupings may be established. Moreover, in 1992, the Commission submitted three proposals for regulations and directives on the creation of the European Cooperative Society, the European Association (non-profit institution) and the European Mutual (insurance society). The Regulation for the Statute for a European Cooperative Society was adopted in 2003. However, the proposals relating to European Associations and European Mutuals were withdrawn by the Commission due to lack of progress.

The Commission's proposed Regulation for a European Private Company was also withdrawn as part of the 2013 REFIT¹⁴¹ exercise, though the Commission proposed in April 2014 a Directive on single-member private limited liability companies. This aims to resolve a number of identified problems whilst avoiding difficult discussions on matters of concern for companies with more than one member. Notably this proposal focuses on the harmonisation of national laws rather than the creation of a new legal form¹⁴².

In the years that followed the withdrawal of the Commission's proposed Statutes, the European Parliament has been active in calling for new developments. In its 2006 Resolution on recent developments and prospects in relation to company law, the European Parliament 'calls on the Commission to submit new proposals for Statutes for European mutual societies and European associations'¹⁴³. A similar call by the European Parliament was formulated in its 2009 Resolution on Social Economy, where it emphasises the 'need for the recognition of European statutes for associations, mutual societies and foundations to ensure that social economy enterprises benefit from equal treatment in market law'¹⁴⁴. The European Parliament's Written declaration 84/2010 on establishing European Statutes for mutual societies, foundations and associations¹⁴⁵ notes the need to create a 'level playing field' that provides associations, mutual societies and foundations with instruments and opportunities equivalent to those available to other organisational legal structures, thereby giving a European dimension to their organisation and activities. The Declaration calls on the Commission to take the necessary steps to introduce proposals for European Statutes for associations, mutual societies and foundations, to propose a feasibility study and an impact assessment for the statutes for associations and mutual societies, and to complete the impact assessment for the Statute for foundations in due course. Finally, the 2011 European Parliament resolution on a Single Market for Europeans, calls for 'an appropriate legal framework for foundations, mutual societies and associations so as to give them a European status and prevent legal uncertainty'¹⁴⁶. As a result, the Commission presented a proposal in 2012 for a European Foundation Statute (EFS).

In the following sections we examine the general objectives of EU Statutes, the problems they seek to resolve and then focus specifically on issues relating to volunteer organisations.

¹⁴¹ European Commission Press release, '[REFIT - Fit for growth](#)' – Commission takes ambitious next steps to make EU law lighter, 2 October 2013.

¹⁴² European Commission, Press release, '[Proposal for a Directive on single-member private limited liability companies – frequently asked questions](#)', 9 April 2014.

¹⁴³ European Parliament, Resolution on recent developments and prospects in relation to company law (2006/2051(INI)).

¹⁴⁴ European Parliament, Resolution of 19 February 2009 on Social Economy (2008/2250(INI)).

¹⁴⁵ European Parliament, Declaration on establishing European statutes for mutual societies, associations and foundations, P7_TA(2011)0101, 10 March 2011.

¹⁴⁶ European Parliament, Resolution of 6 April 2011 on a Single Market for Europeans (2010/2278(INI)).

3. General objectives of EU Statutes

Two fundamental objectives can be seen behind calls for EU statutes: free movement and effective recognition and dialogue between EU institutions and stakeholders.

Free movement of goods, services, capital and people.

Firstly, the Statutes are rooted in the establishment of the single market and the need to facilitate free movement of goods, services and capital and remove barriers to such movement. While not all activities of volunteer organisations may be considered ‘economic activities’ for the purposes of the single market, many of their activities such as fund raising, product selling, provision of services, are paid. Thus there have been calls for ‘the recognition of European statutes for associations, mutual societies and foundations to ensure that social economy enterprises benefit from equal treatment in market law¹⁴⁷’.

3.1. Civil Dialogue

The second key objective, which has been identified by stakeholders as particularly relevant to volunteer organisations, is the recognition of volunteer organisations and the maintenance of regular and meaningful dialogue with them at the EU level.

In accordance with Article 11 of the Treaty on European Union, EU institutions have a joint responsibility to ensure that organised civil society, embodying the aspirations and interests of European citizens, is actively involved in the formulation of European policies. Therefore, all EU institutions should make a genuine and long-lasting commitment to engage in a permanent and structured dialogue with organised civil society at European level.

Civil dialogue is ‘the ongoing and structured conversation that policy makers – most commonly meaning the European institutions – maintain with the organisations of civil society’¹⁴⁸. It describes an interaction between public institutions and civil society organisations that goes beyond information and communication, and is based on mutual recognition and responsiveness. It covers various degrees of formalisation, ranging from informal to legally recognised structures, from ad hoc to continuous exchange¹⁴⁹.

The EU institutions have long recognised the importance of dialogue specifically with the volunteer sector. For example, the European Commission’s 1997 Communication on promoting the role of volunteer organisations and foundations in Europe¹⁵⁰ emphasises the long history of contacts and informal consultation that the European institutions have had with the volunteer sector. As it states, ‘the increasingly pivotal role the volunteer sector plays in a wide range of issues central to the construction of Europe, including in particular, in many Member States, in the management and delivery of key aspects of social welfare services, has been acknowledged and reflected in the Commission’s main statements on social and employment policy¹⁵¹’...

¹⁴⁷ European Parliament, Resolution of 19 February 2009 on Social Economy (2008/2250(INI)).

¹⁴⁸ Definition provided by Stakeholders Involvement in Social Inclusion Policies, ‘[Civil Dialogue](#).’

¹⁴⁹ EU Civil Society Contact Group, [Civil Dialogue](#), web content.

¹⁵⁰ Communication from the Commission on promoting the role of voluntary organisations and foundations in Europe, COM (1997) 241 final, 6 June 1997.

¹⁵¹ Communication from the Commission on promoting the role of voluntary organisations and foundations in Europe, COM (1997) 241 final, 6 June 1997, p 6.

In that same Communication it highlights that a 'high level of political commitment exists at European level to ensuring that more systematic consultation with the volunteer sector is instigated, as regards both the development and implementation of policy, commensurate with their increasingly important role, especially in social policy, in the Member States'.

Similarly, the European Commission's 2000 Discussion Paper on non-governmental organisations¹⁵² points to the fact the NGOs are recognised as a significant component of civil society and as providing valuable support for a democratic system of government. Given that developing and consolidating democracy is a general objective of the European Union, engaging with NGOs in the development of EU policies and laws is considered part of that process. This view has been specifically expressed by the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) in its 2011 public hearing 'Towards a statute of the European association'¹⁵³ in which it highlighted the role of an EU statute for European associations in achieving the objective of improved participatory processes.

In reaction to a need to improve the dialogue and consultation process, the Commission's 2002 communication on a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue, provides basic principles for the conduct of public consultations by the Commission. All target groups should be involved in consultations, and they should be given all the information they require in order to be able to express their views on the documents or projects on which they are being consulted. Moreover, they should always be given confirmation that their views have been received by the consulting body¹⁵⁴.

As will be seen in the following sections, EU Statutes can facilitate the process of EU engagement with organisations which have been established under an EU Statute.

4. The problems that EU Statutes seek to resolve

An examination of the various EU Statutes that have been proposed and their accompanying documents shows that the barriers they aim to resolve can broadly be divided into:

- Legal barriers, arising due to differences in national rules on the establishment, organisation, functioning etc. of those organisations, for example, recognition procedures, discrimination as regards tax benefits;
- Psychological barriers, for example, lower acceptance of unknown legal form;
- Barriers relating to the recognition of organisations at the EU level. These issues primarily affect foundations and volunteer organisation and not the activities of companies.

As can be seen these problems are directly linked to the primary objectives of facilitating free movement and improving dialogue with EU institutions.

¹⁵² The Commission and Non-Governmental Organisations: [Building a Stronger Partnership](#)

¹⁵³ European Economic and Social Committee, Public hearing: '[Towards a statute of the European association](#)', Brussels, 28 April 2011.

¹⁵⁴ Communication from the Commission, '[Towards a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue - General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission](#)', COM(2002) 704 final, 11 December 2002.

4.1. Problems arising in the establishment and functioning of organisations

Looking at all the proposed EU Statutes, a key common objective is to facilitate the setup and running of relevant organisations across borders by reducing compliance costs on the creation and operation of organisations. Such costs arise from disparities between national rules both on the formation and on the operation of organisations¹⁵⁵.

4.2. Different administrative rules

Member States impose different legal and administrative requirements on organisations with respect to their establishment, purpose and definition, organisation and governance. Thus where an organisation wishes to operate in more than one Member State they often have to establish a new entity subject to national laws. As such they can for example be subject to different minimum capital requirements, registration and notary fees, internal governance rules, supervision obligations, and restrictions on activities allowed.

As a result of these differences, organisations wishing to operate across borders experience additional costs and administrative burdens they are not subject to when operating on a domestic level. Where they have to set up new organisations or branches they will need legal and administrative resources to understand and comply with legal and fiscal requirements and to keep up to date with new laws. They may need additional capital in order to set up the new organisation and will have a range of administrative fees to pay. It has been noted that specifically with respect to foundations (though this could arguably be a similar problem for volunteer organisations), uncertainty about recognition as a foundation, due to different national definitions, can result in additional recognition procedures as well as increased administrative costs 'linked to the creation and administration of several 'recognised' legal entities in the countries where [a foundation] needs to operate to fulfil its objectives'¹⁵⁶.

Moreover, differences in laws create uncertainty which in itself can dissuade organisations from operating in other countries, particularly where they do not have experience in doing this already or have limited financial and human resources to devote to such an endeavour.

Overall, those looking to operate as organisations across borders face a complex mix of laws. It was for this reason that the European Commission adopted a proposal for Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Association, acknowledging that 'cross-border cooperation between associations and foundations is currently hampered by legal and administrative difficulties in the Community which should be eliminated in a market without frontiers'¹⁵⁷.

¹⁵⁵ See, for example: [Proposal for a Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Private Company](#), Sec (2008) 2098.

¹⁵⁶ Salole, G., 'Why is the European Foundation Statute needed?', *The International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law*, Volume 11, Issue 1, November 2008.

¹⁵⁷ Commission Proposal for a Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Association (92/C 99/01), COM(91) 273-final – SYN 386, Submitted by the Commission on 6 March 1992, OJ 21 April 1992, No C 99/1.

4.3. Different taxation rules

In addition to administrative issues, differences in taxation have also been raised as a problem. Member States have a wide freedom to design their tax systems and allocate taxation powers between themselves. Whilst such tax systems must be implemented in a non-discriminatory way, differences in tax treatment such as higher taxes for foreign entities or tax incentives for local organisations have also repeatedly been cited as creating barriers to the operation of legal entities across borders¹⁵⁸.

Finally, a lack of trust in, and knowledge of, foreign forms of organisations (whether these are companies, associations or foundations) is identified as being a barrier to involvement in such entities (whether this is investment, donations or purchases).

The Statute for European Foundations addresses several of these legal, administrative and tax-related obstacles that often led to increased costs for foundations operating across borders¹⁵⁹.

4.4. Problems relating to the recognition of organisations at the EU level

An examination of the literature and discussions with key EU volunteer networks and with the EESC have revealed that concerns remain over the recognition of volunteer organisations by EU institutions and the way that the institutions enter into dialogue with these organisations.

Some of these problems have been recognised in earlier Communications, such as in the Commission's 2000 Discussion Paper. In that paper the Commission pointed to the complexity of EU policies as well as the growing number of regulations and funding sources (budget lines). This coupled with recent financial security problems created a great deal of uncertainty for NGOs about co-operation with the Commission. Whilst the EU institutions have reformed considerably since 2000, the extent of EU legislative and non-legislative action has not become any less complex and, if anything, has grown in size.

Thus, with a view to further reform, the Commission carried out a review of its consultation processes as part of the EU Regulatory Fitness exercise. In 2012, it published its findings¹⁶⁰ which brought out the following issues:

4.5. Public consultation design: concerns relating to the scope of individual consultations

In practice, services often tackle time limitation challenges of developing policies by using a mix of targeted and open consultations. Most initiatives subject to an impact assessment, combined an open public consultation with additional targeted consultations (via stakeholder meetings, public hearings,

¹⁵⁸ Proposal for a Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation (FE), Impact assessment for the proposed Regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation, 8 February 2012.

¹⁵⁹ European Parliamentary Research Service (EP Think Tank), A Statute for European Foundations, November 23, 2012.

¹⁶⁰ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, EU Regulatory Fitness, COM(2012) 746 final, 12 December 2012.

workshops, conferences, surveys, advisory committees, expert groups or consultations of specific groups such as social partners, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), consumers, etc.). However, concerns were raised that this resulted in stakeholders not always being fully involved in all stages of policy-making.

4.6. Openness and reach: identification of stakeholders and communication with them

The Commission emphasises the importance of seeking the views of the whole spectrum of relevant stakeholders. However, it acknowledges that reaching the right stakeholders and getting the necessary information from them is challenging. This relates both to the design of consultation documents and in terms of identifying target groups and actively seeking them out to ensure they are granted a real possibility of participating in the consultation. With respect to identifying the right stakeholders, this can be particularly difficult with respect to the volunteer sector which encompasses such a wide variety of forms of organisations, covering most sectors that the EU has the right to act in. Being able to identify the most representative organisations, which are in the best position to provide input to policies, is also particularly important when carrying out targeted consultations, which, as has been indicated, represents a large proportion of all consultations.

Use of consultation tools to reach stakeholders: while the existing consultation planning and central websites such as Your Voice in Europe are all welcomed, stakeholders have indicated the need to widen the existing alert mechanism for consultations to include the publication of summary reports and to extend its availability to all interested parties, not only those registered in the Transparency Register.

Other tools such as targeted questionnaires are used to reach out to specific groups. However, some respondents to the Commission's consultation felt that such an approach is limited in terms of the representativeness of replies and the transparency with which those asked to take part in a consultation are selected.

Overall, it can be seen that with such a diversity of stakeholders it can be very difficult for the EU institutions to identify all relevant actors and to engage in dialogue with them. At the same time, a constantly evolving policy framework, programme of activities and objectives, and a wide variety of consultation tools can make it difficult for volunteer organisations to know how to effectively engage with the EU institutions at the right point.

With respect to the objectives for a European Statute for Associations which is specifically relevant to volunteer organisations, these discussions have revealed that, contrary to other EU Statutes, the primary problem that stakeholders would like the Statute to resolve is recognition and difficulties in dialogue with the EU institutions. Arguably, an important reason for this results from the way in which cross-border volunteering is achieved – namely through placements with volunteer organisations established in another Member State. Thus, there is a much lower need and drive for volunteer organisations to establish themselves in other Member States in order to engage in cross-border volunteering.

Volunteer organisations with a strong transnational and European dimension have been calling for the creation of a European Statute 'to give institutional recognition to the engagement and activism of millions of citizens who freely and voluntarily join together in associations across Europe'¹⁶¹. The European Alliance for the Statute of the European Association (EASEA) confirmed 'the need to adopt a statute for the European Association and to open a wide public debate on what is an association in Europe, what are our differences and our common grounds in the understanding and the putting into practice of the freedom of association'¹⁶². In the view of the EASEA, the adoption of the Statute should be considered as part of a structured framework on civil dialogue based on interlinking elements:¹⁶³

- European statutes for associations, foundations and mutual societies;
- Identification of the players in European civil dialogue;
- Establishing eligibility criteria for participating in European civil dialogue;
- Establishing an institutional framework for European civil dialogue.

Views from the European Alliance for the Statute of the European Association (EASEA)

Members

The European Alliance for the Statute of the European Association (EASEA) is an informal organisation that coordinated, together with the International Association of Mutuals (AIM) and the European Foundation Center (EFC), an awareness raising and lobby campaign towards MEPs for the adoption of European statutes for the Associations, Foundations and Mutuals.

Objectives

The establishment of a Statute for the European Association should provide 'institutional recognition to the engagement and to the activism of millions of citizens, freely and voluntarily joining together in associations across Europe'¹⁶⁴. According to Art 11(2) of the Lisbon Treaty 'the institutions shall maintain an open, transparent and regular dialogue with representative associations and civil society'. This requires a genuine and longstanding commitment of all EU institutions. Whereas several initiatives have taken place to establish the 'European citizens' initiative' as regulated in Art. 11(1), according to the EASEA, limited action is taken to provide structures to enhance a regular dialogue between the EU institutions and civil society. The Statute is considered to be an instrument that can ensure that volunteer organisations are recognised by the EU institutions as part of European civil society and involved in this dialogue. Currently civil society and volunteering is recognised at the national level, however not at the European level.

¹⁶¹ European Civic Forum, '[Round Table: Making the Case for European Civic Education](#)', 4 December 2013.

¹⁶² European Civil Society Platform on Lifelong Learning (EUCIS-LLL), Public hearing, '[Recognising the role of volunteers and volunteering for social cohesion and active citizenship](#)', 30 November 2010.

¹⁶³ European Civic Forum, '[Towards a structured framework for European civil dialogue](#)', 2010, p. 4.

¹⁶⁴ European Year of Volunteering (EYV) 2011, '[Invitation letter to join the European Alliance for the Statute of the European Association](#)' (EASEA).

Problems underlying the need for a Statute

The EASEA explains that it often has to deal with questions of whom they are and who they represent. There is a general lack of knowledge on associations, also from the side of the EU institutions. It is the feeling of civil society organisations that if their impact is to be better understood, they should be considered as part of the ‘social economic sphere’. The organisations now fight for recognition because they are not recognised as valuable stakeholders. The EASEA also regrets that – in view of the Commission communication ‘Towards a single Market’ – associations, foundations and mutual societies are not clearly included in the sphere of social economy. Despite the fact that Article 11(2) of the Lisbon Treaty establishes dialogue as a principle of governance, according to the EASEA members, the Commission does not (sufficiently) take into account the opinion of associations – or does not distinguish between the opinion of associations, individuals and NGO’s – which can content-wise be very different.

Content and scope

In addition to the need for recognition of associations to be part of a structured dialogue, an additional contribution of the Statute could be to identify which organisations are a European association. This would clarify various issues, such as who can have a position as representative in stakeholder consultations. Criteria for the establishment of an association that have been discussed among the European Alliance partners include¹⁶⁵:

- Not-for-profit;
- Independent;
- Democratically governed; and
- Implemented in a minimum number of Member States.

The views of the EASEA are reflected by the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC). It held a public hearing ‘Towards a Statute of the European Association’¹⁶⁶ in 2011 and noted that in the context of Article 11 TEU and participatory democracy, ‘the establishment of a European Statute for European associations, accompanied by a process of ‘labelling’ associations that meet certain criteria and wish to engage in European civil dialogue, would be a step towards enriching European democracy by more participatory processes’¹⁶⁷.

In this respect, it is notable that the scope of the Statute for a European Foundation can help to improve the ability of such foundations to be recognised and consulted. In particular, it clarifies ‘terms and the concept of foundations as organisations with their own resources and independent governance’¹⁶⁸. Moreover, it was anticipated by the European Foundation Centre that the Statute could be seen as ‘a benchmark and quality label in terms of governance, transparency, and accountability in cross-border work and financing, at a time when the prevention of terrorism financing is of key concern to national governments as well as European and multilateral

¹⁶⁵ These criteria are less strict than the criteria that were developed by the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) to define what constitutes a ‘representative association’.

¹⁶⁶ European Economic and Social Committee, Public hearing: Towards a statute of the European association, Brussels, 28 April 2011.

¹⁶⁷ European Economic and Social Committee, Public hearing: Towards a statute of the European association, Brussels, 28 April 2011.

¹⁶⁸ Salole, G., ‘Why is the European Foundation Statute needed?’, The International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law, Volume 11, Issue 1, November 2008.

institutions’¹⁶⁹. A more general observation was that a European Foundation Statute could ‘provide new opportunities regarding EU citizenship and have a positive impact on EU policy’¹⁷⁰ for example through improved dialogue.

5. Options for a Statute for a European Association

Given repeated calls for the adoption of an EU Statute on Associations, and based on the above analysis of the main objectives and problems which an EU Statute could resolve and those which stakeholders feel are of greatest priority, three options are examined below for how a Statute might be adopted and potential costs of those options. It should be noted that while the calls mentioned above cover all forms of associations, given the remit of this study, options are only considered which are specifically relevant to volunteer organisations.

As such, given that the primary issue that has been identified relates to recognition and dialogue, an alternative option is examined revolving around improvements in the process of dialogue.

5.1. Widening the scope of the proposal for a Regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation

The European Commission in 2012 presented a proposal for a European Foundation Statute (EFS) in order to facilitate the cross-border activities of public benefit foundations and make it easier for them to support public benefit causes across the EU¹⁷¹. Given that a number of the objectives of the Statute for European Foundations coincide with those of a European Statute for Associations, it was considered whether it would be feasible to extend the scope of the proposed Statute to include volunteer organisations specifically.

The aim of the EFS is to create ‘a new European legal form intended to facilitate foundations’ establishment and operation in the single market’¹⁷². In short, it is ‘an optional legal tool that will help foundations to better channel their recourses into improving the lives of European citizens in a wide range of areas’¹⁷³. Key aspects of the proposed Statute are provided below:

2012 Foundation proposal¹⁷⁴

Chapter I: General provisions

(Definitions, Rules, Disclosure, General requirements for FE, Public benefit purpose, Cross-border component, Assets, Liability, Legal personality, Legal capacity; Economic activities)

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Proposal for a Council regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation, Brussels, 8 February 2012, COM (2012) 35 final, 2012/0022 (APP), p. 3.

¹⁷² Proposal for a Council regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation, Brussels, 8 February 2012, COM (2012) 35 final, 2012/0022 (APP), p. 3.

¹⁷³ European Foundation Centre, [The cases for a European Foundation Statute](#), 2013.

¹⁷⁴ Proposal for a Council regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation, Brussels, 8 February 2012, COM (2012) 35 final, 2012/0022 (APP).

Chapter II: Formation

Section 1: Methods of formation

Section 2: Statutes

Section 3: Registration

Chapter III: Organisation of the FE

Chapter IV: Registered office and its transfer

Chapter V: Involvement of employees and volunteers

Chapter VI: Dissolution of the FE

Chapter VI: Member States supervision

However, despite a significant overlap in arguments used to establish a Statute, the objective of the EFS is very specifically tailored around the definitions, general requirements, formation and organisation as well as tax treatment of a European foundation. Some of the legal barriers of volunteer organisations are of a different nature and may only be addressed by widening the scope of the current proposal on EFS. Whereas foundations experience obstacles in the fields of civil law and taxes, barriers identified for cross-border activities of volunteer organisations relate to labour law issues, administration as well as training and awareness raising.

In addition, given that the EFS has already been proposed and been the subject of discussions for two years, and that it seeks to address not only issues common to volunteer organisations but also broader issues, it is unlikely to be practically or politically feasible to incorporate amendments to that proposal (in an already complex negotiating environment).

As such this option was rejected and is not subject to any cost assessment.

5.2. Proposal for a Council Regulation on the European Statute for Associations

A second option, which is called for in the Scurria report could be the adoption of a European Statute for associations through a Council Regulation.

A Statute is a legal instrument to define how an organisation is set up and defined, organised and dissolved, etc. The objective of the original proposed Statute was for associations 'to take advantage of the single market in the same way as companies can, without having to forego their specific character as groupings of people'¹⁷⁵. It could further be anticipated that this would provide important benefits to the association sector, as to clarify terms and the concept of association and to strengthen the formal recognition of the 'European association' by the European institutions and Member States.

The main benefits of the Statute would be the 'full freedom of establishment for all activities which contribute to the objectives of the Community, irrespective of the form taken by the body which carry

¹⁷⁵ European Commission, Enterprise and Industry, Associations and Foundations [[web page content](#)]

them on'¹⁷⁶. Associations could then 'operate outside their own national borders in all or part of the Community'¹⁷⁷.

Two main aspects needed to be considered with respect to the adoption of a regulation. Firstly, its content and secondly the legal basis and feasibility of the proposal.

5.2.1. Content of the Statute

A proposal for a Regulation on a European Statute for Associations would content-wise most reasonably build upon the 1992 proposal and the 2013 EFS proposal. However, taking into account the primary objectives suggested by stakeholders and difficulties experienced in agreeing the two proposals, a more limited approach would be suggested for a Statute focused on volunteer organisations.

In particular, it should be recalled that the Associations proposal was withdrawn as part of a wider screening process, as there was no real prospect for adoption or it was felt to be obsolete¹⁷⁸. Notably, there had been concerns that the proposal was too detailed. Looking to the Foundations proposal, it has been subject to two years of negotiation resulting in no agreement on key issues, such as requirements on assets. Significantly, proposals relating to tax rules – aimed at resolving a key problem identified by stakeholders – have been deleted from the most recent compromise texts.

Finally, the EASEA itself recognises that establishing criteria for the Statute (such as 'who is considered to be an association') is very complex. Overall, the EASEA would prefer the Statute to have not too many and not too restrictive criteria in defining associations.

From that perspective – as well as from the concept of subsidiarity – it is suggested that a new or revised proposal would have a better prospect of agreement if it were limited to the minimum requirements for establishing a European [voluntary] association and helping to resolve identified problems in recognition and dialogue.

When considering the possible content of the Statute, various sources can be considered including:

- National approaches to Statutes for volunteer organisation;
- Principles of good practice established by EU associations;
- Existing and previously proposed EU Statutes;
- Studies relevant to EU Statutes.

5.2.2. National approaches to self-regulation by civil society volunteer organisations

Self-regulation initiatives exist in Estonia, Ireland, Slovenia, the Netherlands, Romania and the United Kingdom¹⁷⁹.

¹⁷⁶ Commission Proposal for a Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Association (92/C 99/01), COM(91) 273-final – SYN 386, Submitted by the Commission on 6 March 1992, OJ 21 April 1992, No C 99/1.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the Outcome of the screening of legislative proposals pending before the legislator, COM(2005) 462, final, 27 September 2005.

¹⁷⁹ GHK, 'Study on volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010.

These are briefly described in the table below:

Member State	Volunteer code charter	Specific content/requirements
Estonia	The code of ethics for NGOs - adopted on April 7, 2002 at the General Assembly of the Roundtable of Estonian Nonprofit Organizations in Tartu ¹⁸⁰ . Code of conduct for volunteers.	Principles of “ethical operation of Non-Profit Organisations” (set out in Code of Ethics): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Democratic governance – Civic courage and care – Sustainability and prudence in using funds and resources – Responsibility and accountability – Openness and transparency – Independence and avoiding conflicts of interest – Honouring commitments and recognition of authorship of ideas – Tolerance
Ireland	Charter for Volunteering	Not legally binding. Sets out organisations rights, volunteer responsibilities and rights including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – to be offered appropriate training – to be treated fairly and not experience discrimination – to have insurance cover; volunteer responsibilities
Netherlands	A Quality award is available as a quality tool for volunteer organisations since 2005	The award is given “when a volunteer organisation has a good volunteering policy” (how successful they are at working with volunteers and how attractive they are to volunteers) ¹⁸¹ .
Romania	The ‘NGO Code of Conduct’ was launched and was adopted by the National Volunteer Centre Pro Vobis ¹⁸²	It is based on 4 principles: transparency, responsibility, equity and dignity, and confidentiality. Each principle is explained and exemplified, and each principle comprises certain indicators (ranging from 16 indicators to 2 indicators for a principle), followed by auto-evaluation questions for NGOs.
Slovenia	Volunteering Ethics Code	Basic guidelines and minimum standards that volunteers and their organisations are encouraged to comply with, including that volunteers have the right to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – be informed about their work and volunteer organisations; – to get the support and acknowledgement of their work; – to have expenses reimbursed; – and to benefit from insurance¹⁸³.

¹⁸⁰ Arenduskeskus, Code of Ethics of Estonian Non-profit organisations. Available at: <http://www.arenduskeskus.ee/code-of-ethics-of-estonian-nonprofit-organizations/>

¹⁸¹ GHK, ‘Study on volunteering in the European Union’, Final report to the European Commission, 2010.

¹⁸² National Volunteer Centre Pro Vobis, ‘[NGO Code of Conduct](#)’.

¹⁸³ GHK, ‘Study on Volunteering in the European Union, [Country Report Netherlands](#)’.

Member State	Volunteer code charter	Specific content/requirements
United Kingdom	Volunteering Compact Code of Good Practice . Agreement between the Government and the volunteer and community sector (VCS) to improve their relationship for the benefit of each other and the communities they serve. It was published in 1998.	<p>Importance of volunteering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The government and VCS agree that there should be a greater understanding about the scope of volunteering and for there to be increased publicity about the achievements of volunteers. They agree to work together to expand the public perception of volunteering by improving the profile, status and range of volunteer activity, enabling volunteering and community activity (3.4). <p>Facilitating volunteering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Work to effectively tackle discrimination to ensure that volunteering is open to all (4.3). - Commit to free England-wide access to CRB checks for volunteers (4.3). - Consult the sector so that proposed legislation or regulation, guidance and policies take account of the ways they may affect volunteers and volunteering activities (4.4). - Take forward 'joined-up thinking' across Government departments and Agencies (4.4). - Work to actively reduce barriers to volunteering resulting from existing legislation, regulation and policies (4.4). - Recognise that it is legitimate for volunteer and community organisations to include the cost of enabling greater access to volunteering (e.g. removing physical barriers) in relevant applications for funding (4.4). <p>Valuing volunteer contributions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop, promote and celebrate volunteering as an expression of both active citizenship and basic human rights of freedom to assemble and associate (4.5). - Keep good data on volunteering (4.5). - Assess how volunteering can contribute to achieving Government policy Objectives (4.5). - Acknowledge that volunteering can help tackle social exclusion (4.5). - Make visible the value of volunteers' contributions, for example, in Publications (4.5). - Involve volunteers when developing new policies and ideas (4.5).

Member State	Volunteer code charter	Specific content/requirements
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ensure that arrangements made for volunteers do not unfairly exclude particular groups from volunteering, for example, the timing and accessibility of activities (4.5). <p>Volunteer infrastructure :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Recognise the volunteering infrastructure as independent volunteer sector Bodies (7.4). – Adopt policies to help ensure that specialist volunteering infrastructure can develop realistic sustainable long-term funding (7.4). – Government and VCS will work together to create and maintain a modern and dynamic volunteering infrastructure (7.5).

In addition to these established self-regulatory tools on the set up of organisations, numerous codes of conduct or commitments of some type can be found, which set out the relationship between the volunteer organisations and the volunteer. For example, volunteering centres in France promote reciprocal rights and obligations called Conventions (*Convention d'engagement*) between the volunteers and the volunteer organisations¹⁸⁴. In Belgium, the 2005 Law on Volunteering defines the notion of volunteering and establishes requirements with respect to the different kinds of people that might undertake volunteering, for example employees and unemployed persons. The Law also provides a framework for volunteer organisations. For example, it establishes for most organisations civil liability towards the volunteers engaged by the volunteer organisation. It also requires volunteer organisations to provide information to volunteers on, for example, the aims of the organisation, its legal status, insurance provision¹⁸⁵.

Overall some of the main themes that can be identified from these practices are:

- Independence
- Democratic governance: provision for an executive board or similar decision making body
- Responsibilities to towards volunteers including provision of information, training and insurance.

¹⁸⁴ GHK, 'Study on Volunteering in the European Union, [Country Report France](#)'.

¹⁸⁵ GHK, 'Study on Volunteering in the European Union, [Country Report Belgium](#)'.

5.2.3. Principles of good practice established by EU volunteer organisations

While different volunteer organisations have their own self-regulatory tools, it is worth examining the Principles of Good Practice of the European Foundation Centre (EFC) which were updated and approved in May 2014.

As the EFC puts it with respect to the principles, ‘foundations throughout Europe are invited to adhere to these revised EFC Principles of Good Practice’. These principles form ‘a self-regulatory tool that reflects a clear pro-active commitment by foundations to enhanced transparency and accountability’¹⁸⁶.

The Principles cover four key areas:

- **Independent Governance:** The foundation has an identifiable and independent decision-making body which acts with high ethical standards and whose members are nominated in accordance with established principles and procedures.
- **Sound Management:** The foundation promotes effective and prudent management as well as sustainable investment strategies, while ensuring the best use of resources for the public benefit.
- **Transparency:** The foundation communicates the remit, goals and results of its work in a comprehensive and digestible manner, holding transparency at the core of all activities.
- **Accountability:** The foundation acts in a responsible and collaborative manner by accounting for its actions to stakeholders, and by being active in sharing its knowledge and experiences.

Detailed guidance is provided on each of the principles¹⁸⁷. For example, with respect to governance it is advised that:

- The board sets out its strategic objectives and ensures that programmes, operations and finances are in line with these objectives
- Details of the governance structure, including the duties of the board and its decision-making procedures, are clearly defined and publicly available.
- Membership of governing bodies is renewed and rotated on a regular, pre-determined basis.
- A remuneration and/or compensation policy for board members exists, as well as clear policies to address conflicts of interest for board members

Whilst it would not be appropriate for an EU legislative instrument to enter this level of detail, the approach taken in the guiding principles could provide guidance for the content of a Statute.

5.2.4. Existing and previously proposed EU Statutes

An examination of previously proposed Statutes highlights some core elements relating to the registration and organisation of the relevant entities, which can be used to guide the development of an EU Statute on volunteer organisations. The table below provides a comparison of key elements of EU Statutes:

¹⁸⁶ European Foundation Centre, [EFC Principles of Good Practice: A Self-Regulatory Tool for Foundations](#).

¹⁸⁷ European Foundation Centre, [EFC Principles of Good Practice: A Self-Regulatory Tool for Foundations](#).

	Statute for a European Cooperative Society	Statute for a European Company	Statute for a European Foundation ¹⁸⁸	Statute for a European Association (1992 proposal) ¹⁸⁹
Abbreviation	SCE	SE	FE	EA
Registration System	Every SCE shall be registered in the Member State in which it has its registered office.	Every SE shall be registered in the Member State in which it has its registered office. ¹⁹⁰	The FE shall be registered in one Member State. The FE formed by a cross-border merger shall be registered in one of the Member States where the merging entities were legally established	The EA's registered office, which is to be specified in its statutes, must be within the Community, and must be in the same place as its central administration.
Objective	To facilitate cooperatives wishing to engage in cross-border business, by making legislative provisions which take account of their specific features? To provide for the involvement of employees in the European cooperative society (EEC) so that employees can play their proper part in the organization.	To enable companies from different states of the Union to merge, form a holding or joint subsidiary, promoting mutual collaboration, while avoiding the problems arising from working with the different legal systems of member states.	The FE shall serve the public interest at large. The FE is allowed to engage in economic activities as long as the profit is used in pursuance of its public benefit purpose(s).	The EA is a body whose members pool their knowledge or their activities either for a purpose in the general interest or in order directly or indirectly to promote the interests of particular professions or groups.
Minimum Capital	EUR 30.000	EUR 120.000	EUR 25.000	NO
Applicable rules	National legislation of the Member State where the SCE is registered applicable to public limited-liability companies	National legislation of the Member State where the SCE is registered applicable to public limited-liability companies	Legislation of the Member State concerned applicable to public-benefit purpose entities.	Legislation of the Member State concerned applicable to national volunteer organisations.
Legal Personality	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

¹⁸⁸ Proposal for a Council regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation, Brussels, 8 February 2012, COM (2012) 35 final, 2012/0022 (APP).

¹⁸⁹ Commission Proposal for a Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Association (92/C 99/01), COM(91) 273-final – SYN 386, Submitted by the Commission on 6 March 1992, OJ 21 April 1992, No C 99/1.

¹⁹⁰ There is no EU-wide register of SEs, but each registration is to be published in the [Official Journal of the European Union](#).

5.2.5. EESC Criteria for engagement in dialogue with the EU institutions

Whilst no formal criteria have been agreed, the EESC proposed in 2002 a list of criteria to be used to determine which organisations should be given the opportunity to 'participate' in EU policy development. In its view 'only clearly established representativeness can give civil society players the right to participate effectively in the process of shaping policies and preparing Community decisions¹⁹¹'.

It states that in order to be considered representative, a European organisation must meet nine criteria. It should:

- exist permanently at Community level;
- provide direct access to expertise;
- represent general concerns that tally with the interests of European society;
- comprise bodies that are recognised at Member State level as representative of particular interests;
- have member organisations in most of the EU Member States;
- provide for accountability of its members;
- have authority to represent and act at European level;
- be independent, not bound by instructions from outside bodies;
- be transparent, especially financially and in its decision-making structures.

However, it should also be noted that the EESC distinguishes between 'participation' and 'consultation'. For the Committee, "consultation", is 'open in theory to all the organisations having expertise in a given field, and "participation" is an opportunity for an organisation to intervene formally and actively in the collective decision-making process, in the general interest of the Union and its citizens. This process, which is underpinned by democratic principles, enables civil society organisations to be part and parcel of policy framing and preparing decisions on the development and future of the Union and its policies¹⁹²'.

These criteria are useful when considering factors which might be relevant to improving dialogue and helping institutions to identify the right stakeholders to engage with. However, given that they envisage a much greater role and obligation towards organisations meeting the criteria than the general notion of dialogue entails, the above criteria should only be used for guidance purposes. For example, the requirement that the association has member organisations in most of the EU Member States would exclude the vast majority of associations that would be interested in adopting the EU Statute.

Based on the above analysis, an EU Statute on Associations could be limited to establishing the foundations of the European association. In addition, the Statute should contain minimum requirements which would help ensure that any volunteering association bearing the 'EU label', would be properly established, effectively organised and would be able to properly and positively contribute to EU policy making. This would facilitate the identification of appropriate stakeholders for

¹⁹¹ Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on The representativeness of European civil society organisations in civil dialogue; SC/023 of 14 February 2006.

¹⁹² Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on The representativeness of European civil society organisations in civil dialogue; SC/023 of 14 February 2006.

consultation and dialogue and would help ensure that are able to provide effective and meaningful input.

Based on the above considerations, and the particular objectives of a volunteering organisation, it is suggested that the Statute could be focused on:

5.2.6. Formation of a volunteer association

- Definition and form: criteria for associations and the form of the European voluntary association;
- Scope: scope and limits of associations e.g. what activities they may or may not be involved in;
- Legal personality;
- Registration: The rules for registration might provide that an association shall be registered in the Member State in which it has its registered office; however ensure EU-wide recognition;
- Purpose: Beyond the objectives generally recognised for volunteer organisation, it could include contributing to EU policy through production of information and evidence-based reports.

5.2.7. Organisation of a voluntary association

- Composition of the association: minimum rules on the composition of the association, such as governing board, members, membership, as well as their duties and responsibilities;
- Governance procedures: Minimum governance requirements such as (general) meetings, chair and vote;
- Volunteers: insurance for volunteers could be a requirement in addition to relevant training;
- Information requirements: ensure information on the organisation is provided to employees and volunteers;
- Principles: associations would operate on the basis of non-discrimination and transparency;
- Dissolution;
- Content and amendment of the Statute.

5.2.8. Feasibility Considerations

Legal Basis: With respect to the legal basis for the Statute, the proposed EU Statute of Associations was based on Article 100a EC. This provided for approximation of law relating to the establishment or functioning of the common market (now Article 95 Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union - TFEU).

However, in line with the legal basis chosen for the existing European legal forms in the field of company law, that is the European Company, the European Economic Interest Grouping and the European Cooperative Society', and for the EU Statute for Foundations, it is suggested that the most appropriate legal basis for a Regulation on a European Statute for Associations would be Article 352 TFEU.

Political Feasibility: while a range of factors are relevant to this question, arguably the most significant are the negotiating procedure to be adopted and the content of the proposal (and thus its impact on Member States and their likely opposition or support of it).

With respect to the former issue, as the Regulation would be proposed under Article 352 TFEU (by the Commission) it would be subject to adoption by unanimity in the Council after obtaining the consent of the European Parliament. As has been seen from previous proposals, achieving agreement on Statute proposals under unanimity is extremely difficult. The Foundation proposal for example has still not been adopted two years since it was proposed despite fundamental aspects being deleted (with the Greek Presidency presenting a seventh revised compromise text in June 2014).

Perhaps recognising these difficulties, the Commission has taken a different approach this year to private companies. In that respect it has proposed a Directive aiming at limited harmonisation for single member companies under Article 50 TFEU. Notably this Directive is subject to adoption under the ordinary legislative procedure, which means qualified majority voting in Council and consultation of the European Parliament. As such, it is likely to be more easily adopted than under unanimity.

However, if the content of the Statute has a limited and more targeted focus, concentrated on core aspects of the establishment and governance of volunteer organisations with a view to ensuring they are effectively run, this is likely to simplify any negotiations and increase the feasibility of the proposal.

5.2.9. Advantages and drawbacks

The greatest advantage of taking a legislative approach is that volunteer organisation set up in accordance with the Regulation would be recognised throughout the EU and would not need to register as new entities in all the Member States in which they operated. This would help avoid administrative, financial and legal burdens which they currently face. In addition, it would have the potential to resolve wider issues depending on a given need, for example, lack of insurance for volunteers. Moreover, were the Statute aimed at covering all associations (as opposed to just associations of volunteer organisations), a broader approach would better accommodate their needs as well. However, such additions are likely to reduce its political acceptability.

In addition, it would ensure that such organisations met certain minimum requirements to ensure they are well set up and run. This contrasts with volunteer organisations approaches where organisations would be free to choose which aspects they apply or do not apply.

However, to have a realistic prospect of adoption, it is likely that the Regulation would need to have a focused scope and avoid being too expansive in its ambitions. Moreover, it is likely to entail a lengthy negotiation process which could result in important aspects of the Regulation being deleted. Finally, whilst a Regulation would help identify associations with a strong, properly established organisation structure, that alone would not guarantee improvements in dialogue between the EU institutions and those organisations.

5.2.10. Cost assessment

The main costs for this option are assumed to relate to:

- Legislative development including negotiations (accruing to EU authorities)
- Recognition of volunteer organisations under the Statute by competent authorities (accruing to Member State authorities)

Changes to ensure conformity with the Statute's requirements (accruing to volunteer organisations).

With regard to the legislative development of the Statute, resource implications cannot be precisely quantified but can be assumed to be in line with those for comparable legislative developments such as the Statute for European societies or foundations. Costs entailed would include research and policy development, consultations, impact assessment, legislative preparation and all costs associated with carrying out a legislative negotiation in the Council and in the European Parliament.

Becoming acquainted with the topic and main information requirements is likely to require the equivalent of 5 days of work p.a. per Member State authority (or about EUR 1,700 p.a.). In principle, the latter cost parameter is to be considered as independent from the number of organisations. In terms of recognition of volunteer organisations under the Statute by competent authorities in Member States, the extent of applicable costs will to a large extent depend on the total number of associations effectively applying for recognition over time. Based on discussions with public sector officials, on average, 2 days p.a. (or about EUR660 p.a. based on assumptions previously discussed in this report) are likely to be required per organisation. For illustrative purposes, calculations have been carried out on the assumption of 50 organisations p.a.¹⁹³.

It must also be noted that these costs are unlikely to be evenly distributed across Member States, as a handful of them appear to account for a large share of cross-border volunteering activity.

The extent of effort required for volunteer organisations to conform to the Statute will heavily depend upon the latter's scope and requirements. While these costs cannot be quantified on the basis of currently available information, attention will need to be paid to the risk that smaller organisations are disproportionately affected.

Based on the above assumptions, the table below summarises the cost estimates linked to the recognition of volunteer organisations under the Statute.

¹⁹³ This assumption was made for illustrative purposes only. It was based on the current number of members of the European Alliance for Volunteering.

Table 30: Estimated annual cost for option 2

Main costs of a legislative proposal for a Statute	Time (days) required per action*	Annual equivalent days required per action	Total cost per CA (Member State level)	Total costs incurred by EU28 Member State Authorities
Becoming acquainted with topic and main information requirements (Member State authorities)	5	5	EUR1,700	EUR46,000
Recognition of volunteering organisations under the Statute (Member State authorities)*	100	100	EUR33,000	EUR930,000
TOTAL	105	105	EUR35,000	EUR980,000

*It is assumed that there are 50 volunteer organisations per Member State p.a. Rounded figures.

Source: Milieu elaboration

5.3. Recommendation on a volunteer code

Given potential difficulties in adopting a legislative instrument for a European Statute, a first step could be the development of a Commission Communication on a volunteer code. Such a Communication need only be developed and adopted by the European Commission through its internal procedures and it would not be subject to legislative procedures.

Such an option would provide volunteer organisations guidance on how they should be organised and set up. Such criteria would, as with a legislative Statute, be aimed at ensuring volunteer organisations were properly established, had strong internal governance procedures and amongst their aims was development of evidence to assist in EU policy processes. The criteria and the establishment of such associations could enhance the process of recognition of 'European associations' at the EU and Member State level and break ground for further legal steps.

In order to be fully effective, the Commission should on its side commit to engaging in dialogue with any organisations which conform with the requirements. The content of the Communication could be similar or even more extensive than any legislative proposal. In particular, the Commission could look to develop a core set of standards which all associations would look to follow as well as developing additional 'gold' standards for associations which want and are able to go further. Such an approach has been used by the European Foundations Centre in its guiding principles.

However, such an option would not result in legal recognition of the association across the EU. As such, whilst it could resolve dialogue problems (the primary issue identified), it would not resolve issues relating to registration in more than one Member State. Associations would remain subject to national laws on the establishment of volunteering associations.

5.3.1. Cost assessment

In essence, this option would pursue similar goals as the option discussed above. Therefore, both options share some of the abovementioned costs parameters. Given the non-binding nature of this option, however, an even higher level of uncertainty exists with regard to the magnitude of costs associated with its implementation.

This option departs from the legislative proposal for a Statute with regard to at least two important aspects. First, the administrative procedure required to develop the communication/volunteer code is likely to be shorter, that is limited to internal procedures within the European Commission. Second, there would not be recognition-related costs to Member States.

The discussion regarding adaptation costs for organisation in regard to the previous option largely apply to this option as well.

5.4. Options, other than a Statute, to strengthen institutional recognition

Although an EU Statute for Voluntary Associations can be used to help resolve a range of identified barriers, discussions with stakeholders have indicated that their primary objective for a Statute would be the improvement of institutional recognition, and the resulting positive effect on civil dialogue, of volunteering associations.

In addition, it must be taken into account that should an EU Statute be used to resolve other barriers, for example, on taxation, the political feasibility of adopting the Statute is likely to be reduced.

Moreover, while within the remit of this study, it is only possible to carry out a superficial examination of the costs and benefits of an EU Statute, there are factors which indicate that a Statute may not necessarily be neither the most appropriate tool to achieve the primary objective, nor necessarily the most feasible and proportionate tool for this objective.

As such, it has also been considered whether dialogue could be improved through non-Statute based action. Earlier analysis of the difficulties that volunteer organisations have in understanding the dialogue and consultation process and entering into it on the one hand, and the difficulties the EU institutions have in identifying the rights stakeholders and gaining relevant input from them on the other hand, indicate where potential solutions should be focused.

These issues could be resolved through the development by the Commission of a 'stakeholder engagement plan'. Such a plan could include the following elements:

- Fine tuning the Commission's process to engage with stakeholders in the civil dialogue to ensure effective focus on volunteer organisations and regular feedback;
- Creating greater transparency in the policy making process, with a specific focus on policy relevant to volunteer organisations, for example online information and direct contacts aimed at knowledge improvement;
- Regular active engagement of the EU institutions with volunteer organisations to inform and to consult with them on policy developments, objectives and future plans;

- Information and training to volunteer organisations to guide them on the EU decision making process and to improve their understanding of how they can facilitate that process, for instance by carrying out relevant research and national consultations with a view to developing an evidence base for action. This could improve the relevance and quality of stakeholder input.

These objectives can be achieved through a range of actions. However, one effective approach could be the establishment of a steering or advisory committee on cross-border volunteering issues: this would provide a forum to discuss issues of mutual interest and could help drive the volunteering agenda. Stakeholders could be involved in establishing the Committee's agenda. The steering committee could be used to ensure strong involvement of stakeholders, could be used as an ad-hoc consultation forum and could act as an information platform to exchange ideas, best practice and emerging concerns. In addition, the European Parliament could create an Intergroup on volunteering which would improve their dialogue with volunteer organisations.

5.4.1. Advantages and drawbacks

This non-legislative solution is relatively straightforward to implement, and as will be seen should be cost effective. It also focuses on improving engagement of both sides - EU institutions and volunteer organisations.

However, it would not guarantee that all associations that wish to engage are able to effectively do so, and it would not necessarily ensure that the right associations were identified and involved in the policy making process. In addition, it would not resolve wider cross-border volunteering issues such as recognition of status in different Member States.

For the purposes of this study, the establishment of the steering commitment is cost assessed below.

5.4.2. Cost assessment

The main costs for this option are assumed to relate to:

- Setting up the steering committee (accruing to EU authorities)
- Preparing, organising and conducting stakeholder meetings (accruing to EU authorities)
- Attending stakeholder meetings (accruing to volunteer organisations)

The time and resources expended on the set up and functioning of a committee is highly variable and dependent on specific objectives, priorities, etc. In order to carry out a cost assessment, a number of assumptions have been made below. However, these are for illustrative purposes only, but could be regarded as a minimum.

With regard to the steering committee set-up, resource requirements are estimated at 15 days initially (i.e. once over a period of 10 years) to agree its composition and liaise with prospective committee members, then 10 days p.a. to manage its functioning.

As to the preparation and organisation of meetings, estimates for resource requirements are in line with those presented earlier in this study with regard to EU action to address barriers regarding

residence permits or social security benefits, that is 12 days broken down as follows: 10 days p.a. to organise the meeting and 2 days p.a. to conduct it (assuming one meeting p.a.). If travel and accommodation expenses of committee members were to be covered by EU authorities, costs in the region of EUR600 per member per meeting (EUR300 transportation costs, two night's accommodation at a rate of EUR150 per night per person) would also need to be foreseen. Assuming a 20-member steering committee, these costs would add up to approximately EUR12,000 p.a.¹⁹⁴.

In turn, steering committee members would need to dedicate at least 2 days p.a. to attend committee meetings, that is 40 days p.a. under the assumption of a 20-strong committee.

Tentative cost estimates for this option are summarised in the table below.

Table 31: Estimated annual cost for option 4

Actions required	Time (days) required per action*	Annual equivalent days required per action	Total Annual Cost incurred by EU-level authorities and volunteer organisations
Set-up of steering committee (EU authorities)	15	1.5	EUR800
Management of steering committee (EU authorities)	10	10	EUR5,000
Organisation and preparation of committee meetings (EU authorities)	10	10	EUR5,000
Travel and accommodation expenses of meeting participants (EU authorities)	-	-	EUR12,000
Conducting committee meetings (EU authorities)	2	2	EUR1,000
Attending committee meetings (volunteering organisations)	40	40	EUR6,000
TOTAL	77	63.5	EUR30,000

¹⁹⁴ The European Alliance for Volunteering – the leading group promoting the EU Statute for Associations, has 45 groups supporting it. It was assumed, for illustrative purposes, that 20 such groups would engage in the debate as interlocutors with the EU.

5.5. Summary of options

The table below provides a summary of the options assessed in Chapter 6. Given the likely costs and difficulties of adopting the Statute, the study recommends following a combination of Options 3 and 4. The Commission could develop a Communication which serves the same objectives as a Statute but which would be adopted on a voluntary basis and also serve as a means to improving engagement with volunteer organisations. The European Parliament could also adopt resolutions or commitments to the same effect (Option 3). Other ways of engaging actively with volunteer organisations could involve setting up informal bodies, such as a Steering Committee for ad-hoc consultations, or a platform to exchange information and ideas or best practices (Option 4).

Option	Advantages	Drawbacks	Costs	Conclusions
– Widening the scope of the proposal for a Regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation (EFS)	A number of arguments used for the establishment of the EFS coincide with those for a European Statute for Associations. This option was considered for efficiency purposes.	Objectives of the EFS are related to definitions, general requirements, establishment and tax treatment of a European foundation. Barriers to cross-border volunteering such as labour law issues, training and information would not be addressed by the EFS. Practical and political feasibility of incorporating amendments to the EFS proposal is very low at this stage in the policy making process.	N/A	This option was rejected and is not subject to any cost assessment
– Proposal for a Council Regulation setting up a European Statute for Associations	This could be focussed on improving institutional recognition of volunteer organisations. A European Statute for Associations would guarantee that relevant associations have adopted exactly the requirements of the Statute, thus providing a 'quality label'.	Likely to be the most expensive to adopt and put in place; Low political feasibility. This option alone would not guarantee that EU institutions engage with associations that adopt the Statute. This would require wider commitments from the EU institutions.	Based on the assumption that it takes 50 organisations to effectively apply for a recognition under the Statute over time, and assuming that the costs are unevenly distributed across Member States, total costs of implementation for EU28 would be EUR 980,000.	The extent of effort required for civil society volunteer organisations to conform to the Statute will heavily depend upon the latter's scope and requirements. There is a risk that smaller organisations would be disproportionately affected.
– Recommendation on a voluntary code – a Commission Communication	Higher political feasibility; Less burdensome legislative process than options 1 and 2.	It would not result in the legal recognition of the association across the EU. While it could promote greater dialogue between the EU and	This option shares some of the costs parameters as for option 2. Given the non-binding nature of this option, however, an even higher level of uncertainty exists	This option departs from the legislative proposal for a Statute with regard to at least two important aspects: First, the administrative procedure

Option	Advantages	Drawbacks	Costs	Conclusions
		volunteer associations, it would not resolve issues relating to registration in more than one Member State. Associations would remain subject to national laws on the establishment of volunteer associations.	with regard to the magnitude of costs associated with its implementation.	required to develop the communication/volunteer code is likely to be limited to internal procedures within the European Commission. Second, there would not be recognition-related costs to Member States
– A ‘stakeholder engagement plan’ - the establishment of a European Commission Steering or Advisory Committee on cross border volunteering issues or a European Parliament InterGroup	High political feasibility; straightforward implementation.	This option would not guarantee that all volunteer organisations will be able to effectively engage with the EU institutions; It would not necessarily ensure that the right associations were identified and involved in the policy making process; It would not resolve wider cross-border volunteering issues such as recognition of status in different Member States.	For the establishment of the Steering committee, for 77 days of work required, total annual cost incurred by EU institutions and volunteer organisation is EUR 30,000 per year.	Cost effective option.

ANNEX I: Bibliography

Articles and reports

- Age UK London, 'We just clicked!', MiCommunity Project Report, June 2012, Available at:
http://www.ageuk.org.uk/brandpartnerglobal/londonvpp/documents/wejustclicked_report.pdf
- Cook, S. et al, 'Volunteering and Older Adults', Final report, Volunteer Canada, February 2013.
- Davis Smith, J. et al, 'Volunteering for All? Exploring the link between volunteering and social exclusion', Institute for Volunteering Research, 2004.
- DG EAC, 'Qualitative Impact of the 'Youth In Action' Programme: Report of the 2010 Survey', Brussels, 2010.
- Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 'Senior European Volunteers Exchange Network – SEVEN, Final Report', Public part, 2011. Available at:
<http://www.seven-network.eu/site/files/SEVEN%20Final%20Report%20Public%20Part.pdf>
- Ellis Paine, A. et al, 'Does Volunteering improve employability? Evidence from the British Household Panel Survey', 2013.
- EU Civil Society Contact Group, 'Civil Dialogue'[web content] Available at:
<http://www.act4europe.org/code/EN/policy.asp?Page=238&menuPage=214>
- European Civic Forum, 'Round Table: Making the Case for European Civic Education', 4 December 2013. Available at: http://www.civic-forum.fr/site/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=83&Itemid=51&lang=en
- European Civic Forum, 'Towards a structured framework for European civil dialogue', 2010. Available at: http://www.civic-forum.fr/documents/towards_a_structured_framework_for_european_civil_dialogue.pdf
- European Foundation Centre, EFC Principles of Good Practice: A Self-Regulatory Tool for Foundations. Available at:
http://www.efc.be/programmes_services/resources/Documents/Principles_to_AG_A.pdf
- European Foundation Centre, [The cases for a European Foundation Statute](#), 2013. Available at:
http://www.efc.be/programmes_services/resources/Documents/TheCasesfortheEFS_updated.pdf
- European Foundation for the Improvement of the Living and Working Conditions (Eurofund), 'Volunteering by older people in the EU', Luxembourg, Publication Office of the European Union, 2011.
- European Foundation for the Improvement of the Living and Working Conditions (Eurofund), 'Second European Quality of Life Survey. Participation in volunteering and unpaid work', Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2011.

- European Parliamentary Research Service (EP Think Tank), A Statute for European Foundations, November 23, 2012. Available at:
<http://epthinktank.eu/2012/11/23/a-statute-for-european-foundations-2/>
- European Volunteer Centre (CEV), 'Involvement of third country nationals in volunteering as a means of better integration', 2006.
- European Volunteer Centre (CEV), 'Manifesto for Volunteering in Europe', CEV and Volunteering England, 2006.
- European Volunteer Centre (CEV), Policy Conference, 'Cross-Border Volunteering in the European Year of Citizens – What is it for?', Sarajevo, 3-4 October 2013.
- GHK, 'Study on the impact of non-formal education in youth organisations on young people's employability', European Youth Forum, 2012. Available at:
http://issuu.com/yomag/docs/reportnfe_print
- GHK, 'Study on volunteering in the European Union', Final report to the European Commission, 2010.
- Granville, G., 'Understanding the experience of older volunteers in intergenerational school-based projects', The Beth Johnson Foundation, 2000.
- Grossman, J. B. et al, 'Making the Most of Volunteers', Public/Private Ventures, July 2002.
- Hirst, A., 'Links between Volunteering and Employability', research report 309, Cambridge Policy Consultants, year?
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), Annual Report 2012. Available at:
http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Photos/Secretariat/201401/1259900-IFRC%20Annual%20Report%202012-EN_LR.pdf
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), 'The value of volunteers - Imagine how many needs would go unanswered without volunteers', Red Cross Red Crescent Academic Network, January 2011.
- International Labour Organisation (ILO), 'Manual on the measurement of volunteer work', ILO 2011.
- Joint Report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field, EU Youth Report, 2012.
- Leigh, R. et al, 'State of the world's volunteerism report. Universal values for global well-being', UN 2011.
- Newton B. et al, 'Volunteering: Supporting transitions, V inspired', The National Young Volunteers' Service, May 2011.
- Observatory for Sociopolitical developments in Europe, '[Volunteering in Europe – International exchange about concepts and benefits to society](#)', 2014.
- Petersen, A.C. et al, 'Guidance for Uncertainty Assessment and Communication', 2nd Edition, PBL, 2013.
- Population Reference Bureau (PRB), 'Volunteering and Health for Ageing Populations', in 'Today's Research on Aging', No. 21, August 2011.

- Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', <http://cor.europa.eu/en/documentation/studies/Documents/Mobility%20of%20young%20volunteers%20across%20Europe/EN.pdf>
- Salamon, L. et al., 'The Global Civil Society and Volunteering, Latest findings from the implementation of the UN Nonprofit Handbook', Johns Hopkins University, Center for Civil Society Studies, Comparative nonprofit working paper no. 49, March 2013.
- Salole, G., 'Why is the European Foundation Statute needed?', The International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law, Volume 11, Issue 1, November 2008. Available at: http://www.icnl.org/research/journal/vol11iss1/special_5.htm.
- SALTO Youth, 'Meet' in EuroMed', Salto-Youth EuroMed's Magazine, Issue 14, June 2011.
- SALTO Youth, 'Training of Trainers for European Erasmus+ Youth in Action Projects' [webpage content]. Available at: <https://www.salto-youth.net/rc/training-and-cooperation/tc-rc-nanetworktcs/tot/>
- Schröer, R., 'Development of International Youth Voluntary Service in the EU Comparison of programme and policy development in Germany, Italy, France, Czech Republic and Poland', Association of Voluntary Service Organisations (AVSO), year?
- Stakeholders Involvement in Social Inclusion Policies, 'Civil Dialogue', available at: <http://www.stakeholders-socialinclusion.eu/site/en/concepts/cidi>
- Stiehr, K. et al., 'Research Report, Impact of transnational exchange experiences on senior volunteers and organisations', Institut für Soziale Infrastruktur, Frankfurt am Main, October 2010.
- The European Volunteer Measurement Project, 'The results are in: Statistics Portugal's survey on volunteer work for 2012', 2013.
- The EVY 2011 Alliance, 'Policy Agenda for Volunteering in Europe (PAVE)', report, 2011.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV), 'State of the World's Volunteerism report', UNV 2011.

Legislative/policy documents

European Commission

- Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, EU Regulatory Fitness, COM(2012) 746 final, 12 December 2012.
- Commission Staff Working Document, Review of the Commission Consultation Policy accompanying the document Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, EU Regulatory Fitness, COM (2012) 422 final, 12 December 2012.

- Proposal for a Council regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation, Brussels, 8 February 2012, COM (2012) 35 final, 2012/0022 (APP).
- Proposal for a Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation (FE), Impact assessment for the proposed Regulation on the Statute for a European Foundation, 8 February 2012. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/company/eufoundation/index_en.htm
- Communication from the Commission on EU Policies and Volunteering: Recognising and Promoting Crossborder Voluntary Activities in the EU, COM(2011) 568 final, 20 September 2011.
- Proposal for a Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Private Company Sec (2008) 2098. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/company/docs/epc/proposal_en.pdf.
- European Commission, DG Justice, Freedom and Security, Directorate B, Unit B/4: Financial support: Immigration and Asylum, European Fund for the integration of third-country nationals, 2007-2013. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/financing/fundings/docs/call_10172/call_proposals_2009_en.pdf.
- Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the Outcome of the screening of legislative proposals pending before the legislator, COM(2005) 462, final, 27 September 2005.
- Communication from the Commission, Towards a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue - General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission, COM(2002) 704 final, 11 December 2002. Available at: <http://www.stakeholders-socialinclusion.eu/site/en/tools/2002-3>.
- Communication from the Commission on promoting the role of voluntary organisations and foundations in Europe, COM (1997) 241 final, 6 June 1997.
- Commission Proposal for a Council Regulation on the Statute for a European Association (92/C 99/01), COM(91) 273-final - SYN 386, Submitted by the Commission on 6 March 1992, OJ 21 April 1992, No C 99/1.
- Commission Discussion Paper, 'The Commission and Non-Governmental Organisations: Building a Stronger Partnership'. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/civil_society/ngo/docs/communication_en.pdf.

European Parliament

- European Parliament, Resolution of 10 December 2013 on volunteering and voluntary activity in Europe (2013/2064(INI)), 10 December 2013, P7_TA(2013)0549.
- European Parliament, Report on volunteering and voluntary activity in Europe, A7-0348/2013, 23 October 2013.
- European Parliament, European Added Value Assessment, A Statute for European mutual societies, An assessment accompanying the European Parliament's Legislative own-Initiative Report (Rapporteur Luigi Berlinguer MEP), EAVA 1/2013, 21 January 2013.

- European Parliament, Report on recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU, A7-0166/2012, 12 May 2012.
- European Parliament, Procedure file, Recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU, (2011/2293(INI)).
- European Parliament, Resolution of 6 April 2011 on a Single Market for Europeans (2010/2278(INI)).
- European Parliament Declaration on establishing European statutes for mutual societies, associations and foundations, P7_TA(2011)0101 , 10 March 2011.
- European Parliament, Resolution of 19 February 2009 on Social Economy (2008/2250(INI)).
- European Parliament, Resolution of 4 July 2006 on recent developments and prospects in relation to company law (2006/2051(INI)).

European Council

- Council Regulation (EU) No 390/2014 of 14 April 2014 establishing the 'Europe for Citizens' programme for the period 2014-2020, OJ L 115/3, 17 April 2014.
- Regulation (EU) No 1288/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing 'Erasmus+': the Union programme for education, training, youth and sport and repealing Decisions No 1719/2006/EC, No 1720/2006/EC and No 1298/2008/EC.
- Council Recommendation of 20 December 2012 on the validation of non-formal and informal learning, 2012/C 398/01
- Council Regulation (EC) No 2157/2001 of 8 October 2001 OJ L294/1.

European Economic and Social Committee (EESC)

- Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on Statistical tools for measuring volunteering (own-initiative opinion), (2014/C 170/02) OJ C 170 of 5.06.2014, p. 11
- European Economic and Social Committee, Public hearing: Towards a statute of the European association, Brussels, 28 April 2011. Available at: <http://www.socialeconomy.eu.org/spip.php?article1597>
- Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on The representativeness of European civil society organisations in civil dialogue; SC/023 of 14 February 2006.

EU Civil Society Volunteer organisation initiative

- European Civil Society Platform on Lifelong Learning (EUCIS-LLL), Public hearing, 'Recognising the role of volunteers and volunteering for social cohesion and active citizenship', 30 November 2010. Available at: [http://www.valuenetwork.org.uk/Documents%20for%20Website/Bibliog%20docs/Recognising%20the%20role%20\(EUCIS-LLL\).pdf](http://www.valuenetwork.org.uk/Documents%20for%20Website/Bibliog%20docs/Recognising%20the%20role%20(EUCIS-LLL).pdf)

- European Year of Volunteering (EYV) 2011, Invitation letter to join the European Alliance for the Statute of the European Association (EASEA). Available at: http://www.eyv2011.eu/images/stories/Letter_for_CSOs.pdf (Accessed on 20 June 2014)
- Volunteering Charter, European Charter on rights and responsibilities of volunteers. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/pdf/volunteering_charter_en.pdf.

Information/factsheets/data

- DG EAC, The impact of the European Voluntary Service, EVS results, leaflet.
- Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), Lifelong Learning, Statistical data. Available at: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/results_projects/statistics_en.php.
- European Commission Press release, 'Proposal for a Directive on single-member private limited liability companies – frequently asked questions', 9 April 2014. Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-274_en.htm
- European Commission Press release, 'REFIT - Fit for growth – Commission takes ambitious next steps to make EU law lighter', 2 October 2013. Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-891_en.htm
- European Commission, [Youth in Action Programme Guide](#), 2013.
- European Foundation Centre (EFC), 'EFC Principles of Good Practice: A Self-Regulatory Tool for Foundations'. Available at: <http://www.efc.be/about/Pages/Code-of-Practice.aspx>.
- [European Voluntary Service Accreditation Guidelines](#), Erasmus+, January 2014
- European Voluntary Service, Fact sheet, Brussels, 2006
- Eurostat, 'Average annual gross earnings by economic activity', NACE Rev. 2, Human health and social work activities, 2010.
- Eurostat, 'Average annual gross earnings by economic activity', NACE Rev. 2, Public Administration and defense, 2010.
- Eurostat, 'Average annual gross earnings by occupation', ISCO 88 (Legislators, senior officials and managers), 2010.
- International Voluntary Service, 'Volunteering for Peace and Justice, Costs and Cancellation information'. Available at: <http://ivsgb.org/info/types-of-volunteer-projects/costs-and-cancellations.html>.
- United Nations Volunteers, 'UN Volunteer statistics worldwide - 2011 Annual Report'. Available at: http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2012/annual_report_2012/UNV_Annual_report_stat_2011_en_hd.pdf.
- Welcome Europe, 'EU Aid Volunteers initiative', funding data. Available at: <http://www.welcomeurope.com/european-funds/eu-aid-volunteers-initiative-969+869.html>.

Websites

- Erasmus+ in detail, Commission presentation:
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/promo/erasmus-plus/pub/erasmus-plus-in-detail_en.pdf
- Erasmus+: whatomeurope.com/european-funds/eu-aid-volunteers-initiative-969+869.html
- EU Aid Volunteers, web page of Kristalina Georgieva, Member of the European Commission. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/georgieva/hot_topics/european_humanitarian_voluntary_corps_fr.htm
- European Commission web page on Associations and Foundations:
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/social-economy/associations-foundations/index_en.htm#h2-2
- Ministère des Droits des femmes, de la Ville, de la Jeunesse et des Sport
<http://www.associations.gouv.fr/>
- Ministère des Droits des femmes, de la Ville, de la Jeunesse et des Sports:
<http://www.associations.gouv.fr/>
- OFAJ: <http://www.ofaj.org/english-version>.
- SEVEN network: <http://www.seven-network.eu/>

Member State documents/laws

- Arenduskeskus, Code of Ethics of Estonian Non-profit organisations. Available at: <http://www.arenduskeskus.ee/code-of-ethics-of-estonian-nonprofit-organizations/>
- Decreto del Presidente del Consiglio dei Ministri (DPCM) of 10 August 2001, Law No. 64/2001.
- Federal Volunteer Service Act (BDFG - Bundesfreiwilligendienstgesetz), 2011
- Law of 10 March 2010 on Civic Service (Loi du 10 mars 2010 relative au service civique)
- Law on Support of Youth Voluntary Services (Gesetz zur Förderung von Jugendfreiwilligendiensten), 2008
- Romanian National Volunteer Centre Pro Vobis, 'NGO Code of Conduct'. Available at:
http://issuu.com/pro_vobis/docs/codul_bunelor_practici_organizatori?e=1754216/6946444.
- Servizio Civile Italy, web content data. Available at:
<http://www.serviziocivile.gov.it/Contenuti/Default.aspx?PageID=42>
- Volunteer Now UK, Volunteers and expenses information sheet. Available at:
<http://www.volunteernow.co.uk/fs/doc/publications/volunteers-and-expenses-information-sheet.pdf>.

Annex II - List of stakeholders consulted

Name	Organisation	Phone interviewee (April-May 2014)	Survey respondent (June 2014)
Eline Sauvage	Red Cross Belgium	✓	
Clémentine Laforêt	Itineraire International	✓	✓
Sergio Andres	Lunaria , Italy	✓	✓
Amandine Tieberghien	Plateforme Francophone du Volontariat, Belgium	✓	
Chrysafo Arvaniti	Alliance of European Voluntary Service - Alliance Network	✓	
Maks Merela	Speleological Association of Slovenia, Cave Rescue Service	✓	✓
Ingrid Ter Maat	Service Civil International	✓	✓
Katherine Smart	Red Cross United Kingdom	✓	✓
Catherine Mallet	Eurodiaconia	✓	✓
Ludger Vorndieck	Kreisjugendamt Steinfurt	✓	
Raffaella de Cicco	Italian Civic Service	✓	✓
Gnone Massimo	Diaconia Valdese, Italy	✓	
Jacob Schouenborg	ISCA - International Sports and Culture Association	✓	✓
Heidi Pekkola	ENGSO - European Non-Governmental Sports Organisation Youth	✓	✓
Roberto Domínguez	AXEGA – Galician emergency agency	✓	✓
Gabriella Civico Juan Angel Poyatos	EVEN - Employee Volunteering European Network	✓	
Audrey Frith	EUCIS-LLL - European Civil Society Platform on Lifelong Learning	✓	
Alexandrina Najmowicz	European Alliance European Civic Forum (ECF)	✓	

Name	Organisation	Phone interviewee (April-May 2014)	Survey respondent (June 2014)
Peter Timmermans	Aachen Red Cross	✓	✓
Vladimir Dostal	World Sokol Organisation, Czech Republic	✓	✓
Jonathan Mack	Phiren Amenca, Budapest	✓	
Reka Varkonyi	PilNet Budapest Foundation (The Global Network for Public Interest Law)		✓
Vera Kockler	Ev. Freiwilligendienste gGmbH, Diakonisches Jahr im Ausland (Action Committee Service for Peace)		✓
Kirstine Rønnov Due	Diaconal Year	✓	✓

Annex III Scurria recommendations on cross-border volunteering – EU follow-up and recommendations for action

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
Social inclusion		
1. Calls on Member States and the EU to pay specific attention to disadvantaged young people and youth with fewer opportunities (esp. persons with disabilities) so that they may participate in volunteering activities and benefit from adequate educational and financial support (Scurria, 2012, no. 4).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 2012 European Charter on Volunteers refers explicitly to ensuring the support for persons with disabilities or mental health problems, minors or older people who want to volunteer (Article 42)¹⁹⁶. - The Commission Communication on EU Policies and Volunteering (Recognizing and Promoting Cross-Border Voluntary Activities in the EU): The Commission may introduce proposals that specifically cater for volunteering in the EU's employment strategy, in its fight against poverty and social exclusion and in the context of the Commission's "New Skills for New Jobs" initiative. - 2013 EU Citizenship Report highlights the need to facilitate the mobility of persons with disabilities within the EU by supporting the development of a mutually recognized EU disability card to ensure equal access to service benefits and transport, tourism, culture and leisure, for e.g. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With regard to EU funding opportunities, there should be shorter time frames between application and funding granted and implementation of the activity, as well as more flexibility to change participants if the original one can no longer attend due to a change in circumstances that can be very probable for people belonging to these groups¹⁹⁷. - Further research concerning participation of disadvantaged young people in cross-border voluntary activities. - Support volunteer-sending and hosting organisations targeting young people with fewer opportunities.
2. Volunteering should be made more	- European Fund for the integration of third country	

¹⁹⁵ Only recommendations specific to the EU cross-border volunteering and calling for EU action are presented in this table.

¹⁹⁶ Volunteering Charter, [European Charter on rights and responsibilities of volunteers](#).

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
accessible to immigrants/minorities as an essential element in encouraging their integration and social inclusion (Scurria, 2012, no. 6)	nationals 2007-2013, set as a priority to « Encourage interaction between immigrants and the host population, including through volunteering ¹⁹⁸ ».	
<p>3. Calls on the Commission to make European programmes more inclusive and open to all age groups. (Scurria 2012, 26; Scurria 2-13, 17)</p> <p>4. Calls on the Commission to support employees and retired staff in becoming involved in volunteering activities. (Scurria, 2012, 30).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Lifelong Learning Programme includes the Grundtvig programme which promotes the participation of European citizens in volunteering projects in a European country other than their own. - European Volunteer Measurement Project – launched during the 2011 EYV, to improve the measurement of volunteering using the ILO Manual. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EU should re-instate a funding programme as part of the life-long learning Erasmus+ programme that enables and funds cross-border volunteering for over 30S. Currently in the new programme there are very limited possibilities for volunteering over the age of 30 and none if the volunteer activities are outside the youth field¹⁹⁹ - The funding for the Gruntvig programme has not been renewed by the Commission. The Commission should examine the possibility of transferring funds from other budget lines to fund volunteering under the Gruntvig programme²⁰⁰.
Information and training		
5. Commission to improve the facilities of volunteering organisations and volunteer centres for providing information and training (Scurria, 2012, no. 12).	<p>Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EU funded project: Training of Trainers for European Erasmus+ Youth in Action Project. The objective of this training course is to train trainers who have the competences and the motivation to contribute to the improvement of the quality of projects within the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projects should be funded under the Europe for Citizens Programme, to ensure training for volunteer managers. Information on funding opportunities under this programme should be disseminated. - Within EU funding programmes, there should be greater recognition or prioritisation of volunteering.

¹⁹⁸ DG Justice, Freedom and Security, Directorate B, Unit B/4: Financial support: Immigration and Asylum, European Fund for the integration of third-country nationals, 2007-2013.

¹⁹⁹ Interview with CEV, 6 April 2014.

²⁰⁰ Interview with CEV, June 2014.

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
	<p>ERASMUS+ Youth in Action Programme of the European Union²⁰¹.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other EU programmes used to co-finance training of volunteers and volunteer training: European Social Fund; PROGRESS (now EaSI) social innovation grants to experiment on volunteering with refugees and asylum seekers. 	
<p>6. Calls on the Commission and the national, regional and local authorities and the various civil society organisations to improve information networks in order to make everyone aware of volunteering opportunities, tackle barriers to participation, enhance access to volunteering best practice and promote cooperation across borders. (Scurria 2012, 19)</p> <p>7. Create a centralised EU portal, in cooperation with volunteering organisations and associations (in particular the European Networks), to include a best practice volunteer resources bank and a section on cross-border volunteering, with information on the programmes available, their costs and the conditions for participation, allowing for an exchange of information on administrative burdens, the legal and fiscal aspects of volunteering, barriers encountered in accessing programmes and the best was to tackle them. (Scurria, 2012, 20; Scurria 2013,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A European Youth Portal on youth volunteering was set up in 2012 and the website of “Europe for Citizens” programme was used to disseminate general info on volunteering. 	<p>The EU should communicate on social media, reaching out rather than expect people to find the youth portal. This should involve more awareness on the Youth Portal at a minimum.</p> <p>Efforts could also be made to improve the youth portal. Information is scattered across various policies, and not always up to date and easily accessible. The content should be updated more proactively.</p>

²⁰¹ SALTO Youth, ‘Training of Trainers for European Erasmus+ Youth in Action Projects’[webpage content].

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
29)		
8. Proposes that a training and qualifications framework for volunteer coaches be established and incorporated in the European Qualifications Framework in order to improve the mobility of volunteer coaches and enhance the transferability of skills and competences developed through volunteering (Scurria 2012, no. 40).	-Erasmus + programme, Key Action 3, Support for Policy Reform – Civil Society Cooperation in the field of Education and Training – this is a one off action on volunteering as a priority.	MS governments should be encouraged to apply for funding line from Key Action 3. This action could be used for Education Ministries to develop experimentation (pilot projects) for training.
Measuring volunteering		
9. Commission to encourage Member States to adopt the use of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work and the United Nations Handbook on Non-Profit Organisations to make available comparable statistics. (Scurria 2012, 21; Scurria 2-13, 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) adopted Opinion on Statistical tools for measuring volunteering²⁰² - encourages making use of the main principles of the ILO <i>Manual</i>, and taking into account the experiences of countries which have already undertaken research using the solutions described in the <i>Manual</i>; - In December 2013, the Programming Committee on Youth of the Council of Europe agreed on a method to recognize with a financial value as co-funding the time given by volunteers to youth activities supported by the European Youth Foundation, making it the first European structure 	European Commission should <i>first</i> , put in place the conditions necessary to work on a standardized methodology for research into volunteer work; and <i>second</i> , to ensure its adoption via an appropriate regulation for the purpose of regular research conducted by the Member States ²⁰³ .

²⁰² - Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on Statistical tools for measuring volunteering (own-initiative opinion), (2014/C 170/02) OJ C 170 of 5 June 2014, p. 11.

²⁰³ Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on Statistical tools for measuring volunteering (own-initiative opinion), (2014/C 170/02) OJ C 170 of 5.06.2014, p. 11.

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
	to do so.	
Promoting volunteering in specific sectors		
10. Calls on the Commission and Member States to give a high profile to volunteering in sport, particularly at the grassroots level, to acknowledge the important role played by volunteer-led sporting organisations in strengthening culture, promoting social inclusion and enhancing communities and to reduce the barriers to sports volunteering across the EU (Scurria 2012, 28; Scurria 2013, 21).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under the 2010 Preparatory Action in the field of sport, the Commission funded four pilot projects on volunteering and sport (including 'Promoting and securing volunteering in sports. Focus on management support of sports clubs.') - Erasmus + funding programme sets volunteering in sports as a priority. 	- The Commission should organize a conference or information event on possibilities offered by Erasmus + funding, to disseminate information on funding opportunities for sports organisation.
11. Urges the national, regional and local authorities and the EU to recognize the important contribution also made by volunteering to protecting the environment and to support volunteering activities in environmental education, prevention and crisis management and in defending artistic and cultural heritage (Scurria, 29).	- Commission Communication on EU Policies and Volunteering (Recognizing and Promoting Cross-Border Voluntary Activities in the EU): recognized importance of environmental volunteering in protecting and improving the environment for present and future generations while at the same time increasing awareness of environmental issues and the likelihood of carrying out environmentally friendly practices.	
12. Create European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps (Scurria, 2012, 42) 13. Take existing structures into consideration to incorporate these from the outset when establishing a European	- Regulation (EU) No 375/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 April 2014 establishing the European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps ('EU Aid Volunteers initiative').	- There is scope to extend civil protection scheme within Europe, to establish a core of civil protection volunteers focused only on the EU.

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps. (Scurria, 2012, 43).	- EU aid volunteers expected to be fully operational in 2015. This is run by DG ECHO.	
Recognition of volunteering		
<p>14. Include the skills acquired through volunteering in the ECTS (European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System) for students in the European Skills Passport. (Scurria, 2012, 31, 33, 35, 36, 38, 40).</p> <p>15. Calls on the Commission to develop a similar calculation and recognition system for skills acquired through volunteering for adults who are not at university. (Scurria 2012, no. 34)</p> <p>16. Calls on the Commission to make the European Skills Passport a reality as soon as possible (Scurria 2012, no. 35).</p> <p>17. Calls on the Commission to address in the “European Skills Passport”: the need for a cohesive and transferable approach to proper screening and vetting of volunteers who work with children and/or vulnerable members of society (Scurria no. 38).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Commission Recommendation to the Council of 20 December 2012 on the validation of non-formal and informal learning²⁰⁴ includes provisions to recognise skills acquired during volunteering service. The recommendations refers specifically to ‘skills acquired through volunteering’. - The guidance for the Europass CV template contains a specific mention to volunteering. - Europass Mobility is a specific document for mobility experiences and non-formal learning, it is specific to international mobility. This is not an official validation, more of a tool created by the EU for recording informal learning skills. - The EU Commission is working on a European area for skills and codification, and are aiming to restructure all their tools. - This would include a new tool that encompasses all informal learning, such as a ‘Europass Experience’ template (provisional name). - The aim of this tool is to facilitate mobility around the EU, facilitating the recognition of skills and qualifications (gained through all kinds of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Commission Recommendation to the Council - of 20 December 2012 on the validation of non-formal and informal learning should be fully implemented in advance of target date of 2018 and ensure volunteering is recognised.

²⁰⁴ Council Recommendation of 20 December 2012 on the validation of non-formal and informal learning, 2012/C 398/01.

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
	experiences, formal and non-formal). Different sets of European tools (not just the Europass) will be launched. The documents will be allow different types of informal learning experiences to be recorded in the new tool. DG EAC are working in coordination with volunteer organisations in this process (including CEV) and have invited them to meetings on the design of the document ²⁰⁵ .	
Funding		
18. Urges the national, regional and local authorities and the EU to ensure adequate and stable funding and to simplify administrative procedures, including tax incentives, for the organisations involved in volunteering work, including all the relevant associations and networks, particularly for small associations with limited resources, with a view to enhancing their roles, activities and achievements for the benefit of society (Scurria, 2012, 44; Scurria 2013, 33)	Funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renewed funding of EVS programme through Erasmus+ programme (EUR14.7 billion budget for 2014-2020) - Europe for Citizens 2014-2020 programme, funding for volunteering. 	
19. Calls on the Commission to ensure that funding is guaranteed for volunteering	Funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renewed funding of EVS programme through 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The European Parliament could create an

²⁰⁵ Information obtained through an interview with DG EAC, Unit Skills and Qualification strategies, Multilingualism and Policy, 4 June 2014.

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
projects (following European Year of Volunteering 2011) and to develop and encourage efficient inter-institutional coordination to promote volunteering in EU policies. (Scurria, 2012, 54)	Erasmus+ programme (EUR14.7 billion budget for 2014-2020) Inter-institutional coordination: - See section 5: Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society	Intergroup on volunteering. - A Commission Steering Committee including volunteering stakeholders could be used to both improve dialogue with those stakeholders and the European Parliament.
20. Commission to ensure that information on available funding and the relevant programmes is freely available to volunteer-led projects and that procedures are not made inaccessible due to red tape. (Scurria, 2012, 55).	No action identified.	Erasmus + sets a requirement that participating organisations are registered as education providers. There are many civil society volunteer organisations that could participate, but first have to register as formal education provider. Erasmus + has created red tape for non-formal education providers which should be removed.
21. Commission to ensure that adequate funding is provided for programmes in various policy areas to support cross-border volunteering activities. (Scurria, 2012, 56).	Funding: - Renewed funding of EVS programme through Erasmus+ programme (EUR14.7 billion budget for 2014-2020). - Europe for Citizens Programme (Regulation setting up the 'Europe for Citizens' programme for the period 2014-2020).	
22. Commission to allocate adequate	No action identified.	

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
resources to the creation of a European Volunteer Centre Development Fund aimed at developing infrastructure to support volunteering. (Scurria, 2012, 62, Scurria 2013, 42)		
Dismantling barriers to volunteering		
23. Commission to propose a mechanism to allow Member States to exempt from VAT all or most of the activities and transactions carried out by voluntary non-profit-making organisations. (Scurria, 2012, 46)	No action identified	
24. Calls on the Commission to assist with the process of dismantling existing barriers (Scurria 2012, no. 48).	- The Commission will propose a revision of the Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems by looking into extending the export of unemployment benefits for another three months . The Commission will propose a revision of the Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems.	- Use the OMC co-operation framework to discuss and settle the issues arising due to the different legal treatment of foreign volunteers in various Member States.
25. Commission to publish a report identifying the obstacles to cross-border volunteering, for example age limits in insurance policies, and where appropriate, legislative proposals. (Scurria, 2012, 13)	No Commission reports identified.	- Commission to complement the European Parliament's Cost of Non Europe study on Volunteering to examine in more detail, including through broader stakeholder consultation, priority issues.

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society		
26. Member States and Commission to communicate more to the voluntary organisations the programmes under cohesion policy, and to facilitate access of these organisations to these programmes (Scurria, 2012, 52).	See Chapter 6: Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society	See Chapter 6: Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society
27. Commission to propose a European Statute for Associations to give voluntary associations the legal framework within which to operate, reduce the administrative costs. (Scurria 2012, 58; Scurria 2013, 7)	See Chapter 6: Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society	See Chapter 6: Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society
28. Commission to maintain the useful contact points set up both with EYV 2011 Alliance and the successor Volunteer Platform (Scurria 2012, 65; Scurria 2013 24, 25)	No action identified	Commission or European Parliament to confirm that contacts have been maintained.
29. Commission to undertake a detailed analysis of national volunteering practices and traditions with a view to fostering a common European approach (Scurria, 2013, 2)	No action identified.	A study funded by the EU Commission was carried out in 2010 by GHK, Volunteering in the European Union, Final report to the European Commission, 2010. However, stakeholders have indicated that a more in depth study is necessary to obtain a strong evidence base of this sector. In doing so, it would be important to ensure full and effective consultation of stakeholders.

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
30. Commission to introduce and develop a volunteering policy and to use the open method of coordination in order to foster dialogue. (Scurria 2013, 26)	No action identified.	See Chapter 6: Dialogue between EU institutions and civil society
31. Commission and Member States to set up a single point of contact in the form of a service with responsibility for volunteering policy and for coordination (Scurria 2013, 28)	No action identified.	This recommendation could partly be addressed through the suggested engagement planned outlined in Chapter 6.
Promoting volunteering		
32. Commission to promote volunteering in the relevant EU policies, taking account of the cross-cutting nature of such activities and ensuring that the policies themselves provide the development of volunteering and foster the involvement of all section of society (Scurria, 2012, 60).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CEV Policy Conference held in Sarajevo in October 2013²⁰⁶, funded by the Europe for Citizen's Programme. - Commission funding of 2 European Networks – European Volunteer Centre and Volonteurope. 	
33. Calls on the Commission to give due recognition in EU programmes and projects to the genuine contribution that the work performed by volunteers makes to the community.	No action identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Commission should also ensure that volunteer time is recognised as co-financing in grants under Erasmus+ and other funding grants.

²⁰⁶ European Volunteer Centre (CEV), Policy Conference, 'Cross-Border Volunteering in the European Year of Citizens – What is it for?', Sarajevo, 3-4 October 2013.

Scurria recommendation ¹⁹⁵	EU actions taken	Recommendations for further EU action
34. Promote volunteering, in particular during the European Year of Citizens in 2013, and calls on the Commission to include volunteering support in international development assistance policies (Scurria, 2012, 65)	No action identified	The Commission could develop an engagement plan with stakeholders to improve dialogue (see Chapter 6).

Annex IV Data identified on cross-border volunteering

Mobility scheme	Geographical scope	Date/period	Number of volunteers sent/hosted per year	Data limitations
International Schemes				
IFRC	International	2012	Total number of volunteers 13.000.000 in 2012 ²⁰⁷ Based on a 6% expenditure of programmes for Europe (780.000 volunteers in 2012). There is no data specific to cross-border volunteers within the EU.	No disaggregated data specific to cross-border.
UN Volunteers	International	2011	Total number of volunteers: 7,303 (2011) ²⁰⁸ For Europe 4% (292 volunteers - 2011)	No disaggregated data specific to cross-border.
EU funded schemes				
European Voluntary Service	International	2007-2013	Data from 2007 and 2013 (data not available for each year): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 28346 volunteers sent under the EVS scheme.²⁰⁹ (data available for each Member State). Projections 2014- 2020: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The European Voluntary Service continues under the Erasmus+ programme (2014-2020). An estimated 10,000 volunteers will go abroad in 2014 and a yearly increase is expected throughout the programme lifecycle estimated to reach 20 000 volunteers in 2020²¹⁰. 	
Grundtvig programme	EU	2012	For Grundtvig (sending senior volunteering abroad within the EU) – there were 60 beneficiaries under all of the Grundtvig GMP programmes in 2012 from EU Member States ²¹¹ .	Data does not reflect what percentage of participants in the programme were

²⁰⁷ International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), Annual Report 2012.

²⁰⁸ United Nations Volunteers, 'UN Volunteer statistics worldwide - 2011 Annual Report'.

²⁰⁹ Source: Data sent by Mariann Klingberg, DG EAC Unit D1, 12 June 2013.

²¹⁰ Source: Email correspondence with Mariann Klingberg, DG EAC Unit D1, 12 June 2013.

²¹¹ Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), [Lifelong Learning Statistical data](#) [web content].

Mobility scheme	Geographical scope	Date/period	Number of volunteers sent/hosted per year	Data limitations
				involved in cross-border volunteering.
The EU Aid Volunteers' initiative (2014-2020) ²¹²	EU	2014-2020	Projections 2014-2020: Plan to send 4000 volunteers abroad; with an additional 10000 online volunteers ²¹³ .	Data is not disaggregated to reflect what percentage of the volunteers are sent within the EU.
State funded Schemes²¹⁴				
France				
French Civic Service	International	May 2010- June 2014	Between May 2010 and 19 June 2014, 334 volunteers were sent abroad within the EU through the French State funded programme (out of a total of 1281 sent abroad during that period) ²¹⁵ . The main hosting country is Germany (215 volunteers in 2010-2014 period).	
Germany				
Freiwilliges Soziales Jahr (FSJ – Voluntary Year of Social Service)	International	2013	On average there are 3000 volunteers sent abroad yearly under these schemes, of which half (an estimated 1500) are sent to EU countries (this estimate applies to 2013) ²¹⁶ .	Data not available online - obtained through a phone interview with the Federal Ministry of Family Affairs in June 2014.
Freiwilliges Ökologisches Jahr (FÖJ – Voluntary Year of Ecological Service)	International	2013	On average 800-1000 volunteers under this scheme are hosted each year, of which approximately half (400-500) are sent from EU countries ²¹⁷ .	Data not available online - obtained through a phone interview with the Federal

²¹² Welcome Europe, 'EU Aid Volunteers initiative', [funding data](#) [web page content].

²¹³ EU Aid Volunteers, web page of Kristalina Georgieva, Member of the European Commission [\[web page content\]](#).

²¹⁴ NB: This is not an exhaustive list of State funded schemes. The most important volunteer State funded schemes seem to be in Germany, Italy and France. Other countries were included below only because some (limited) data was found on them.

²¹⁵ Information obtained from Francine Meyer, Civic Service Agency France, International Development, June 2014.

²¹⁶ Source: Data obtained from interview with Dr. Ralf Weingaertner, Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth - Youth Volunteer Service, 22 May 2014.

Mobility scheme	Geographical scope	Date/period	Number of volunteers sent/hosted per year	Data limitations
				Ministry of Family Affairs in June 2014.
Adia (Anderer Dienst Im Ausland (Alternative Service Abroad))	International	2008	2008: 487 volunteers sent abroad (impossible to tell how many are sent to another EU country as the scope of the included programmes is not limited to Europe. ²¹⁸	
Italy				
Italian Civic Service Abroad (Servizio Civile all'estero)	International	2010	In 2010, 61 volunteers sent abroad (within EU) on the State funded scheme ²¹⁹ .	
Sweden				
Swedish Branch of Service Civil International (SCI) – Internationella Arbetslag (IAL)	International	2006	In 2006: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100 volunteers hosted from Europe and beyond; - 150 volunteers sent from Europe and beyond²²⁰; 	Data is not specific to EU cross-border volunteering.
United Kingdom				
International Voluntary Service (IVS) Great Britain ²²¹	EU and World	2013	100-120 volunteers hosted from the EU per year ²²² .	

²¹⁷ Source: Data obtained from interview with Dr. Ralf Weingaertner, Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth - Youth Volunteer Service, 22 May 2014.

²¹⁸ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', year?

²¹⁹ Servizio Civile Italy, [\[web content data\]](#).

²²⁰ Public Policy and Management Institute, 'Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe, study for the Committee of the Regions', year?

²²¹ International Voluntary Service, (IVS) Volunteering for Peace and Justice, Costs and Cancellation information, [\[web content data\]](#).

²²² Information obtained from the International Voluntary Service UK, June 2014.

Annex V – Exclusion/Selection of barriers to cross-border volunteering

Barriers	Exclusion criteria			Selection criteria				Overall assessment:
	Cross-border?	Scope for EU action?	Unresolved by (by EU/MS action?)	Magnitude of impact on volunteer organisations	Magnitude of impact on volunteers	Affecting a representative share of volunteer sectors	Affecting a representative share of volunteers	Low(0)/ Medium (1-3)/ High (4)
Administrative/legal barriers								
Criminal record check procedures	√	√	?	x	x	x	x	L
Lack of legal certainty on insurance practices and discriminatory insurance practices (e.g. upper age limits/ disability)	√	√	√	x	x	x	x	L
Legal and regulatory framework for volunteering								
Sub-barrier 1: Volunteering is not a legal ground for obtaining a residence permit in a receiving country	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	M
Sub-barrier 2: Uncertainty and risks of forfeiting social security	√	√	√	x	√	√	√	M

Barriers	Exclusion criteria			Selection criteria				Overall assessment:
	Cross-border?	Scope for EU action?	Unresolved by (by EU/MS action?)	Magnitude of impact on volunteer organisations	Magnitude of impact on volunteers	Affecting a representative share of volunteer sectors	Affecting a representative share of volunteers	Low(0)/ Medium (1-3)/ High (4)
benefits								
Sub-barrier 3: Lack of clarity on legal status of volunteers leading to volunteer expenses being taxed as income tax in certain MS	√	√	√	x	x	x	x	L
The lack of mutual recognition of associations between Member States	√	√	√	x	x	x	x	L
Financial barriers								
Lack of clarity regarding tax exemptions for employee volunteering	x							
Sustainable funding for organisations (EU funding programmes; red tape; other)	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	M

Barriers	Exclusion criteria			Selection criteria				Overall assessment:
	Cross-border?	Scope for EU action?	Unresolved by (by EU/MS action?)	Magnitude of impact on volunteer organisations	Magnitude of impact on volunteers	Affecting a representative share of volunteer sectors	Affecting a representative share of volunteers	Low(0)/ Medium (1-3)/ High (4)
Recruitment, training and recognition of volunteering								
Lack of clarity with regard to recognition of the skills and competences gained through volunteering	√	√	√	x	√	√	√	M
Information on volunteering opportunities is not adequately disseminated	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	H
Inadequate training and preparation for volunteers (including cultural/linguistic issues)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	H
Lack of diversity in recruitment	√	√	√	x	x	x	x	L
Measuring volunteering - difficulties in obtaining comparable data to measure the contribution of volunteering	X							

Annex VI – Survey questions

General questions:

1. What is the typical duration of EU cross-border volunteering placements in your organisation?

- ☐ < 1 month
- ☐ 1 - 3 months
- ☐ 4 - 6 months
- ☐ 6 - 12 months
- ☐ > 12 months
- ☐ Very different according to placement, but most often:months

2. What percentage of your EU cross-border volunteers are dedicated full-time to the assignment?

- ☐ 0 - 25%
- ☐ 26% - 50%
- ☐ 51% - 75%
- ☐ 76% - 100%

3. On average, how much time does your organisation spend in organising the EU cross-border activities of each volunteer sent/hosted (in advance of and during the hosting period)?

- ☐ No time spent
- ☐ < 5h
- ☐ 6 - 10h
- ☐ 10 - 15h
- ☐ 16 - 20h
- ☐ > 20 h (Please specify)

ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS

Volunteering not being a legal ground for obtaining a registration certificate (residence permit) in a receiving country has been identified as a barrier to cross border volunteering and may result in volunteers opting for shorter placements or facing administrative hurdles.

4. Based on your experience, what is the approximate share of your volunteers affected by this barrier?

- ☐ None
- ☐ < 5%

- ☐ 6% - 10%
- ☐ 11% - 15%
- ☐ 16-20%
- ☐ >20% (please specify)

5. Based on your experience, to what extent could this barrier be considered to impact the duration of EU cross-border volunteering placements?

- ☐ No impact
- ☐ < 10% of participating volunteers would have opted for longer projects
- ☐ 10% - 20% of participating volunteers would have opted for longer projects
- ☐ 21% - 30% of participating volunteers would have opted for longer projects
- ☐ > 30% (please specify)

6. Approximately how much time does your organisation spend helping volunteers deal with problems generated by this barrier (e.g. opening a bank account; obtaining health insurance; access to services, etc.)?

- ☐ No time spent
- ☐ 1 - 4h per volunteer affected
- ☐ 5 - 8h per volunteer affected
- ☐ 9 - 12h per volunteer affected
- ☐ > 12h per volunteer affected (please specify)

Uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits

7. Based on your experience, what is the approximate share of your potential volunteers refraining from engaging in cross-border volunteering activities due to uncertainty with regard to social security and unemployment benefits?

- ☐ None
- ☐ < 10% of potential volunteers do not participate due to this barrier
- ☐ 11% - 20% of potential volunteers do not participate due to this barrier
- ☐ 21% - 30% of potential volunteers do not participate due to this barrier
- ☐ > 30% of potential volunteers do not participate due to this barrier (please specify)

8. Based on your experience, what is the average incidence of this barrier in terms of last-minute cancellations (e.g. one month or less prior to the planned start of their activity)?

- ☐ No incidence
- ☐ < 5% of scheduled volunteers cancel at the last minute due to this barrier
- ☐ 6% - 10% of scheduled volunteers cancel at the last minute due to this barrier

<input type="checkbox"/> 11% - 15% of scheduled volunteers cancel at the last minute due to this barrier <input type="checkbox"/> >15% of scheduled volunteers cancel at the last minute due to this barrier (please specify)
9. Approximately how much time does your organisation spend helping your volunteers deal with problems generated by this barrier (e.g. providing information and advice, contacting public authorities)? <input type="checkbox"/> No time spent <input type="checkbox"/> 1-5h per volunteer affected <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10h per volunteer affected <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15h per volunteer affected <input type="checkbox"/> >16h per volunteer affected (please specify)
RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND RECOGNITION OF VOLUNTEERING <i>Uncertainty with regard to the recognition of skills and competences gained through cross-border volunteering</i>
10. In your opinion, to what extent could EU action in this regard increase the number of people engaging in your cross-border volunteering projects? <input type="checkbox"/> No impact <input type="checkbox"/> <5% per year <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10% per year <input type="checkbox"/> 11%-20% per year <input type="checkbox"/> >20% per year (please specify)
<i>The fact that information on volunteering opportunities is not always adequately disseminated</i>
11. In your opinion, to what extent could EU action in this regard increase the number of people engaging in your cross-border volunteering projects? <input type="checkbox"/> No impact <input type="checkbox"/> <5% per year <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10% per year <input type="checkbox"/> 11%-20% per year <input type="checkbox"/> >20% per year (please specify)
<i>Lack of adequate training and preparation for volunteers (e.g. pre-departure training and mentoring in order to adapt to a new role and to a new culture)</i>
12. In your opinion, to what extent is lack of adequate training and preparation for EU cross-border volunteers responsible for early returns of your volunteers to their home country? <input type="checkbox"/> Not relevant <input type="checkbox"/> < 5% of volunteers return earlier than expected due to lack of adequate training <input type="checkbox"/> 6% - 10% of volunteers return earlier than expected due to lack of adequate training

☐ 11% - 15% of volunteers return earlier than expected due to lack of adequate training

☐ >15% (please specify)

13. In your opinion, to what extent is lack of adequate training and preparation for EU cross-border volunteers responsible for volunteer placements failing to reach their full potential?

☐ Not relevant

☐ <10% of volunteers do not perform at their full potential due to lack of adequate training

☐ 11% - 20% of volunteers do not perform at their full potential due to lack of adequate training

☐ 21% - 30% of volunteers do not perform at their full potential due to lack of adequate training

☐ > 30% (please specify)

14. Additional comments

**EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION OF 12 JUNE 2012 ON
RECOGNISING AND PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER VOLUNTARY
ACTIVITIES IN THE EU (2011/2293(INI))**

ANNEX II -

P7_TA(2012)0236

Cross-border voluntary activities in the EU

European Parliament resolution of 12 June 2012 on recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU (2011/2293(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union,
- having regard to Articles 165, 166 and 214 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU),
- having regard to Decision No 1719/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 establishing the ‘Youth in Action’ programme for the period 2007 to 2013²²³,
- having regard to Decision No 1720/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 establishing an action programme in the field of lifelong learning²²⁴,
- having regard to Decision No 1904/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 establishing for the period 2007 to 2013 the programme ‘Europe for Citizens’ to promote active European citizenship²²⁵,
- having regard to Council Decision 2010/37/EC of 27 November 2009 on the European Year of Voluntary Activities Promoting Active Citizenship (2011)²²⁶,
- having regard to the Resolution of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council of 24 April 2006, on the recognition of the value of non-formal and informal learning within the European youth field²²⁷,
- having regard to the Council Resolution of 27 November 2007 on voluntary activities of young people (14427/1/2007),
- having regard to the Resolution of the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council of 16 May

²²³ OJ L 327, 24.11.2006, p. 30.

²²⁴ OJ L 327, 24.11.2006, p. 45.

²²⁵ OJ L 378, 27.12.2006, p. 32.

²²⁶ OJ L 17, 22.1.2010, p. 43.

²²⁷ OJ C 168, 20.7.2006, p. 1.

2007, on implementing the common objectives for voluntary activities of young people²²⁸,

- having regard to the Council Recommendation of 20 November 2008 on the mobility of young volunteers across the European Union²²⁹,
- having regard to Recommendation 2006/961/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on transnational mobility within the Community for education and training purposes: European Quality Charter for Mobility²³⁰,
- having regard to its declaration of 10 March 2011 on establishing European statutes for mutual societies, associations and foundations²³¹,
- having regard to the Council conclusions of 3 October 2011 on the role of voluntary activities in social policy (14552/2011),
- having regard to the Council conclusions of 29 November 2011 on the role of voluntary activities in sport in promoting active citizenship²³²,
- having regard to the Commission's EU citizenship report 2010 of 27 October 2010 entitled 'Dismantling the obstacles to EU citizens' rights' (COM(2010)0603),
- having regard to the Communication from the Commission of 5 September 2007 to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions entitled 'Promoting young people's full participation in education, employment and society' (COM(2007)0498),
- having regard to the Communication from the Commission of 27 April 2009 to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions entitled 'An EU Strategy for Youth: Investing and Empowering – A renewed open method of coordination to address youth challenges and opportunities' (COM(2009)0200),
- having regard to the Communication from the Commission of 3 March 2010 entitled 'Europe 2020 – A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth' (COM(2010)2020),
- having regard to the Communication from the Commission of 15 September

²²⁸ OJ C 241, 20.9.2008, p. 1.

²²⁹ OJ C 319, 13.12.2008, p. 8.

²³⁰ OJ L 394, 30.12.2006, p. 5.

²³¹ Texts adopted, P7_TA(2011)0101.

²³² OJ C 372, 20.12.2011, p. 24.

2010 to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions entitled ‘Youth on the Move – An initiative to unleash the potential of young people to achieve smart, sustainable and inclusive growth in the European Union’ (COM(2010)0477),

- having regard to the Communication from the Commission of 20 September 2011 to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on EU Policies and Volunteering: Recognising and Promoting Cross-border Voluntary Activities in the EU (COM(2011)0568),
 - having regard to the Communication from the Commission of 23 November 2010 to the European Parliament and the Council entitled ‘How to express EU citizens’ solidarity through volunteering: First reflections on a European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps’ (COM(2010)0683),
 - having regard to its resolution of 22 April 2008 on the role of volunteering in contributing to economic and social cohesion²³³,
 - having regard to Rule 48 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Culture and Education and the opinion of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (A7-0166/2012),
- A. whereas ‘volunteering’ means activities, including formal, non-formal, informal and vocational training and learning, which are undertaken voluntarily on the basis of a person’s own free choice and motivation, and without concern for financial gain and for a non-profit cause, which benefit volunteers, those receiving services from a volunteer association, communities and society as a whole;
- B. whereas the success of the European Year of Voluntary Activities Promoting Active Citizenship (2011) at national, regional, local and European levels has positive effects in terms of increased public visibility and awareness-raising and should influence the drafting of public policy;
- C. whereas volunteering is an informal learning experience suitable for persons of all ages; whereas it offers benefits in terms of personal development, community management, strengthening of democracy, civic values, social solidarity and participation in democratic life, intercultural learning and the acquisition of social and professional skills as well as contributing to the aims of European Union policies on social inclusion and combating discrimination, and on employment, education, culture, development of skills and citizenship;

²³³ OJ C 259 E, 29.10.2009, p. 9.

- D. whereas volunteering is an important factor in creating social capital and development and in promoting socio-economic cohesion, given the potential of non-formal learning opportunities to help volunteers gain skills that will make them more employable and thus contribute to the Europe 2020 growth strategy;
 - E. whereas a growing number of EU citizens of all ages are participating in volunteering in the fields of education, culture, youth policies, sport, the environment, sustainable development, health, immigration, rights advocacy, corporate social responsibility and the EU's relations with third countries;
 - F. whereas there is a huge variety of cultures, traditions, legal systems and organisational methods for volunteering in the Member States but persistent obstacles to its practice, since volunteering is not recognised or not adequately recognised in many national Member State legal systems, and whereas it must not replace tasks which could potentially create paid jobs;
 - G. whereas the economic crisis and fiscal consolidation are endangering the financial sustainability of many NGOs and volunteering providers working every day on increasing active citizenship, solidarity and social inclusion all over Europe;
 - H. whereas the economic crisis and political and economic factors have an impact on sustainable funding and fundraising for voluntary activities;
 - I. whereas many volunteer-led projects and organisations do not have the resources to access and secure funding under existing EU programmes due to excessive red tape and bureaucracy;
 - J. whereas EU action has an added value in promoting cooperation between the Member States and the exchange of information and good practice concerning volunteering, while respecting the subsidiarity principle;
1. Calls on those Member States who do not have a clear or adequate legal framework for volunteers to put one in place and to draw up national strategies to promote the growth of volunteering activities, including the recognition of the rights of volunteers, and to ensure quality, protection and equal access for everyone, without discrimination, particularly in terms of adequate access to health and social protection;
 2. Invites those Member States that have not made substantial progress in the area of volunteering to devote more attention to this sector in their future policy-making, programmes and financing;
 3. Calls on the Member States to ensure that the rights and responsibilities of

volunteers are recognised and respected and that volunteers themselves are aware of them; suggests that, in this regard, Member States use the European Charter on the Rights and Responsibilities of Volunteers, drawn up by the stakeholder conference at the 2nd Youth Convention on Volunteering in 2011 as a reference for policy-making and national legislation in this field;

4. Asks the national, regional and local authorities and the EU to pay particular attention to disadvantaged young people and young people with fewer opportunities (especially people with disabilities), so that they may participate in volunteering activities and, to that end, benefit from adequate educational and financial support;
5. Points out that volunteering reduces the risk of social exclusion and that it is essential to attract all social groups to such activities, especially people with disabilities; draws attention to the need to ensure that volunteering becomes more widely recognised and less hampered by barriers of all kinds;
6. Reiterates the need to make volunteering accessible to immigrants and minorities as an essential element in encouraging their integration and social inclusion;
7. Notes the benefits arising from cooperation between volunteers from the European Union's Member States and third countries and points out that such cooperation is particularly important in the context of the European Neighbourhood Policy; notes, too, that, in addition to the primary benefits associated with volunteering, it can also help to promote democracy and the rule of law in third countries;
8. Calls on the Council and the Commission to continue to make progress in the negotiations towards easier visa regimes for non-EU citizens wishing to enter the EU for the purpose of volunteering, provided they fulfil the criteria to perform volunteering activities;
9. Calls on the Member States to implement the provisions of Council Directive 2004/114/EC²³⁴ on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service and to simplify the procedures for the granting of visas for those wishing to undertake voluntary activities as part of the EU neighbourhood policy;
10. Notes that volunteering involves citizens in economically, socially and ecologically sustainable local and cross-border development and can often ensure the swift provision of aid when disasters occur; points out that it also plays a role in fostering solidarity, active citizenship and inter-cultural learning, providing volunteers with the opportunity to learn the language and

²³⁴ OJ L 375, 23.12.2004, p. 12.

culture of the country in which they work, thereby strengthening social cohesion and participative democracy;

11. Encourages the Member States to recognise the benefits of participating in cross-border volunteer activities to provide citizens with new skills, contributing to their employability and mobility and strengthening the development of social inclusion, and to support cooperation between organisers of voluntary activities in EU countries in order to promote the mobility of volunteers of all ages across Europe, with the aim of fostering mutual intercultural enrichment;
12. Calls on the Commission to improve the facilities of volunteering organisations and volunteer centres for providing information and training and for coordinating activities between volunteers and volunteering organisations;
13. Calls on the Commission to publish a report identifying the obstacles to cross-border volunteering, for example age limits in insurance policies, and, where appropriate, legislative proposals;
14. Highlights the need to ensure that high-quality volunteering is developed, both nationally and at cross-border level, through a structured framework of comprehensive information and appropriate training for volunteers which includes current best practice, the development of hosting capacities for providers and organisations at local and national level, a recognition of the rights of volunteers to reconcile their voluntary work with their personal lives, and by creating the necessary infrastructure at all levels;
15. Highlights the importance of developing activities that can bring together and channel the motivations of potential volunteers, capitalising on every individual's personal assets and increasing the quality of volunteering in every entity and partnership and in every Member State, and with a particular focus on cross-border volunteering;
16. Calls on the Member States to promote the use of volunteer time as matching funding for European projects, particularly in cross-border initiatives;
17. Urges the Member States to develop international volunteering initiatives and programmes that extend beyond EU borders and draws attention to the successful examples and practices already implemented in certain Member States for this purpose;
18. Calls on the Member States to promote training programmes and develop guides and materials on the management of volunteers and schemes to motivate people to engage in cross-border volunteering activities;

19. Calls on the Commission and the national, regional and local authorities and the various civil society organisations to improve information networks in order to make everyone aware of volunteering opportunities, tackle barriers to participation, enhance access to volunteering best practice and promote cooperation across borders;
20. Proposes, therefore, that a centralised EU portal be created, in cooperation with organisations and associations working in this sector and in particular their European networks, to include a best practice volunteer resources bank and a section on cross-border volunteering, with information on the programmes available, their costs and the conditions for participation, allowing for an exchange of information on administrative burdens, the legal and fiscal aspects of volunteering, barriers encountered in accessing programmes and the best ways to tackle them;
21. Encourages the Member States to adopt the use of the International Labour Organisation's (ILO) Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work and the United Nations Handbook on Non-Profit Organisations with a view to making available comparable statistics and data providing a clear picture of the significant contribution made by volunteering and of the needs of volunteers and providers throughout the European Union;
22. Calls on the Commission to encourage the Member States to adopt the ILO Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work in order to ensure robust comparable data which can help improve monitoring and policy-making;
23. Notes that older people who engage in volunteering find it easier to make the transition from work to retirement, i.e. gradually to leave active work;
24. Stresses the importance of providing information, adequate funding and support for senior citizens wishing to volunteer in another EU country, encouraging active ageing as a rich source of wisdom and experience for society;
25. Notes that volunteering contributes to integration, social inclusion and social innovation, and can also contribute to poverty reduction, thus helping to achieve economic and social cohesion; points out that volunteering also promotes solidarity between generations by encouraging cooperation between young people and senior citizens, and that it contributes to active ageing and social involvement in all phases of life, as well as helping to improve environmental protection;
26. Notes that volunteering increases people's tolerance, creates human and social capital and plays a vital role in the empowerment of socially excluded groups; emphasises the need to provide access to as wide a range of volunteering opportunities as possible and encourages the Commission to make European programmes more inclusive and open to all age groups;

27. Encourages the Member States to set national targets for volunteering and to establish official reporting, monitoring and evaluation of volunteering actions;
28. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give a high profile to volunteering in sport, particularly at the grassroots level, to acknowledge the important role played by volunteer-led sporting organisations in strengthening culture, promoting social inclusion and enhancing communities and to reduce the barriers to sports volunteering across the EU;
29. Urges the national, regional and local authorities and the EU to recognise the important contribution also made by volunteering to protecting the environment, and to support volunteering activities in environmental education, prevention and crisis management, and in defending artistic and cultural heritage;
30. Encourages businesses in the European Union actively to support their employees and retired staff in becoming involved in volunteering activities;
31. Supports the Commission's proposal to establish a 'European Skills Passport', so that the skills acquired through volunteering may be officially recognised, both for professional and learning purposes, which is a vital element in motivating potential volunteers and in creating a link between non-formal learning and formal education;
32. Emphasises that the European Skills Passport should not be a series of new separate certificates but, rather, a comprehensive document listing all practical experience, training and soft and vocational skills acquired through life-long learning, including those gained through volunteering, if desired by the volunteer;
33. Suggests therefore including the skills acquired through volunteering in the ECTS (European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System) for students;
34. Calls on the Commission to consider developing a similar calculation and recognition system for skills acquired through volunteering for adults who are not at university;
35. Calls on the Commission to make the European Skills Passport a reality as soon as possible; emphasises that the skills acquired during volunteering work are also of considerable significance in working life and provide added value to a CV, and notes that volunteering can help young people in their choice of a career;
36. Stresses that recognition of competences and skills gained through volunteering as non-formal and informal learning and work experience is essential;

37. Notes that voluntary work helps volunteers to broaden their horizons and develop their personalities, and highlights the fact that volunteering also brings economic benefits to Member States, as people who engage in voluntary activities contribute to the generation of GDP;
38. Calls on the Commission to address in the 'European Skills Passport' the need for a cohesive and transferable approach to proper screening and vetting of volunteers who work with children and/or vulnerable members of society;
39. Urges the Member States to develop mechanisms for validating non-formal and formal learning outcomes, which will improve the value and transferability of the skills acquired outside formal education, facilitating in particular the acquisition of additional ECTS credits at university thanks to volunteering, and a standardised mechanism for recognising the skills acquired through volunteering in the ECTS, and also to explore ways of eliminating the tax obstacles that volunteers encounter when participating in cross-border activities;
40. Proposes that a training and qualifications framework for volunteer coaches be established and incorporated into the European Qualifications Framework in order to improve the mobility of volunteer coaches and enhance the transferability of skills and competences developed through volunteering;
41. Calls on the Member States to support employee volunteering and employer-supported volunteering also in the context of corporate social responsibility;
42. Supports the Commission's proposal to create a 'European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps', which will increase the participation of volunteers in solidarity actions in the context of the EU's humanitarian aid policy;
43. Calls on the Commission also to take existing structures into consideration and actively to incorporate these from the outset when establishing this voluntary corps; emphasises, too, that the duplication of organisations in the area of civil protection is not desirable and should be avoided;
44. Urges the national, regional and local authorities and the EU to ensure adequate and stable funding and to simplify administrative procedures, including tax incentives, for the organisations involved in volunteering work, including all the relevant associations and networks, particularly for small associations with limited resources, with a view to enhancing their roles, activities and achievements for the benefit of society;
45. Calls, therefore, for the concept of grants to associations to be clarified so that association funding is not confused with state aid, which could hinder competition in the financial sector;

46. Calls on the Commission to propose a mechanism to allow Member States wishing to strengthen civil society to exempt from VAT all or most of the activities and transactions carried out by voluntary non-profit-making organisations; stresses that at least the smaller non-profit-making organisations should be covered by such a mechanism;
47. Calls on the Member States to ensure legal certainty for volunteers, not least with regard to insurance issues, so that the various regimes in the different Member States encourage cross-border volunteering, and also to ensure better provision of information to volunteers in connection with their rights and the regulatory and institutional arrangements pertaining in the various Member States;
48. Calls on the Commission to assist with the process of dismantling existing barriers;
49. Calls on the Member States to review their cross-border tax and social security arrangements in connection with cross-border volunteering, so as to ensure that they do not create additional barriers to such activity and that cross-border volunteers are able to receive the social security benefits to which they are entitled under Regulation (EC) No 883/2004;
50. Stresses that, although it is an important resource in our economy and society, volunteering must not be an alternative to or a substitute for regular, paid work and must not, under any circumstances, constitute a reason for governments failing to fulfil their social obligations;
51. Considers that this aspect should be particularly emphasised in the care sector, where the amount of volunteering is continuing to grow; points out, furthermore, that promoting volunteering as a means of acquiring, developing or maintaining skills should not result in volunteering becoming a mandatory requirement, as this would undermine its fundamental nature;
52. Calls on the national, regional and local authorities and the EU in particular to communicate existing European programmes to the actors and partners involved in volunteering, especially those with 'European territorial cooperation' objectives under the cohesion policy, and to facilitate access to them so that they can take advantage of them more effectively in their projects and cross-border activities;
53. Calls on the Member States to promote and implement national schemes for cross-border volunteering in order to contribute to its development across the EU;
54. Calls on the Commission, in particular, as part of the creation of new multiannual programmes and considering the important experience gained from the European Year of Volunteering 2011, to ensure that funding is

- guaranteed for volunteering projects and for the structures organised by voluntary activities and to develop and encourage efficient inter-institutional coordination in order to promote the role of volunteering in EU policies;
55. Calls on the Commission to ensure that information on available funding and the relevant programmes is freely available to volunteer-led projects and that the application procedures are not made inaccessible due to excessive red tape;
56. Asks the Commission to ensure that adequate funding is provided for programmes in various policy areas to support cross-border volunteering activities; calls on the Member States to actively implement schemes for fostering national and cross-border volunteering; asks for particular attention to be paid to financial support for volunteering infrastructure; maintains that public subsidies for volunteering should be allocated without discrimination against any organisation;
57. Proposes that a cross-border network of voluntary organisations in the various Member States should be set up by coordinating the existing voluntary organisations while facilitating the exchange of good practice and experience, and takes the view that new contact points should be opened only in Member States that do not already have such structures;
58. Calls on the Commission to propose a European Statute for Associations to give them the legal framework within which to operate, reduce the administrative costs associated with cross-border volunteering activities and establish voluntary structures at a European level which encourage mobility of volunteers in the EU;
59. Emphasises the role that volunteer work can play in promoting EU policies;
60. Calls on the Commission to give due recognition to and promote volunteering in the relevant EU policies, taking account of the cross-cutting nature of such activities and ensuring that the policies themselves promote the development of volunteering and foster the involvement of all sections of society;
61. Calls on the Commission to give due recognition in EU programmes and projects to the genuine contribution that the work performed by volunteers makes to the community;
62. Calls on the Commission to allocate adequate resources to the creation of a European Volunteer Centre Development Fund aimed at developing infrastructure to support volunteering;
63. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to allow volunteer time to be included as co-funding in all EU-funded programmes on the basis of a

contribution in-kind with a financial value;

64. Recommends that the Commission and the Member States maintain a continuity between 2011 and future years by strongly integrating the volunteering dimension, which is an expression of active citizenship that promotes social integration, including that of older citizens, within both the European Year for Active Ageing (2012) and the proposed European Year of Citizens (2013);
65. Draws attention to the need to promote volunteering, in particular during the European Year of Citizens in 2013, and calls on the Commission to include volunteering support in international development assistance policies, not least with a view to meeting all the targets laid down in the Millennium Development Goals;
66. Supports a formal examination of the ‘Solidarité proposal’ for an inter-institutional human resources programme in the EU institutions to facilitate the involvement of the institutions’ staff and trainees in volunteering, humanitarian and social activities, both as part of staff training and volunteering in their own time;
67. Highlights the fact that the proposed programme is cost saving and highly value-adding and would help to implement EU policies and programmes;
68. Recommends that the Commission maintain the useful contact points set up both with ‘EYV 2011 Alliance’ and the successor Volunteer Platform, which include many civil society volunteering and networking organisations, and with the national coordinating bodies, strategic partners and national government spokespersons in this sector, given the large variety of bodies responsible for volunteering in the EU, and encourages these contact points to engage with the proposed centralised EU portal, as a pan-European platform, to facilitate further coordination and increased cross-border activity;
69. Stresses the importance of contact networks and the exchange of good practices to distribute information about existing EU procedures which can help and support cross-border volunteering;
70. Calls on the Commission to act, where it deems appropriate, on the Policy Agenda on Volunteering in Europe (PAVE), which was drawn up by the volunteering organisations involved in the EYV 2011 Alliance;
71. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the governments and parliaments of the Member States.

**EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION OF 10 DECEMBER 2013
ON VOLUNTEERING AND VOLUNTARY ACTIVITY IN EUROPE
(2013/2064(INI))**

ANNEX III-

P7_TA-PROV(2013)0549**Volunteering and voluntary activity in Europe****European Parliament resolution of 10 December 2013 on volunteering and voluntary activity in Europe (2013/2064(INI))**

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union,
- having regard to Articles 165, 166 and 214 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,
- having regard to the definition of volunteer work proposed by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in its Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work (2011),
- having regard to Decision No 2241/2004/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2004 on a single Community framework for the transparency of qualifications and competences (Europass),
- having regard to Decision No 1719/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 establishing the Youth in Action programme for the period 2007 to 2013²³⁵,
- having regard to Decision No 1720/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 establishing an action programme in the field of lifelong learning²³⁶,
- having regard to Decision No 1904/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 establishing for the period 2007 to 2013 the programme 'Europe for Citizens' to promote active European citizenship²³⁷,
- having regard to Council Decision 2010/37/EC of 27 November 2009 on the European Year of Voluntary Activities Promoting Active Citizenship (2011)²³⁸,
- having regard to the resolution of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the recognition of the value of non-formal and informal learning within the European youth field²³⁹,

²³⁵ OJ L 327, 24.11.2006, p. 30.

²³⁶ OJ L 327, 24.11.2006, p. 45.

²³⁷ OJ L 378, 27.12.2006, p. 32.

²³⁸ OJ L 17, 22.1.2010, p. 43.

²³⁹ OJ C 168, 20.7.2006, p. 1.

- having regard to the Council resolution of 27 November 2007 on voluntary activities of young people (14427/1/2007),
- having regard to the resolution of the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council of 16 May 2007, on implementing the common objectives for voluntary activities of young people²⁴⁰,
- having regard to the Council recommendation of 20 November 2008 on the mobility of young volunteers across the European Union²⁴¹,
- having regard to Recommendation 2006/961/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on transnational mobility within the Community for education and training purposes: European Quality Charter for Mobility²⁴²,
- having regard to its declaration of 10 March 2011 on establishing European statutes for mutual societies, associations and foundations²⁴³,
- having regard to the Council conclusions of 3 October 2011 on the role of voluntary activities in social policy (14552/2011),
- having regard to the Council conclusions of 29 November 2011 on the role of voluntary activities in sport in promoting active citizenship²⁴⁴,
- having regard to the Commission's EU citizenship report 2010 of 27 October 2010 entitled 'Dismantling the obstacles to EU citizens' rights' (COM(2010)0603),
- having regard to the communication of 5 September 2007 from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions entitled 'Promoting young people's full participation in education, employment and society' (COM(2007)0498),
- having regard to the communication of 27 April 2009 from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions entitled 'An EU Strategy for Youth: Investing and Empowering – A renewed open method of coordination to address youth challenges and opportunities' (COM(2009)0200),
- having regard to the communication of 3 March 2010 from the Commission entitled 'Europe 2020 – A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth' (COM(2010)2020),

²⁴⁰ OJ C 241, 20.9.2008, p. 1.

²⁴¹ OJ C 319, 13.12.2008, p. 8.

²⁴² OJ L 394, 30.12.2006, p.5.

²⁴³ OJ C 199 E, 7.7.2012, p. 187

²⁴⁴ OJ C 372, 20.12.2011, p. 24.

- having regard to the communication of 15 September 2010 from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions entitled ‘Youth on the Move – An initiative to unleash the potential of young people to achieve smart, sustainable and inclusive growth in the European Union’ (COM(2010)0477),
 - having regard to the communication of 20 September 2011 from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions entitled ‘EU Policies and Volunteering: Recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU’ (COM(2011)0568),
 - having regard to the Commission proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing ‘Erasmus for All’ – The Union Programme for Education, Training, Youth and Sport (COM(2011)0788),
 - having regard to the report of 19 December 2012 from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the implementation, results and overall assessment of the 2011 European Year of Volunteering (COM(2012)0781),
 - having regard to the opinion of 28 March 2012 of the European Economic and Social Committee on the communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions entitled ‘EU Policies and Volunteering: Recognising and Promoting Cross-border Voluntary Activities in the EU’,²⁴⁵,
 - having regard to its resolution of 12 June 2012 on recognising and promoting cross-border voluntary activities in the EU²⁴⁶,
 - having regard to the Council Recommendation of 20 December 2012 on the validation of non-formal and informal learning,
 - having regard to the Commission report on the implementation, results and overall assessment of the 2011 European Year of Volunteering (EYV 2011);
 - having regard to Rule 48 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Culture and Education (A7-0348/2013),
- A. whereas EYV 2011 was a success, had relevant objectives and helped to raise awareness of the issue;

²⁴⁵ CESE 824/2012.

²⁴⁶ OJ C 332 E, 15.11.2013, p. 14.

- B. whereas creating an environment in which volunteering can thrive and is accessible to everyone is a lengthy process in which all stakeholders need to be involved;
- C. whereas volunteering is a key facet of active citizenship and democracy, as well as of personal development, embodying European values such as solidarity and non-discrimination, and whereas it also helps to boost participatory democracy and promote human rights inside and outside the EU;
- D. having regard to the importance which is attached to volunteering in the debate on public policies;
- E. whereas engagement in voluntary activity can be an important way of gaining skills needed in the labour market as well as a means of attaining prominent social positions in the community;
- F. whereas volunteers are, to a large degree, the lifeblood of sport;
- G. whereas volunteering is a key factor for individual and collective emancipation, solidarity and social cohesion;
- H. whereas volunteering plays a key role in creating social capital and boosting development, as well as in promoting economic and social cohesion, thus helping to further the aims of the Europe 2020 strategy;
- I. whereas the Council conclusions of October 2011 on the role of voluntary activities in social policy underline the importance of voluntary activities for addressing gender inequalities;
- J. whereas bureaucratic barriers at national level continue to restrict opportunities to engage in volunteering, which is still not legally recognised to a sufficient degree in some Member States;
- K. whereas, owing to different traditions and cultural practices, major disparities exist between Member States as regards the laws applying to volunteering, the rights that volunteers have and the way in which volunteering is organised;
- L. whereas the severe economic crisis, austerity measures and tax pressures are jeopardising the financial stability of many NGOs, sports bodies and voluntary organisations, which are nonetheless continuing to do what they can to enhance inclusion and social wellbeing in these difficult times;
- M. whereas in order to safeguard the achievements of EYV 2011, European volunteering policy - to which a piecemeal approach is currently being taken at EU level, with responsibility being scattered across a range of services - needs to be properly structured and coordinated;
- 1. Notes the figures given for the EYV 2011 communication campaign in the annexes to the Commission report, and deplores the fact that poor results were achieved because of a lack of financial resources;

2. Recognises and supports the various forms of volunteering practised in the Member States through national organisations and networks of associations operating at local level; calls, in this respect, for a multicultural approach from the Member States, and calls on the Commission to undertake a detailed analysis of national volunteering practices and traditions with a view to fostering a common European approach;
3. Notes that the further consolidation of a common European approach to volunteering will create more opportunities for young people's mobility and employability by allowing them to acquire valuable skills;
4. Welcomes the fact that some Member States have adopted or revised laws in this area with a view to creating a favourable environment for volunteering. and recommends other Member States to do likewise, with a focus on strengthening volunteers' rights using the European Charter for the Rights and Responsibilities of Volunteers;
5. Encourages Member States to continue creating an enabling environment for volunteering, especially by means of a legal framework where one is still lacking;
6. Notes that some Member States have implemented the guidelines set out in the ILO Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work, and encourages the others to follow suit so that a body of comparable data providing a clear picture of the valuable contribution such work makes to society may be compiled;
7. Calls for a European statute for voluntary organisations to be adopted in order to help ensure that they are given proper legal and institutional recognition;
8. Stresses the need to promote volunteering, especially among schoolchildren, students and other young people, in order to broaden the horizons of solidarity and support for it;
9. Points out that the large number of European Skills Passports created online over recent months illustrates the success of this 'electronic portfolio', which provides a comprehensive picture of individuals' skills, including those acquired during volunteering work, so that they may be officially recognised for both employment and learning purposes;
10. Draws attention to the fact that skills and abilities acquired during volunteer work, which may be counted as non-formal and informal learning and work experience, are a plus point on CVs and in working life;
11. Believes that the proposed 'Europass Experience' document would allow volunteers to describe and record skills developed during volunteer work that may not lead to certification, and encourages the Commission, in the light of the Council's recommendation on the validation of non-formal and informal learning, to launch that document as soon as possible;

12. Notes the importance of the skills and abilities mentioned above for motivating young people to volunteer and for generating social capital and boosting societal development;
13. Suggests that attention be paid to the issue of gender parity within the voluntary sector, and especially to the pronounced discrepancy that exists among voluntary leaders, with men being over-represented in managerial positions;
14. Believes that the skills acquired by young people during volunteer work should be included in the European Skills Passport and Europass, so that formal and non-formal learning are treated in the same way;
15. Emphasises that volunteering offers young people who have broken off their schooling an inclusive environment and inclusive activities;
16. Reiterates its support for the Commission's European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps initiative, which is intended to help the EU respond swiftly and in a coordinated manner to humanitarian crises and serious natural disasters by providing support for the training, mobilisation and coordination of volunteers for EU humanitarian aid operations;
17. Points out that volunteering, which is becoming increasingly common among both young and elderly people, promotes intercultural learning as well as a sense of European identity and intergenerational solidarity, and fosters active ageing and lifelong civic participation;
18. Points out that volunteering enables both young people and older people to make a contribution to society and earn recognition and esteem in return, and that this improves their quality of life, wellbeing and general state of health;
19. Points out that the existence of a broad range of volunteering activities, as well as ease of access to such activities, as regards cost, availability of information and infrastructure, and provision of liability and accident insurance cover, are essential if volunteering is to be promoted among all age groups;
20. Considers that volunteering, as an active method of building civil society, can contribute to the development of intercultural dialogue and play a major role in combating prejudice and racism;
21. Points out that volunteering plays a key role in creating human and social capital and promoting social inclusion; calls on the Commission and the Member States to give due recognition to the vital contribution made by volunteering in the world of sport and, specifically, amateur sport, in which field many sports organisations would not be able to function without the help of volunteers;
22. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to give due recognition to the key contribution that volunteering is making at this time of serious economic crisis;

23. Stresses that continuous effort is required to ensure that women have equal access to voluntary activity;
24. Highlights the need to ensure continuity between EYV 2011 and subsequent EYVs, as part of efforts to ensure that volunteering is seen as a valuable means of taking an active part in society, and in this regard encourages the Commission to include volunteering as an important contribution to active citizenship during the European Year of Citizens;
25. Calls on the Member States to ensure the sustainability of the results achieved at national level during EYV 2011;
26. Calls on the Commission to introduce and develop a volunteering policy and to use the open method of coordination in order to foster dialogue and cooperation between stakeholders in the various Member States;
27. Urges the Member States to take the requisite steps to institutionalise volunteering in a manner consistent with their national labour laws;
28. Calls on the Member States and the Commission to set up a single point of contact in the form of a service with responsibility for volunteering policy and for coordination in this area between Commission departments and the various institutions;
29. Stresses the need, in cooperation in particular with European volunteer organisations, associations and networks, to set up a centralised EU portal providing a pan-European platform for coordination in this area, which should include a volunteering best practice database and a section on cross-border volunteering, with information on programmes available, costs and arrangements for taking part, in order to foster the pooling of information;
30. Encourages the Member States to set up national coordination websites and search engines that will allow easy and well-structured access to volunteering opportunities for single individuals and cooperation possibilities for organisations;
31. Encourages Member States to continue to provide a stable and sustainable support framework for both national and cross-border volunteering that supports both volunteers and volunteering organisations; recommends that Member States should keep in place the national coordinating bodies set up in connection with EYV 2011;
32. Calls on the Member States to implement the provisions of Directive 2004/114/EC²⁴⁷ on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for purposes of study, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service, and to simplify the procedures for the granting of visas, or to abolish them, for those wishing to undertake voluntary activities as part of the European Neighbourhood Policy;

²⁴⁷ OJ L 375, 23.12.2004, p. 12.

33. Urges national, regional and local authorities to make adequate funding available, streamline administrative procedures and provide tax incentives for volunteers' organisations and networks, in particular small organisations with limited resources; calls, in this connection, for the concept of grants to associations to be clarified so that funding for associations is no longer confused with state aid which could hamper competition in the for-profit sector;
34. Calls on the Commission to look into the possibility of counting the economic contribution made by voluntary work as matching funding for European projects;
35. Draws attention to the need for volunteering to be encouraged as part of corporate social responsibility strategies, in keeping with voluntary international standard ISO 26000:2010 on guidance on corporate social responsibility;
36. Calls on the Commission to see to it that Member States make it compulsory for volunteers to have proper insurance cover, in order to protect their health and safety during volunteer work;
37. Calls on the Member States that have not yet done so to adopt legislation on volunteering and to facilitate volunteering through the provision of formal, informal and non-formal training to enhance volunteers' skills and empower them in their work;
38. Calls on the Member States to facilitate volunteering through the provision of formal, informal and non-formal training to enhance volunteers' skills and empower them in their work, their dedication being primarily altruistic and disinterested; encourages them to introduce training courses in volunteering as electives in educational institutions;
39. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to further promote the European Voluntary Service in universities and other higher education institutions;
40. Believes that voluntary work, as a method of informal learning, helps to develop skills and professional qualifications which make it easier for volunteers to enter or return to the labour market;
41. Recommends that the Commission should continue to maintain contacts with the EYV 2011 Alliance successor, the European Alliance for Volunteering, and other volunteer-based organisations and that it should take proper account of the recommendations laid down in the Policy Agenda for Volunteering in Europe (PAVE), as the basis for an action plan for the future;
42. Calls on the Commission to marshal the necessary resources to set up a European Volunteering Development Fund, in order to ensure that appropriate support infrastructure is put in place;

43. Emphasises the need to make it easier for NGOs to gain access to European funding, in particular under the ESF, at national and European level;
44. Calls on the Member States to implement the Council recommendation on the validation of non-formal and informal learning and to ensure, in advance of the target date of 2018, the implementation of formal structures for the validation of the knowledge, skills and competences gained through volunteering leading to a recognised qualification which educational institutions, employers and others should recognise;
45. Calls on the Commission to recognise volunteer time as eligible in-kind cofinancing for all European grants, and to work with volunteer organisations in order to develop systems for recording and documenting volunteer time on the basis of the many tools and models available;
46. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the governments and parliaments of the Member States.

The study examines the legal, administrative and other barriers to cross-border volunteering which prevent it from achieving its full potential. Those barriers include uncertainty and the risk of forfeiting social security benefits, the unclear framework for obtaining residence permits in some host countries, the lack of clear procedures for the recognition of the skills and competences gained through volunteering, the lack of positive action and information on volunteering opportunities, and insufficient preparation and training for volunteers.

The cost associated with the barriers to cross border volunteering is estimated at 65 million euro per year, increasing the positive economic benefit by a third mainly through the removal of administrative barriers.

While the cost of non-action, in political and economic terms, is relatively modest, stronger EU action would increase its visibility, its socioeconomic contribution and foster increased participation in cross-border volunteering.

This is a publication of the European Added Value Unit
EPRS | European Parliamentary Research Service
European Parliament



PE 536.370

ISBN: 978-92-823-7139-8

DOI: 10.2861/871983

CAT: QA-02-15-530-EN-N

The content of this document is the sole responsibility of the author and any opinions expressed therein do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Parliament. It is addressed to the Members and staff of the EP for their parliamentary work.

www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank (Internet) – www.epthinktank.eu (blog) – www.eprs.sso.ep.parl.union.eu (Intranet)