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YOUTH POLICY AND PARTICIPATION IN THE EU

NOTE
This note provides an introduction to the current status of the European Union's Youth Policy, in the context of the debate over its reform. It focuses in particular on the theme of the political and civic participation of young people.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Context and Purpose of this Note

This note was drawn up, in its updated form, after the public hearing on "Youth Participation in the European Union", held at the European Parliament on February 17th 2009. It has been timed to coincide with the revision of the European Union's (EU) Youth Policy in the months to come, which will be triggered by the publication of the European Commission's new communication in this domain, expected in April 2009.

The communication will set out ideas for the future of EU Youth Policy, whilst taking stock of its achievements since 2001. This note is therefore intended to draw attention to the main issues involved in that review, on which Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education (CULT) has requested research, given that it will be called upon to make its voice heard in the debate.

We will examine in particular the issue of youth "participation", in the widest sense of the expression, encompassing political participation (voting in an election or joining a political party) and all forms of "civic" participation (doing voluntary work for example). More specifically, we will consider what the EU institutions can do to encourage participation.

1.2. A Brief History of Youth Policy at the EU Level

On the national level, the worldwide student protests of 1968 are seen as the trigger for the setting up of policies specifically aimed at integrating children and young adults in society. At the EU level the breakthrough in Youth Policy was the creation of the "Youth for Europe" Programme in 1988.

As was the case in other areas, the programme actually predated the formal policy, since it was only a few years later that the Maastricht Treaty introduced "youth" into the EU's legal order. Under article 149 § 2, the Community was invited to encourage "the development of youth exchanges and of exchanges of socioeducational instructors". That is still of course the main purpose of the current "Youth in Action" programme.

In November 2001, the European Commission published a White Paper entitled "A new impetus for European youth"¹, which we can see as a first attempt to define a policy towards young people at the EU level, going beyond the promotion of exchanges. The White Paper laid out four priorities, which could be summarised as follows:

- introducing new ways of encouraging young people to participate in public life;
- improving the information available to young people on European issues (via websites etc);
- encouraging volunteering;
- improving the knowledge available from the research community on youth issues.

Under the first priority, the White Paper naturally emphasized the "participation" problem as far as Youth EU policy is concerned, as well a general issue in society. In other words, it was specifically concerned to address the issue of how to involve youth in preparing policies and
making decisions in the EU context. It stressed, for example, the need to make the European Youth Forum (YFJ) - the main Brussels-based "umbrella" organization of national youth councils and non-governmental organizations - more representative, in the sense that it should also speak in the name of young people who do not participate in such structures.

The White Paper heralded the introduction of the "open method of coordination" (OMC) for Youth Policy in the following year (2002). The OMC - which involves the setting of common objectives at the EU level and leaving implementation up to Member States - was the mechanism chosen to tackle the four priorities already laid out in the White Paper.

The European Youth Pact, dating from March 2005, represents an attempt to integrate some specific youth concerns into the wider "Lisbon Strategy", including the two OMCs on Education & Training and Social Inclusion respectively. Those concerns are located in the following fields: (1) employment, integration social advancement; (2) education, training and mobility and (3) reconciliation of family life and working life. For example, the "Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs" for the 2005-8 period called on Member States to "build employment pathways for young people and reduce youth unemployment" (Guideline n°182).

The European Commission has also called for youth concerns to be taken into consideration in other policies, known as "mainstreaming". These other policies are: (1) the fight against racism, xenophobia and other forms of discrimination and (2) health and well-being.

The history of EU Youth Policy has therefore resulted in a legacy where various instruments co-exist. In overall terms, it should be stressed that national, regional and local governments are still the main protagonists in making policy.

In terms of the Treaty, in addition to article 149, one should mention that article 150 lays down that the Community should "facilitate access to vocational training and encourage mobility of instructors and trainees and particularly young people".

The different strands of EU Youth Policy are therefore the OMC, the European Youth Pact and Mainstreaming. The Youth in Action Programme supports the policy. It contributes, on the one hand, to the Lisbon Strategy (with a special focus on non formal learning) and, on the other, to fostering a sense of citizenship (including European citizenship) among young people.

Those two areas are not of course mutually exclusive. A volunteer spending some time abroad under the European Voluntary Service (EVS) - which is part of Youth in Action - may well simultaneously improve his or her professional skills whilst deepening a commitment to civic participation, for example.

It is worth looking at these different strands in terms of the results they have achieved, particularly in the area of participation, which we will do in the next section.

Before that, it is important to mention that under the Lisbon Treaty, the EU would acquire a specific competence to encourage "the participation of young people in democratic life in Europe".

---

4. These words would be inserted in article 149 of the current treaty.
Finally, one must recognise that the definition of "EU Youth Policy" used here is fairly strict one, for practical reasons. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the effects of the sub-programmes under the current Lifelong Learning Programme, notably Comenius, Erasmus and Leonardo, have in the past and will continue in the future to contribute enormously to Youth Policy. One has to recognise that these sub-programmes are overwhelmingly targeted at younger people.
2. CURRENT SITUATION OF EU YOUTH POLICY AND PARTICIPATION

2.1. The Youth Programmes

The Youth in Action Programme, with a budget of 885 million EUR for the 2007-2013 period, aims, as already stated, to contribute to a sentiment of European citizenship by providing opportunities for young people to go abroad and benefit from a non-formal learning experience. In addition, around 20% of its funding is earmarked for training youth workers. The programme implicitly places special emphasis on the participation of young people with fewer opportunities\(^5\) and is targeted at those aged between 15 and 28 (in certain cases 13-30), as well as at youth workers.

It is organised in five actions. For the purposes of this note, the following are particularly noteworthy:

- Action 1, called "Youth for Europe", which is explicitly about encouraging "active citizenship", through youth democracy projects for example.
- Action 2, which finances the EVS.
- Action 5.1, which contributes to financing meetings of young people and those responsible for youth policy, thus contributing to the youth "Structured Dialogue" (see below).

2.1.1. Impact

General Considerations

In 2008 the programme as a whole mobilised around 110,000 young people, whilst its EVS component accounted for about 5,000 volunteers\(^6\). Between 1996 and 2006, about 30,000 volunteers took part in the EVS\(^7\).

According to a senior Commission official, in 2006, the EU directly contributed to the mobility of about 500,000 people through its various programmes\(^8\). Of these, about two-thirds were young people, including 160,000 participants in the Erasmus Programme. The Youth in Action programme therefore has an impact on a comparable scale to its more famous equivalent for higher education\(^9\).

Given that the programme attaches specific importance to encouraging participants from less privileged backgrounds - where in most countries political support for the EU is lower - its qualitative effects in terms of encouraging a sense of participation in and affection for the Union may be important. For all mobility programmes, the number of overall participants is

---

5 Interview with Mr Pascal Lejeune, Head of Unit for the “Youth in Action” Programme, January 15th 2009.
6 Ibid.
7 This figure comes from (COM(2007)498).
9 Over 20 years the successive programmes have directly benefited more than 1.5 million young people or youth workers. See European Commission, "EU Youth Policies: Frequently Asked Questions".
not the only important measure of their importance, since they can be expected to have "knock-on" effects among family and friends of participants. Still, if one considers that there are roughly 75 million people aged between 15 and 25 in the EU today, only a small minority of young people are directly "mobile" due to Community interventions.

**Participation**

In 2007, 29% of the programme's funding was spent on encouraging active citizenship under Action 1. In the same year, the new sub-action 1.3, aimed at encouraging youth democracy projects was launched. It supported about 54 projects with funds of 1.2 million EUR. Preliminary information indicates that the number of projects supported rose to about 100 in 2008\(^{10}\).

An example of the type of project supported is 'Am I a European?', a documentary put together by two groups of migrant youth in Amsterdam and Antwerp. The film provides insights on the experiences of young people and their families from a variety of ethnic backgrounds who are in the process of trying to obtain EU citizenship. Another project aims to organize debates about the development of the Ombudsman as an institution and pave the way for the creation of positions of 'Young Ombudsman'. The participating countries in the 'Young Ombudsman' project are Bulgaria and Italy\(^{11}\).

**Volunteering**

In terms of encouraging volunteer work explicitly, the EVS numbers are small. It mobilises in any given year volunteers in their hundreds, rather than thousands, in each Member State. In addition, a former President of YFJ, Bettina Schwarzmayr, stresses that many Member States have chosen to rely exclusively on the EVS (and Youth in Action) "as a national programme", rather than trying to develop their own international volunteering schemes\(^{12}\). The resulting situation is therefore a little ambivalent: without the EVS, in some countries young people would have very few international volunteering opportunities. On the other hand, the existence of the EVS allows such countries to "disinvest" in their own schemes.

One should mention in this context that it is increasingly recognised that one way of increasing the flux of EU volunteers is by opening up national schemes to other third-country EU citizens, as is suggested in the recently approved Council Recommendation on cross-border mobility of young volunteers\(^{13}\). This is the first ever recommendation issued at EU level in the youth field. There is as yet little evidence that concrete steps are being taken to open up national schemes, but the European Commission will contribute to such efforts by creating a 'European Youth Volunteer Portal'. The Czech EU Presidency of the Union organised a conference in mid March 2009 to specifically consider how volunteering (and mobility in general) can be further encouraged at the EU level.

Given that the budget of the EVS/Youth in Action are cannot be significantly increased up to 2013, increasing exchanges between national schemes would seem a promising way of boosting mobility.

---

\(^{10}\) The source of this data is DG Education and Culture of the European Commission.

\(^{11}\) Ibid.


2.2. The Open Method of Coordination (OMC)

It is no easy task to evaluate the results of the OMC for youth. It can be argued that the existence of the OMC is in itself a good thing: in the absence of a fully-fledged Community competence over youth, it allows Member-States to cooperate in a regular manner on the four priority issues identified in the 2001 White Paper. It therefore provides an appropriate mechanism for ensuring continuity in EU Youth Policy, which would otherwise be lacking. The creation of the OMC has fuelled more consultation in some countries between public authorities and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) than existed before. It has of course resulted in much more debate on the EU’s Youth Policy between politicians, civil servants, academics and civil society. It has also inspired youth-related legislation or strategies at national level.

The available literature does however point out some deficiencies of the OMC which need to be remedied in the immediate future. There seems to be a degree of consensus on the nature of these deficiencies, if not on the solutions. Leaving aside the issue of participation (dealt with in more detail below), they can be summarized as follows:

- the objectives of the OMC are not precise enough. In particular quantified targets are missing. This makes evaluating its progress and comparing individual country outcomes extremely difficult;

- the transparency of the whole process should be improved, an issue which cannot in reality be dissociated from the “participation debate”.

Many voices have criticised the OMC for lack of transparency. An analysis presented in late 2006 underlined that national reports where Member States are supposed to provide information on their implementation of common objectives were not made public. This is a decision of the Member States, whose reports these are. Since then, the situation does not seem to have changed. The same author argues, with a degree of common sense, that a public debate cannot emerge if key documentation is kept out of the public arena. It is also not helpful in stimulating the exchange of good ideas and innovative projects between countries.

Similarly, the institutional set up (“governance”) of the OMC does not foment learning between countries. The lack of indicators, for example, makes evaluating progress difficult. Such criticisms are also voiced by the YFJ, which argues that the OMC requires fewer objectives and that these need to be defined more clearly. Such steps would lay the foundations for effective monitoring.

In the same policy paper, the YFJ also calls for greater policy coordination in the Commission and for more involvement by the European Parliament. The former could be achieved by creating a group of commissioners with responsibilities for youth policies or a body entrusted with coordination directly responsible to the Commission President. The latter would require a

---


new type of institutional cooperation between Parliament and youth representatives, going beyond what has been achieved in the context of the European Youth Weeks.

2.3. The European Youth Pact

The Youth Pact is a declaration of EU objectives, not an instrument to transform these into reality. As such, its impact cannot be evaluated. One can say that it has generally contributed to raising the profile of youth issues in the "Lisbon Strategy", and that the Commission and the Member States assess its implementation on a regular basis.

Unfortunately the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy, in which the EU Institutions only play a supporting role, does not seem to have yielded many results in terms of improving the social and economic situation of young people. This statement is of course too broad and the reality differs sharply from one Member-State to another.

High youth unemployment, relative to that of the general population, has been a feature of the EU economy for many years now. Economists consider that it is, to some extent, a natural phenomenon, reflecting the difficulties young people encounter in making the changeover from the world of education to the world of work. However, in 2008 unemployment for the under-25s in the EU-27 averaged 15.5%; for 24-74 year olds it was 5.9%, a striking difference.

In terms of measurable poverty, the contrast is less pronounced. In 2007 the at-risk-of-poverty rate in the EU-27 for 16-24 age group was 20%, higher than that for 25-74 year olds, for which it was 14%. Such data indicate that the often heard observation that "life is getting harder" for young people is based on fact. Academic experts also agree that in some countries, particularly in Southern Europe, the labour market is "dualist", meaning that it provides considerable job security to some (normally older) workers and far less to younger ones, particularly if they have low qualifications. The Commission's "Flexisecurity" principles provide an alternative approach to dealing with such problems.

This difficult social reality, notably among young people with few qualifications, has implications for their participation in society, whether at the local, national or EU level.

The YFJ did actually lobby in favour of having specific targets in the Youth Pact in the socio-economic sphere, but the idea was not taken up. They proposed, for instance, an objective of reducing early school leaving by 50% in the 2006-10 period. Similarly, they supported a specific target for reducing youth unemployment, from 18% to 9% in 2006-2010 period.

On a more positive note, there is evidence that the EU is making gradual progress in reducing early school leaving. The total share of the population having at least completed a secondary education in the EU-27 increased from 65% in 2000 to 70.8% in 2007.

2.4. Participation and "Structured Dialogue"

In this section we will look at participation of young people in the preparation and implementation of EU Youth Policy. The "participation debate" is of course a much wider one (see below), but what happens at the EU level, for example in the OMC, is a good starting point for the analysis.

---

17 The data are taken from Eurostat's Labour Force Survey.
18 Source: Eurostat's Education and training - LFS adjusted series.
The European Parliament, in a Written Declaration adopted in July 2008, has called on the Commission to consider, when preparing legislative proposals, what the impact on youth could be and to take into account the results of the structured dialogue with youth organisations\(^\text{19}\). In other words, young people should be consulted on the design of policies from the very beginning.

In the context of the OMC observers identify two major problems in terms of consultation. On the one hand, it is up to Member States to consult youth councils, NGOs and other interested parties nationally. In some countries, little effort is made to consult local or regional NGOs on the issues debated in the OMC. The European Commission is not responsible for organizing these. Nevertheless, some argue that it should issue guidelines on how consultations should be carried out, so that Member States are encouraged to follow similar practices.

Secondly, at the "Brussels level", the YFJ considers that the European Youth Pact does not contain any real participatory structures and that for the OMC these are not sufficiently institutionalized.

The Commission considers, for its part, that it has put in place over the years a "structured dialogue" with youth organizations, including helping to create the YFJ, organizing the well-known "European Youth Week" (every 18 months) and, in particular, foreseeing regular meetings between the YFJ, the commissioner responsible for youth and national politicians on the margins of the Education, Youth and Culture (EYC) Council meetings. In addition, every semester each Presidency organizes a youth event.

The objective of the European Youth Week, for the activities organized in Brussels, is to allow young people from all over the EU meet and to draw up written conclusions on structured dialogue and youth policy generally, which then are then discussed with the EU institutions. Youth in Action provides financial support for these activities at the national level (under Action 5.1 "Meetings of young people and those responsible for youth policy"). Such debates were held in the majority of the 31 participating countries in the 2008 European Youth Week.

It is therefore apparent that the Commission has made considerable efforts to create regular habits of consultation of youth fora in recent years, in particular with the YFJ. Nevertheless, a higher degree of formalisation of this process could be envisaged. The governance structures for consulting youth organizations, at all stages in policymaking, could be improved by making the process more visible and the rules clearer.

At the EP hearing held on February 17th 2009, Pieter Lietaer of the Flemish Youth Council stated that it was still unclear what exactly structured dialogue meant. To some it indicated the relationship between the EU Institutions and the YFJ, to others the Youth Week. He also stressed that dialogue was only truly useful when it took place between young people and decision makers at the same time, rather than just among young people left alone to put forward proposals. In that spirit, he urged decision makers to openly disagree with and challenge young people's ideas when discussing policies.

On the same occasion, Mrs Jilian Van Turnhout, a Member of the European Economic and Social Committee, underlined that the bringing people together for large-scale events cannot be regarded, per se, as "participation" and that young people should discuss policies prior to their adoption.

\(^{19}\) See the Written Declaration 'on devoting more attention to youth empowerment in EU policies'.
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2.4.1. **Representativeness of Youth Organizations**

A question which cannot be avoided is how to ensure that organizations or individuals speaking "in the name of youth" at EU level (or any other) are really representative. The Commission is careful to emphasize that the "structured dialogue" should include persons who are not affiliated in youth structures and has therefore encouraged the YFJ to establish contacts with young people as individuals.

One study\(^{20}\) points out that youth councils in particular only represent a minority of young people. Secondly, even the minority they represent is unlikely to be typical of the general population. Thirdly, the motivation for young people in joining such organizations has changed over the years, in the sense that it has become more pragmatic.

According to the same study, that has led to the creation of alternative forms of youth participation, for example in the form of "youth parliaments". Such forms have not replaced youth councils though.

2.5. **Mainstreaming**

Some initiatives have occurred in the two domains singled out for the "mainstreaming" of EU Youth Policy. In terms of the fight against racism, xenophobia and other forms of discrimination, the Commission supported, for instance, the "All Different-All Equal" campaign organized by the Council of Europe. Under Youth in Action, the Commission has organized activities such as diversity training for youth workers. It has placed intercultural learning and the promotion of human rights in the programme’s objectives.

In the health field, relevant initiatives include the Council Resolution on the health of young people adopted in November 2008\(^{21}\) and a conference on youth health which will take place on 9-10 July 2009.

---


3. PARTICIPATION

3.1. A Clouded Debate

There is a consensus in academic writing that young people’s political participation is in decline, especially in terms of “traditional” engagement, meaning voting in elections or joining a political party for instance. There also seems to be a decline in “civic” engagement, involving activities such as voluntary work.

But academics and other observers do not always agree on the nature and extent of the problem. Some emphasize that there has been a decline in traditional political participation in all age groups and there is nothing out of the ordinary happening with younger people. Their participation, especially in "traditional" politics, has simply declined alongside the rest of society’s. Exponents of this view stress, in addition, that young people are more likely to be attracted to newer forms of political participation, for example joining single-issue groups or signing an online petition for example. They are less likely to join permanent structures than their older counterparts.

Other participants in the debate are more pessimistic; believing that today’s young people are generally less interested in politics than previous generations and perhaps also less participative in civic terms. It is beyond the scope of this note to evaluate which of these schools of thought is closer to the truth. In any case, the crucial issue here is to examine what the EU can do about participation, in cooperation with national, regional and local authorities.

3.2. Trends in Participation

The previously mentioned IARD study concluded in 2001 that membership of youth associations had been stagnating or in decline over the previous decade in those EU countries where they have historically been strongest, usually north of the Alps. It mentioned Belgium, the UK and Denmark as examples of countries where a decline had taken place. It came to the same conclusion about participation in voluntary work, seen as being in decline in northern Europe.

Flash Eurobarometer 202 on "Young Europeans", which polled young people aged between 15 and 30 in 2007, confirmed that there are enormous differences in the EU with regard to participation in organizations or associations. Whilst for the EU-27 about 22% of respondents were members of an organization or association, this figure hides an enormous heterogeneity of situations. In countries such as Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Austria the figure was above 40%. In all four “Southern” countries it varied between 10 and 15%. The average for the 12 “new” Member States was 10%, with Bulgaria and Romania coming last with 7%.

In terms of type of organization adhered to, sports club were by far the most popular, accounting for 49% of responses. These were followed by youth organizations and cultural or

---

22 Ellen Quintelier, "Differences in Political Participation between Young and Old People", Contemporary Politics vol. 13 (2007).
24 Meaning Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain.
artistic associations (8%); trade unions and hobby/special interest clubs (7%) and political parties (5%).

About 16% of respondents declared that they carried out voluntary work in the EU-27. That average hides considerable intra-EU variations which are similar to those for the question on membership of associations. Young people are much more likely to be volunteers in northern Europe than in the "Southern countries"; whilst in the “new” Member States the picture is mixed, with both very high and very low incidence of voluntary work.

Respondents, when asked about their preferred course of action to ensure that their voice is heard by the policy makers, answered the following:

**Figure 1: Preferred type of political participation of young people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of participation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To participate in debates with policy makers</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To join a political party</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take part in a demonstration</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sign a petition</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a member or support an NGO</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To join a trade union</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no answer</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Flash Eurobarometer 202

**3.3. Determinants of Participation**

A major study which investigated political participation amongst young people in eight Member-States concluded that three factors have a major impact on their behaviour:

- the influence of school and the education system
- the influence of parents and friends
- the influence of the mass media

The study emphasized that participatory young people tend to made so by their school activities. This is perhaps therefore an area where EU Youth Policy should focus more clearly on, in terms of supporting efforts of "citizenship education".

Some observers believe that “lifecycle effects” are having a negative impact on youth participation in politics and civic life. Problems already referred to, such as a difficult transition from education to work and youth unemployment may have effects on participation. The fact that voter turnout increases with age is traditionally explained by the fact that as people become more settled in professional and family life they feel that they have a greater “stake” in society and become more inclined to go out and vote or even undertake voluntary work.

3.4. Tentative Conclusions

There seems to be a need for creating more solid and permanent structures at the EU level on which to base a "structured dialogue" with young people on Youth Policy and other Community policies that affect them. The European Parliament, in particular, would benefit from such structures, as it has no formal role to play in the OMC and can only currently influence policy via its co-decision powers for approving EU youth programmes.

As indicated above, the OMC for Youth needs to be made more transparent and active in involving grassroots organizations in the Member States. It would also benefit from clearer objectives and an attempt to measure its results. One must recognise, however, that the situation in terms of youth participation varies enormously in the EU, as indicated by the Eurobarometer survey, meaning that governments are dealing with very different realities. It is also difficult to get young people interested in the EU, because it is perceived as being a very technical affair.26

There are few signs of improvements in the socio-economic situation of young people vis-à-vis older ones, in particular in terms of unemployment and labour market "security" (precarious as opposed to permanent job contracts). Young people continue to "establish themselves" later in terms of professional and private life, which does not encourage participation.

Since research and opinion polls demonstrate that young people are increasingly inclined to prefer "ad hoc" forms of political participation to associations and other permanent structures, the EU Institutions need to further integrate alternative forms of consultation and participation, going beyond organizations such as the European Youth Forum. They could further promote "open" consultations, where young people are consulted on specific issues as one one-off exercise, perhaps even considering supporting directly-elected temporary bodies. E-democracy could be promoted to reach out to 'non-organised' young people.

In formal and informal education, the EU could take a closer look at the possibilities of promoting "peer education" on citizenship in general and EU Youth Policy in particular. This means that young people themselves (for example former participants in Youth in Action and others active in youth organisations) should be encouraged to play a part in school classes. Many argue that young people are more prepared to learn from people of their own age group than from teachers. One academic suggests, for instance, that the "peer group" method should be tried in the context of raising participation in this year's European elections.27 In any case, school seems to the natural place to start encouraging young people to take an active interest in political and civic life. Schools could do so not necessarily by

26 A point emphasized by Pieter Lietaer at the February 2009 public hearing.
adding new subjects to curricula but by fomenting participatory activities, including outside the classroom. Being an active citizen, most of the time, involves getting involved in highly local (not international) activities. The EU should nevertheless aim to harness part of this local activism in the preparation and implementation of its Youth Policy.

Finally, in terms of fostering international mobility and a sense of "European citizenship" the Union plays an important role, notably under Youth in Action and other programmes. Given the small size of the EU budget, the only conceivable way of increasing pan-EU contacts, notably for volunteering, is by opening up national and regional schemes to transnational forms of participation.
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