



## Contents

Contents .....	2
Introduction .....	3
Thematic focus in the EU- Council of Europe youth partnership work plan .....	7
How to communicate youth research better? .....	11
New ways of working on themes and regional focus – bridging EKCYP and PEYR.....	12
Youth research essentials.....	12
Appendix 1. Programme.....	14
Appendix 2. List of participants.....	15

## Introduction

The joint EKCYP-PEYR meeting was organised on 20 September 2017 in the European Youth Centre Budapest.

The meeting was an opportunity to create synergies between the two groups, discuss thematic developments in relation to the activities of the EU-Council of Europe youth partnership, and explore future proposals.

The meeting included inputs, working groups and an open plenary discussion to which both PEYR and EKCYP members contributed.

The meeting was an opportunity for PEYR and EKCYP members to understand their roles and possible links in more depth. Through the testimonials of PEYR and EKCYP members, the importance of making links between policy, research and practice was reaffirmed. The idea of a community of practice was also valued by speakers.

During the thematic working groups, participants explored the work of the EU- Council of Europe youth partnership, as well as some of the relevant themes for the research agenda, as follows:

- [A research agenda on youth](#);
- [Europe Goes Local](#);
- [Mapping educational paths of youth workers](#) and building knowledge on youth work;
- The [role of youth work in combating radicalisation leading to violence](#);
- Youth work with young refugees, including the [workshops on the role of youth work with young refugees](#);
- [Handbook on Quality in Learning Mobility](#);
- Youth Policy: [youth policy seminar](#) and [open online course on youth policy](#);
- Participation, citizenship.

Participants discussed the thematic and regional focus of the work and how to communicate research better.

Finally, participants provided input to the proposals of creating a “youth research essentials” paper, to complement the paper published in 2017 “Youth policy essentials”, an introductory paper to youth policy.

## Opening

Marta Medlinska, co-ordinator of the EU- Council of Europe youth partnership, opened the meeting and welcomed its participants.

She presented the recent developments in the work of the two partner institutions in the field of youth, stressing the relevance of the contributions of the European Knowledge Centre on Youth Policy and the Pool of European Youth Researchers and the importance of knowledge-based youth policy and youth work development.

Ms Medlinska then talked about the work programme of the EU-Council of Europe youth partnership in 2017 and ideas for 2018. She illustrated how youth policy and youth work related activities included therein have gained from research, and vice versa.

She wished all participants a successful day and fruitful discussions.

## Synergies and interaction between PEYR and EKCYP

Three speakers presented their experience and understanding of the respective mandates of PEYR and EKCYP.

**Ozgehan Senyuva** shared his experience in PEYR.

PEYR represents more than just a meeting together once in a year, but there are different working groups and practices. There are three things about PEYR that I would like to underline in my intervention. These are: the composition of PEYR, the internal dynamic of PEYR and the institutional structure of it.

The PEYR composition over the years: it evolves more towards youth work and youth-oriented researchers. Since its inception, PEYR always included highly respected and well-published researchers. But over the years from researchers focusing on youth as one of their subjects of research, it moved towards youth as their/the subject of research, from almost the beginning of their career. So, there is now more focus on youth work and youth research as such among the members of PEYR. I am also glad to see researchers who actually have experience in youth work in their careers as well. The current PEYR members include several researchers who come from youth work practice.

The internal dynamic is friendly and informal. PEYR gave many of us a place to go, for partners, ideas and articles on specific topics. If necessary, I can send an email to the other PEYR members. It always gave a chance to have a place to go and benefit from the resources present in PEYR.

The institutional structure is another aspect. PEYR offers a place to go for other stakeholders in youth work. I believe that, over the years, PEYR has contributed significantly to researcher-practitioner-policy maker dialogue. Especially to the practice-research dialogue, which may be considered the weakest link within the triangle. It offers a place to “go” and ask for evidence or further questions for the youth workers and get feedback on the work they perform. PEYR over the years, thanks to the institutional structure, strengthened this dialogue.

PEYR gave a voice to researchers as well. We changed the view people have on researchers, as a closed community putting youth under the magnifying glass, and we had a chance of representation in other projects and initiatives. For example, in the EPLM – European Platform on Learning Mobility, PEYR is in the steering group, and a part of the last meeting was to link

practitioners and researchers. I am also very glad that now PEYR is also present in the Advisory Council on Youth and will be able to contribute to a wider debate.

I believe that PEYR is constantly evolving for the positive. We have publications, call for joint applications and more possibilities for exchange of ideas and co-operation in an equal manner. I like this equality, I can be a resource person, but I can also use other people's resources and benefit from their ideas. PEYR, in my opinion, is a moving target and it is what we make out of it. So far, we have done rather well.

**Anna Ostriкова**, EKCYP correspondent from Ukraine, shared her experience in EKCYP.

I was nominated by the Ministry to be the EKCYP correspondent two years ago. I did not have any special expectations at the beginning; there is a process of collecting and providing data from the national level to the EU-CoE youth partnership. I did not have a clear understanding what to do with this data and for whom it can be useful. But in the process of communication with other correspondents and the EU-CoE youth partnership team, I found many useful things that I did not expect.

The process of organising the work was to provide, once a year, a country sheet and a thematic questionnaire, and collecting information. For me, it is easy thanks to my position, in the Institute, which is a scientific centre under the Ministry. We have a good co-operation with the CDEJ member of Ukraine. Once a year, we collect data from the regions and different institutions and I can use the data for EKCYP.

For me, the main challenge is how to clearly explain what is going on in Ukraine in the country sheet, as we have a lot of state programmes, without any resources based on evidence. It is difficult to explain that we have a lot of directions, but have no strategy.

One more important task is to share information with researchers at the national level from the EU-Council of Europe youth partnership. The database of EKCYP is very useful for other researchers in my country. My colleagues from universities use EKCYP data as an information resource for students studying youth policy. Based on country sheets, they can study foreign experiences and learn how to make a comparative analysis of different youth policies. I know students who read all the EKCYP country sheets. It is just one example why it is important to share information about EKCYP on the national level.

Also, it is important to share information and invite people from the regional agencies, as they have interesting information and experiences, but they do not always have the opportunity to share this at international level.

We should make our work more visible and understandable for the people in Ministries, other researchers and users for whom our analytical papers can be useful, not only in the EU-Council of Europe youth partnership. This is a big challenge and an area for development at the same time.

**Adina Marina Serban** from Romania shared her experiences, having been involved in both roles.

My first participation in a Council of Europe event was at the Forum on human rights of the Council of Europe, in 2009. Earlier that year, I was a trainee at the European Youth Foundation, a participant in a training of trainers in the youth field (TALE – Trainers for Active Learning in Europe), then a participant in a training in Turkey. Starting in 2011, I was part of the Advisory Council and I had the

opportunity to meet Manfred Zentner and to get to know more about PEYR and about the importance of the permanent dialogue between policy and research.

Thinking of the projects I worked on, it was great to co-operate with researchers and correspondents. For example, I reviewed the glossary on the website of the EU-Council of Europe youth partnership, and I was involved in the symposium on (Un)Equal Europe. I contributed to the review of the country sheets. I also worked on the T-kit on social inclusion and always went back to youth work practice.

What this experience offered was learning and exchange of practice. Coming from a country where there is not much happening in youth research, I have found here resources on the website and people I can rely on. This still offers me as a researcher and practitioner the chance to evolve and move on in the field. Thank you very much!

## Thematic focus in the EU- Council of Europe youth partnership work plan

After a brief presentation on the following topics, participants split into different groups on ECKYP and PEYR involvement:

1. A research agenda on youth;
2. Europe Goes Local;
3. Mapping educational paths of youth workers and building knowledge on youth work;
4. The role of youth work in combating violent radicalisation of young people;
5. Youth work with young refugees;
6. Handbook on Quality in Learning Mobility;
7. Youth Policy: seminar and MOOC;
8. Participation and citizenship.

What follows is a synthesis of the main discussions in these groups.

### **1. A research agenda on youth (resource person: Ewa Krzaklewska)**

Ewa Krzaklewska presented the report "[Future agenda for youth research – exploring young people's lives for development of youth policy and youth work](#)", which she authored. This is a result of the 2016 joint meeting of PEYR and ECKYP. The group discussed whether the areas mentioned as critical in the previous year's report are still relevant and identified emerging research areas that need more focus today.

The first area that was mentioned was a study of the consequences of Brexit, for the UK but also for other countries which could feel the impact, for example Ireland or Poland. This theme is to be studied from the perspective of each single country, but also it relates to the general discussion on European identity. It was noticed that the issue of European identity has not recently received much attention, and that possibly it should come back to the debate.

Second, it was noticed that the gender perspective is not represented – this perspective is necessary as men and women transition to adulthood in different ways and they face different social expectations. This perspective is necessary in diverse areas mentioned in the report, for example refugees, youth work, transition to adulthood. Another area for research is young women and their relation to feminism.

Other areas that need attention were:

- young people/marginalised youth and their use of social and public services
- employment, especially creative employment, in relation to leisure time and its links to professional career
- young families
- mental health of young people.

### **2. European goes local (resource person: Dunja Potocnik)**

The project involves 24 National Agencies of the Erasmus + programme, and aims to create guidelines for youth-friendly and effective local youth work. Within the project, challenges to local youth work were identified, such as creating an enabling context, reaching out to marginalised youth groups, and efforts to transfer policies to the municipal level.

There were three main messages resonating in the group:

1. Owing to outgoing migration, many areas, especially those in need of human resources, are losing young people. Municipalities need policies that can create beneficial conditions for young people.
  2. Young people need to sense that they are subjects, not only the objects of youth policy. The prolongation of their status as “objects” will push them even further on the margins.
  3. Youth work practitioners and researchers from countries that are not taking part of the “Europe goes local” project would like to get engaged and they were advised to get in touch with Judit Balogh, the project co-ordinator.
- 3. Mapping educational paths of youth workers and building knowledge on youth work (resource persons: Tanya Basarab)**

These are core projects of EKCYP, involving also PEYR.

David Cairns and Jim O'Donovan presented the preliminary results and led a discussion about the mapping process. The mapping looks at various aspects from legal status, definitions, competences relating to youth work, professionalisation and quality standards where they exist related to education, training and work/career pathways open to youth workers in different countries.

Discussions focused on the challenges identified through gathering data; some of it was not available and other information was collected from different sources, so EKCYP correspondents were not always sure that what they presented reflects fully the situation in their countries. The researchers already suggested in their presentation that a caveat should be applied to the information in the report because of such challenges.

Many challenges expressed by the correspondents relate to the lack of a clear definition of the practice of youth work and especially the lack of measurement of all the voluntary youth work activities. In most countries, educational opportunities seem to be non-formal; however, there is limited input from youth organisations – possibly due to the timing of the questionnaires. The main contributing group for this knowledge-gathering exercise was the EKCYP network. However, other groups were invited to contribute, including the Advisory Council on Youth, members of the European Youth Forum and participants in the Council of Europe Youth Work Portfolio revision process, Salto Training and Co-operation stakeholders, etc.

The question of viable career opportunities for youth workers is answered only partly and it does indicate the need to look at the question from the other end: survey youth workers on their education and career background. This could be one idea for future research, once all the findings are put together.

Finally, a positive impact is that some countries are already taking the exercise as guidance for setting in place better research and data collection systems on youth work.

**4. Youth work against violent radicalisation discussion group (resource person: Lana Pasic)**

Lana Pasic introduced the research that Miguel Lopez and she carried out in 2017, which includes definitions of radicalisation leading to violence, the forms of radicalisation and its influencing factors and steps, as well as challenges and needs of youth work in dealing with this topic.

The group discussed the problem with defining violence and radicalisation, as well as the ethno-centric use of the term “radicalisation” and labelling of certain groups.

A question discussed was also whether and how we can use certain cultural scripts and new technologies when dealing with the topic and identifying possible cases of violent radicalisation



among youth. The example from the school shooting in Finland was used, and an attempt to help identify/profile certain young people prone to radicalisation based on their online profiles.

Participants affirmed that it is important that youth workers tackled directly certain topics, such as racism.

The group raised the issue of "lone wolves" and how we can identify and approach these individuals through youth work.

The importance of including a gender perspective when discussing the topic of violent radicalisation and of including different community actors was also reaffirmed.

Participants recommended the research from the University of Utrecht (De Meyers) and the EXIT project in different countries (Germany, Norway, Finland) as possible further references and examples of what can be done. Examples of projects and youth work in Serbia's Sandzak region were highlighted, with teachers being an important element in prevention of violent radicalisation of youth, as well as the work of youth centres in Vienna, Austria doing the study on the contribution of youth work to preventing youth radicalisation (and rating the value and quality of youth work provided by the centres) and an example from Sweden of the Youth Agency preparing trainings and training kits on work against violence.

#### **5. Youth work with young refugees (resource person: Mara Georgescu)**

An introduction was given relating to the three main processes carried out on this topic in 2017:

- a youth knowledge book is under development on youth work and young refugees where the main question was the lack of response by policy makers to make contributions to the knowledge book;
- a policy paper relating to the transition of young refugees at 18;
- two workshops, looking at the practice of youth work with young refugees, and a collection of good practice examples.

The main question raised was how much the work with young refugees concerns youth policy and the youth field in general. It seems that NGOs and youth workers are working with young refugees, and for them this is just another target group, while policy makers seem in some countries hesitant to include young refugees within the scope of youth policy. Relating to this, it would be useful to explore how to create stronger links between youth work and youth policy when it comes to young refugees.

An expert group was set up by the European Commission on youth work with young refugees.

#### **6. Handbook on Quality in Learning Mobility (resource person: Soren Kristensen)**

In tandem with the increased opportunities for more young people to engage in transnational learning activities – not least caused by the enlarged budgets of the EU programmes in the field of education, training and youth – questions of quality come to the fore. The important thing is not that a rising number of young people go abroad, but what they bring back in terms of learning that can be used in the context of both their civic and working life.

Under the aegis of the European Platform for Learning Mobility (EPLM) work is currently being carried out to establish a detailed and hands-on framework for quality in projects of learning

mobility carried out in a non-formal context. The work has a focus primarily on physical mobility, and the planned outcome will consist of three parts:

- a set of principles or criteria that clearly identify the concept of quality in learning mobility for young people;
- a set of indicators, elaborated on the basis of the quality criteria, that offers project organisers a checklist to use in the planning and implementation of concrete mobility projects;
- a handbook with definitions, explanations and sources of further information to be used in connection with the quality indicators.

At the moment, the work on the quality criteria has been finalised and the results validated through a consultation process. The 22 criteria have been published in a printed version that is also available on the website of the partnership. Also, a set of 120 indicators have been identified, and is currently being validated through consultations with relevant actors and stakeholders. The handbook is still in the planning phase, but it is hoped that the entire framework can be presented at the 2019 EPLM conference.

The group provided feedback on the content of the set of indicators and expressed appreciation for such a tool, meeting the needs of practitioners to have a simple checklist to guide them for the preparation and management of mobility projects. Participants also suggested finding a format that could be the easiest to use and promote.

## **7. Youth policy: seminar and MOOC (resource person: Davide Capecchi)**

Davide Capecchi presented the concept of the Massive Online Open Course on youth policy, which the team of the EU-Council of Europe youth partnership was developing and was to be launched at the end of October 2017; and the curriculum as well as the general format of the project on youth policy (organised on the basis of national delegations) whose first residential seminar was to start in November, in Zagreb, followed by an in-between phase and a second residential seminar, in spring 2018, in France.

The group then provided feedback on the content of the MOOC and in general on the work of the EU-CoE youth partnership in the field of youth policy.

Participants proposed:

- to use “knowledge-based” instead of “evidence-based”;
- when talking about policy cycle development, to ask specialists of policy cycles to present their experience, as a specific competence (not only *youth* policy developers) on how to influence politicians;
- to stress policy and advocacy capacities and competences development;
- to focus on monitoring and evaluation, self-assessment, how to communicate policy and needs to policy makers, how to build indicators;
- to discuss the limits of youth policy, not to be over-ambitious;
- to present youth policy as based on human rights (and on values), but then again with an eye on needs (not only ideologies and political manifestos);
- to concentrate on participatory youth policy (and, for that matter, participatory youth research);
- to present the involvement of youth councils and youth NGOs;

- to work on a redefinition of participation (expanding, for example, to cultural participation, cultural enterprises);
- to have a critical presentation of differences between the approaches of the European Commission and of the Council of Europe to youth policy;
- to consider also the standards of other organisations, such as the UN.

## **8. Participation and citizenship (resource person: Dan Moxon)**

There was discussion of the challenges created by recent narratives about traditional and non-traditional, innovative and non-innovative participation.

It was raised that, whilst much research attention has been given to the so-called “new forms” of participation, there was still a need to look at addressing issues within traditional forms of political participation – decline in voter rates, lack of trust in institutions, etc. The focus on new forms does not solve these problems.

It was noted that the term participation is now used in very different and broad ways, ranging from promoting young people’s agency, to young people influencing change. Some felt there was a need to reconceptualise what we mean by participation, but others were concerned that this may not be a productive research agenda. Instead, it was proposed that it may be more beneficial to distinguish between the different definitions of participation, so that individual research agendas can be followed more clearly within these different concepts.

This would allow more specific research questions to be addressed, such as participation of rural youth, inclusion of young people from minority backgrounds in mainstream participation approaches, or how young people want to understand and express their own agency.

At the same time, it needs to be recognised that these very broad and diverse fields can be difficult to penetrate and understand for policy makers and practitioners and the fluid way researchers talk about participation makes it difficult for newcomers to engage.

## **How to communicate youth research better?**

Participants shared their views on common mistakes when communicating research and what can be done to not make those mistakes.

Some of the mistakes in communicating research were identified as:

- not knowing the audience;
- creating too complicated and long papers which are not understandable;
- there is a difference between presenting research and presenting outcomes;
- researchers are not trained in communicating research.

Participants gave ideas on what we can do to not make those mistakes:

- to select the right way to communicate (internet, etc.);
- to elaborate different reports for different audiences;
- to get input from the users on how to best present the findings before you publish, through user group panels;
- to offer to decision makers concise and “human” language outcomes of the research and concrete recommendations on how they can deal with the outcomes and visualise outcomes;

- to develop a prognosis of developing the programme suggested in the recommendations;
- to write a summarised and accessible paper;
- to learn how to communicate as researchers;
- to find partners for communicating research;
- to involve the stakeholders and target group before, during and after the research;
- to define your audience;
- to ensure funding for communicating research;
- translate research, for example country sheets;
- to diversify presentation formats, using infographics, videos, etc.;
- to monitor the usage of the research product;
- to pay attention that in presenting research the question “so what?” is addressed, so that people feel that they need to read the research product;
- to choose relevant events and set up a strategic timeline: it is important to communicate during specific events, for example during the Youth Week;
- before the project starts, to define what the purpose is actually, and then guide communication towards that purpose;
- to include practice briefs (key messages for professionals in the field) and youth-friendly versions as versions of the research;
- if young people are involved, to provide them with feedback and inform them that the research is accessible.

## New ways of working on themes and regional focus – bridging EKCYP and PEYR

After introducing the idea of working in regions and clusters of communities of interest, participants shared their ideas. For some, this makes sense. Some were sceptical about the regional approach, as it is more interesting to compare themes with perspectives from different regions.

It was mentioned that in some regions there is already co-operation, for example in the Nordic regions, while in some other regions this could be an opportunity to start co-operation, for example in Eastern Europe and Caucasus.

Some showed an interest in focusing on the theme of the implications of Brexit.

## Youth research essentials

Similarly to the [youth policy essentials](#), the EU-Council of Europe youth partnership has a proposal to develop youth research essentials. Participants provided their ideas on this, in terms of structure, content and format.

Participants proposed to include:

- definitions of youth research;
- main topics, themes and priorities of youth research (youth transition, youth culture, youth policy, youth work, health, mobility, health, leisure, participation, identity, family, employment, rights);
- actors involved in youth research;
- information about why youth research is needed and what it is relevant for and for whom;
- information about what youth research can tell its audience;
- specific information on youth research for policy makers and for young people or youth practitioners, in addition to cross-cutting issues of interest to everyone;

- a description of the plurality of approaches and methods of youth research (programme evaluation, participatory action research, consultations, mapping exercises, longitudinal studies, national/cross-national studies) and theoretical perspectives, with a focus on the interdisciplinary character of youth research;
- description of how youth research can contribute to policy and practice;
- information about where research is stored (journals, databases);
- case study examples of where youth research was used for policy making, programme design;
- current challenges for youth research;
- additional resources and links to websites.

Participants suggested using a user-friendly format and this publication both offline (as a brochure or in a similar format to the “youth policy essentials”) and online (as a document or video).

One example of structuring research was shared: <http://www.youthresearch.fi/research>.

## Appendix 1. Programme

9:00 – 10:30	<p>Opening words from Marta Medlinska, EU- Council of Europe youth partnership</p> <p>Getting to know each other</p> <p>Synergies and interaction between PEYR and EKCYP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation of EKCYP mandate and role, followed by the presentation of the experience of one EKCYP correspondent;</li> <li>- Presentation of PEYR mandate and role, followed by the presentation of the experience of one member of PEYR;</li> <li>- EKCYP knowledge for PEYR analysis – sharing examples;</li> <li>- Discussion on synergies.</li> </ul>
<b>10:30 – 11:00</b>	<b>Break</b>
11:00 – 12:30	<p><b>Thematic focus in the EU- Council of Europe youth partnership work plan</b></p> <p>Brief presentation of topics, research projects and initiatives the EU- Council of Europe youth partnership is involved in, followed by discussion tables on ECKYP and PEYR involvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A research agenda on youth;</li> <li>- Europe Goes Local;</li> <li>- Mapping educational paths of youth workers;</li> <li>- Building knowledge on youth work;</li> <li>- The role of youth work in combating violent radicalisation of young people;</li> <li>- Youth work with young refugees;</li> <li>- Handbook on Quality in Learning Mobility;</li> <li>- Youth Policy: seminar and MOOC;</li> <li>- Participation, citizenship.</li> </ul>
<b>12:30 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
14:00 – 15:30	<p><b>Looking at the future</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Youth research essentials;</li> <li>- New way of working on themes and on regional focus – bridging EKCYP and PEYR;</li> <li>- Communicating research.</li> </ul>
15:30 – 16:00	Conclusions and closing
16:00-16:15	<b>Break</b>
	Departure of EKCYP
<b>19:00 – 21:00</b>	<b>Dinner</b>

## Appendix 2. List of participants

	First name	Last name	Country	Role
1	Sanna	Aaltonen	Finland	PEYR
2	Maria Cristina	Bacalso	Germany	PEYR
3	Ondřej	Bárta	Czech Republic	PEYR
4	Mai	Beilmann	Estonia	EKCYP
5	Orjan	Bergan	Norway	EKCYP
6	Yaryna	Borenko	Ukraine	EKCYP
7	David	Cairns	Portugal	EKCYP - PEYR
8	Marco	Chieffi	Italy	EKCYP
9	Nuala	Connolly	Ireland	PEYR
10	Aliona	Cristei	Moldova (Republic of)	PEYR
11	Valentina	Cuzzocrea	Italy	Expert
12	Ana Cristina F. T.	Da Costa Garcia	Portugal	EKCYP
13	Irina	Drexler	Romania	PEYR
14	Tiina	Ekman	Sweden	EKCYP
15	Tomislav	Gajtanoski	"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	EKCYP
16	Marina	Galstyan	Armenia	PEYR
17	Aleksandra	Gligorovic	Montenegro	EKCYP
18	David	Hayrapetyan	Armenia	EKCYP
19	Alena	Ignatovitch	Belarus	PEYR
20	Jasmin	Jasarevic	Bosnia and Herzegovina	EKCYP
21	Tomi	Kiilakoski	Finland	EKCYP
22	Susanne	Klinzing	Germany	EKCYP
23	Nenad	Koprovica	Montenegro	EKCYP
24	Marko	Kovacic	Croatia	EKCYP
25	Soren	Kristensen	Denmark	Expert
26	Ewa	Krzaklewska	Poland	PEYR
27	Susana	Lafraya	Spain	Expert
28	Sofia	Laine	Finland	PEYR
29	Zdeňka	Maskova	Czech Republic	EKCYP
30	Stefanos	Mastrotheodoros	Greece	PEYR
31	Lorise	Moreau	Belgium	EKCYP
32	Dan	Moxon	United Kingdom	PEYR
33	Magda	Nico	Portugal	PEYR
34	Lars	Norqvist	Sweden	PEYR
35	Guro	Ødegård	Norway	PEYR
36	James	O'Donovan	Int. Expert	Expert
37	Anna	Ostrikova	Ukraine	EKCYP
38	Lana	Pasic	Serbia	PEYR

39	Bojana	Perovic	Serbia	EKCYP
40	Gary	Pollock	United Kingdom	PEYR
41	Dunja	Potocnik	Croatia	PEYR
42	Sandra	Roe	Ireland	PEYR
43	Andrei	Salikau	Romania	EKCYP
44	Tulin	Sener Kilinc	Turkey	EKCYP
45	Ozgehan	Senuya	Turkey	PEYR
46	Adina Marina	Serban	Romania	PEYR
47	Adrienn	Simon	Hungary	EKCYP
48	Beáta	Šimurdová	Slovak Republic	EKCYP
49	Dragan	Stanojevic	Serbia	PEYR
50	Konstantinos	Stergiou	Greece	PEYR
51	Szilvia	Szombathelyi	Hungary	EKCYP
52	Marti	Taru	Estonia	PEYR
53	Smiljka	Tomanovic	Serbia	Expert
54	Irena	Topalli	Albania	EKCYP
55	Nino	Tsereteli	Georgia	EKCYP
56	Mariana	Turcan	Moldova (Republic of)	EKCYP
57	Amalia	Voskanyan	Armenia	EKCYP
58	Laden	Yurttagüler Akkuş	Turkey	PEYR
59	Manfred	Zentner	Austria	EKCYP - PEYR

*Team of the EU- Council of Europe Youth Partnership*

- Marta Medlinska, Co-ordinator
- Tanya Basarab, Research and Youth Policy Officer
- Mara Georgescu, Youth Work and Policy Officer
- Mojca Kodela-Lesemann, Research and Youth Policy Assistant
- Davide Capecci, Research and Youth Policy Officer