

Recommendations for improving and further developing the Structured Dialogue process

The National Youth Councils¹ evaluated the second cycle of the structured dialogue in the context of the seminar organised by Cyprus Youth Council on 4-9 October in Limassol. The outcome of the evaluation seminar is a set of recommendations formulated by National Youth Councils for the improvement and further development of the structured dialogue process.

The National Youth Councils assessed the progress of the structured dialogue process on the basis of the outcomes of the youth delegate session of the Cyprus EU Youth Conference (Annex) and the results of the European Youth Week 2011. ***The National Youth Councils agreed upon the following successes and setbacks of the structured dialogue process during this second work cycle:***

Successes:

- Structured dialogue has motivated the National Youth Councils to search for new methodologies and more diverse partners in their work;
- Increased proportion of youth delegates at EU Youth Conferences were involved in the national dialogue process hence were better prepared;
- Increased cooperation between youth structures and national authorities, especially in Member States where cooperation was lacking previously;
- Increased participation of INGYOs compared to first cycle, but there is still space for further improvement of their involvement;
- Improved timing of the process compared to the first cycle, particularly in terms of the early release of the Cyprus guiding questions at the DK conference;
- NWG work better, improvement in structure and quality of reports;
- Increased creativity and innovation in consultation methods and tools and, in particular, sharing the good practices was very useful;
- Increased outreach in most of the Member States both in the number of young people participating in the process and the local and regional levels at which the process was extended;
- Better understanding of the structured dialogue process and how to use the structured dialogue as a tool for policy-making;
- Increased number of staff members working particularly on structured dialogue in the National Youth Councils.
- Increased diversity of tools used for enhancing the visibility of structured dialogue process (higher involvement of media, blogs, websites, social networks, etc. in the national and EU process);
- Increased number of National Youth Councils having a leading role in the National Working Groups.

Setbacks:

- Lack of coherence of the overall topic within the cycle as well as lack of coherence between the priority and the guiding questions;
- Lack of visibility of the follow-up process in relation to each phase and to the overall work cycle of structured dialogue;
- Lack of a structured approach to follow-up on the recommendations resulting from the process at national and EU level;

¹ National Youth Council of France (CNAJEP), National Youth Council of Portugal (CNJ), National Youth Council of Cyprus (CYC), Romanian Youth Council (CTR), National Youth Council of Poland (PROM), National Youth Council of Italy (FNG), National Youth Council of Latvia (LJP), National Youth Council of Slovenia (MSS), German Federal Youth Council (DBJR), National Youth Council of Czech Republic (CDRM), Youth Council of the French-speaking Community of Belgium (CRIJ), Youth Council of the Flemish-speaking Community of Belgium (VJR), Youth Council of the German-speaking Community of Belgium (RDJ).

- Lack of effective monitoring of the follow-up done at national level on the recommendations resulting from the process and of the implementation of the political outcomes in the Member States and at EU level;
- Lack of sufficient time to implement the structured dialogue at national level, which is connected to the lack of coherence of the overall priority within the 18-month cycle (e.g. challenges related to changes of dates of DK conference);
- Young people cannot decide on the priority theme of the structured dialogue;
- Lack of relevance of chosen Presidency priorities for youth across Europe;
- Lack of consistent dialogue between youth delegates and ministry representatives in the joint working groups at the EU Youth Conferences because of over-focusing on the outcomes – Joint Recommendations – rather than on jointly discussing the topics;
- The available funding – through Youth in Action 5.1. grants – does not match the timing of the structured dialogue process.

The National Youth Councils propose the following recommendations to improve and further develop the structured dialogue process:

1. Strengthening the involvement of youth in all stages of the structured dialogue process

Recommendations for EU level:

- All National Youth Councils should be consulted on the overall priority of the next cycle of the structured dialogue at the European Youth Week, which should be organised at half the term of the cycle (e.g. in November 2013 during the third cycle) or during a different event organised for the evaluation of the structured dialogue and bringing together the National Working Groups, including ministry representatives.
- At the end of each cycle, the Team Presidency should prepare and disseminate a compilation of good practices collected throughout the cycle on aspects related to methodology, visibility tools, follow-up actions at national and EU level, funding means and good functioning of the NWGs.
- The National Youth Councils of the Presidency Trio are encouraged to organise an evaluation seminar for all National Youth Councils at the end of each 18-month cycle.
- The National Youth Councils should have or continue having a leading role in the National Working Groups.
- All the members of National Working Groups, including the Ministry responsible for Youth, should take an active role in implementing the structured dialogue through dedicating human resources, financial resources and political support to the process.

Recommendations for National Working Groups:

- National Working Groups are encouraged to distribute and share the responsibilities and tasks among their members.
- Enlarge the dialogue at national level to involve municipalities, regional authorities, ministries, national politicians as well as different NGOs, civil society organisations, non-organised youth and specific target groups to strengthen the structured dialogue.
- To strengthen the structured dialogue at the Member State level, National Working Groups should utilise both online and face-to-face methods and should continue diversifying and innovating their methodologies.
- National Working Groups should send feedback to all those involved in consultations on what has been done with their contributions.

Good practices:

- In Poland and Finland, an online survey was disseminated in cooperation with the European Youth Card Association (EYCA) to reach out to non-organised youth.
- In the Flemish-speaking Community of Belgium, a participatory event was organised for young people involved in the process, other interested young people, decision-

makers and experts to discuss the preliminary outcomes of the consultations and lead towards final recommendations in Belgium.

- The Cyprus Youth Council organised introductory workshops on the topic of the consultations to prepare young people before the discussions, which led to a more efficient and productive debate.
- In Poland, an organisation member of the Polish Youth Council organised a debate with young people in a rehabilitation centre for youth with addictions on the topic of youth participation in elections during the Danish phase.

2. Improving the involvement of INGYO's in the structured dialogue

- The involvement of INGYO's in the structured dialogue process should be strengthened by setting up one Working Group for INGYO's in order to allow them to jointly carry out consultations and submit a joint report to the European Steering Committee. This should be a step towards creating a European Working Group where INGYO's and European policy-makers should build a dialogue at the EU level.

3. Improving the EU Youth Conferences

Recommendations:

- National Youth Councils (where existing) represent young people in the EU Member States and, as such, they should be given the mandate to select youth delegates for EU Youth Conferences.
- National Working Groups, especially National Youth Councils should prepare the youth delegates before attending the EU Youth Conference. For this reason, the background document of the EU Youth Conference should be sent out as early as possible to participants as well as the workshop themes and the confirmation of the distribution into workshops. As part of their preparation, youth delegates should have the chance to meet the ministry delegates from their country before the conference.
- The EU Youth Conference should last at least 4 days in order to allow consistent discussions between youth delegates and DGs in joint workshops as well as in various informal moments.
- Within the plenary sessions, there should be more room for interaction and dialogue between participants and speakers as well as virtual interaction available for (non-) participants.
- Guiding questions should be delivered to the National Working Groups right at the end of the previous conference to allow for early start of the consultations.
- National Working Groups should raise the visibility of the compilation of the outcomes of national consultations.
- The draft Council document in which the Joint Recommendations would feed into should be made available to National Working Groups before the conference. This would allow for a transparent dialogue and clarify to all participants, including youth delegates, the direction in which the process is going.
- The Presidency should present the goal of the conference and state its commitment to follow-up on the Joint Recommendations from the conference.
- The Presidency should remind the ministerial representatives that the outcomes of the EU Youth Conferences are Joint Recommendations and, as such, they should be taken into account seriously during the negotiations in the Council.

Good practices:

- Poland nominates youth delegates "in pairs": a person with previous experience at youth conferences and a person attending for the first time, so that the senior delegate can guide the junior one.
- The Lithuanian National Working Group selected youth delegates well in advance (6 months) and involved them in the whole process of the national consultation (NWG meetings, choice of methodology, running of consultations, reporting outcomes, etc.).

- In the United Kingdom, delegates are selected from among the 6 'UK Ambassadors' – people who work with the British Youth Council during the 18-month process – and they are involved in consultations as well as in the conferences and the follow-up.
- The longer youth conference organised during the Danish Presidency, which lasted four days, allowed a good time management for consistent joint discussions and dialogue between youth delegates and DGs.
- The high quality of the youth delegate session organised during the Cyprus Youth Conference allowed for interactive discussions.
- Both plenary sessions of the Cyprus EU Youth Conference were live streamed.

4. Improving the follow-up to the outcomes of the structured dialogue

Recommendations for EU level:

- The structured dialogue process should aim at one single meaningful political outcome at the end of the cycle, as this is a necessary precondition for successful follow-up process.
- The outcomes of EU Youth Conferences, including the Joint Recommendations and the video presentations, should be made available in all EU official languages in a youth-friendly way.
- The Presidency and the Member States' Ministries responsible for Youth should share the Joint Recommendations to other relevant sectors and ask them for feedback and any potential follow-up actions. This feedback should be communicated to the European Steering Committee and the National Working Groups.
- The Commission should share the compilation of the outcomes of national consultations and the Joint Recommendations across the Commission Services and link them to on-going institutional and policy development. The Commission should then inform the National Working Groups as to which Commission services were the Joint Recommendations transmitted to and any potential follow-up actions.
- The Presidency should prepare and disseminate an Explanatory Note in which it explains 'why certain recommendations were or were not integrated in the text of the Council document'. The Explanatory Note should also inform of the cross-sectorial approach, namely, to which Council working groups were the Joint Recommendations transmitted to by the Presidency. Suggestions on how to implement the recommendations integrated in the Council text should also be included in this Note.
- The Commission should set up and lead a structured process for monitoring the follow-up on the recommendations resulting from the structured dialogue as well as monitoring the implementation of the political outcomes at national and EU level:
 - The monitoring process should take place every 18 months and should consist of reporting the follow-up actions done by Member States and EU institutions and the impact of these actions.
 - The questionnaire used in the reporting exercise should ask for structured feedback from National Working Groups via targeted questions (e.g. 'To which authorities have the recommendations been sent to?', 'What concrete actions have been taken?') and should be accompanied by a brief explanation of the structured dialogue process.
 - This monitoring process should be linked to the European Youth Week or the evaluation event (same as mentioned in part 1). This should also develop into an online monitoring system – with feedback and online tracking on the follow-up to the process – conducted by the Commission on the European Youth Portal.
- The European Youth Week should be a tool in this follow-up process on the outcomes of the previous cycle by presenting the results of the monitoring process through sharing among National Working Groups the good practices in implementing concrete actions related to the recommendations, at national and European level. For this reason, the European Youth Week should take place in the middle of the work cycle.

Recommendations for National Working Groups:

- All members of the National Working Group should take an active role in following up both the outcomes of the dialogue at national level and the Joint Recommendations and political outcomes at EU level.
- The National Working Group should send the Joint Recommendations to decision-makers on local and regional level as well as to other relevant stakeholders and should develop feedback procedures.
- The National Working Group should arrange meetings with political decision-makers to discuss the outcomes of the structured dialogue process and propose concrete follow-up actions. Young people who participated in the process should be involved in these follow-up meetings.
- Each National Working Group is encouraged to set up a follow-up process, such as: 1) mapping the institutions/sectors to which to send the recommendations; 2) send the recommendations, process the feedback and discuss concrete actions with the relevant stakeholders; 3) Monitor the impact.

Good Practices:

- In Germany, the Youth Ministry and the Youth Ministries of the Federal States discussed the recommendations resulting from the structured dialogue in Germany in the '*Working Group for the implementation of the EU Youth Strategy in Germany*' and provided feedback on which recommendations were taken on board. The German National Youth Council also sent the national recommendations from the Danish phase to the political parties in the National Parliament and asked for feedback through a structured questionnaire. Once the answers are received, they will be published and communicated to all those who participated in the consultations.
- In Slovenia, the National Youth Council took an active role in the follow-up by organising a final event to conclude the dialogue at national level when young people presented the conclusions of the consultation in the Parliament. As a result, the direct interaction and dialogue between young people and decision-makers led to political commitment, with the Parliament taking immediate follow-up actions in relation to the recommendations proposed in Slovenia.
- In Portugal, the National Youth Council organised a national final event to present the Joint Recommendations resulting from the structured dialogue process and comment on them. Hence, young people that participated in the regional consultation events received feedback on their inputs and on how were these inputs integrated in the conclusions of the process.
- The Youth Council of the Flemish Community of Belgium used the recommendations resulting from the structured dialogue in Flanders as the basis for the advice on youth participation sent to the Ministry for Youth, members of the parliamentary commission for youth, other stakeholders and the network of Youth Councils.
- In Germany, the online tool used for running consultations and prioritising the results by the participants is also currently being developed to track the follow-up to the outcomes of the process through a system of individual feedback.

5. Improving the funding for the implementation of the structured dialogue

Recommendations for the EU level:

- Since the Commission acknowledges the importance of the structured dialogue, the Commission should provide sustainable funding dedicated particularly to this process.
 - Long-term grants for implementing the 18-month process should be available for National Youth Councils.
 - The deadlines for grant applications should match the timing of the structured dialogue process.
 - Part of the funding granted to youth organisations should be allocated especially for the follow-up of the process.
 - Part of the funding should allow the sharing of good practices and tools between National Youth Councils.

- European Union and Member States should recognise the volunteer-time contribution and other non-monetary contribution provided by youth organisations and National Youth Councils as co-funding in structured dialogue projects.

Recommendations for national level:

- Member States should provide sustainable funding and support for the implementation and follow-up of structured dialogue process at national as well as regional and local level, including the necessary funding for permanent staff working on the structured dialogue in the National Youth Council. The sustainable funding could also serve as co-funding to the European Commission grant.

Good practices:

- The Flemish Youth Council has used the grant received from Youth in Action under action 5.1 to employ a project officer for the structured dialogue.
- The Ministry of Youth for the French-speaking community of Belgium provides funding to the French-speaking National Youth Council, which also covers one permanent staff member working on structured dialogue.
- The Slovenian Youth Council received some funding from Slovenian MEPs to implement regional events of structured dialogue.

6. Enhancing the visibility of the structured dialogue

Recommendations for EU level:

- Create a general branding of the structured dialogue (e.g. logo, slogan, etc.) in order to build a common identity of those participating in the process at both Member State and EU levels.
- Set up a visually attractive online platform at EU level to provide youth-friendly information, updates and follow-up on the structured dialogue process (same as for follow-up process). This online platform should also facilitate the interaction between National Working Groups and their exchange of good practices. The European Commission should provide such an online platform on the European Youth Portal.

Recommendations for National Working Groups:

- Develop a communication strategy to raise awareness and attract more media attention to the structured dialogue process.
- National Working Groups are encouraged to enhance the visibility of the process at national level through, among others, involving local and regional authorities, schools and universities in the dialogue process and organising national events where the structured dialogue can be presented as a good practice of youth participation.

Good practices:

- The initiative of Eurodesk Cyprus to interview participants at the Cyprus Youth Conference was an effective tool to enhance the visibility of the structured dialogue.
- The national conference that concluded the consultations in Slovenia received recognition from the National Parliament and national media.
- The Polish National Working Group prepared a booklet on consultation tools to be used when organising national consultations (the booklet is translated into English).
- The German National Youth Council sends a monthly newsletter on the structured dialogue process in Germany.
- The Portuguese Youth Council involved local and regional media to raise awareness of the regional events of the structured dialogue process in Portugal.
- Many National Youth Councils – in Germany, Portugal, Slovenia and Flanders – have utilised social media such as Facebook and Twitter, and developed dedicated webpages and created logos for the structured dialogue in their respective country.

ANNEX – Outcomes of the Youth Delegate Session at the EU Youth Conference in Cyprus, 12 September 2012

Background information about the youth delegate session

The youth delegate session at the Cyprus Presidency EU Youth Conference was organised by the Cyprus Youth Council and the European Youth Forum. The session gathered all youth delegates present at the EU Youth Conference and took place after discussions in workshops had been concluded.

The theme of the youth delegate session was “*Assessing the second cycle of the structured dialogue*”. The underlying aim was the approaching end of the second work cycle of the structured dialogue, which is a good time to reflect upon the past 18-month process in order to identify precisely its good practices and setbacks and use them to advance the structured dialogue in the third cycle.

The objective set for the session was to collect, share and exchange youth delegates’ views and assessments of the current structured dialogue cycle on the overall priority of youth participation. The outcomes of the youth delegate session will also be presented in the European Steering Committee at its next meeting.

Outcomes of the youth delegate session

1. What is the procedure for nominating youth delegates for the EU Youth Conference in your country? Is the selection performed by the National Youth Council, National Working Group or by the Ministry responsible for Youth?

The vast majority of youth delegates present at the EU Youth Conference in Cyprus have been selected by the National Youth Council (45) while few others were nominated by the National Working Group (7) or the Ministry responsible for Youth (3). The representatives of International Non-Governmental Youth Organisations (INGYOs) were selected by the European Youth Forum from among the member organisations that took part in the consultation process.

INGYO representatives called for increased responsibility and space given to INGYOs both in the process and at EU Youth Conferences. INGYOs want to have a more active role in the dialogue process as they can reach out young people not involved in National Working Groups’ consultations through their membership. For this, more information should be given to INGYOs from the beginning of the process.

The majority of youth delegates present had been actively involved in this round of consultations in their country. This shows an important increase since the Polish and Danish youth conferences – when approximately half of the delegates had been previously involved in consultations – and thus is an indicator of the development of the process and the improvement of the conferences.

2. How did you get prepared for the conference? How could you be better prepared? Who should ensure a better preparation of participants before and during the Youth Conferences?

- It was proposed to set up an online forum where participants can exchange inputs and views prior to the conference.
- The compilation could have been clearer and shorter.
- Earlier confirmation of the workshop allocation would help a better preparation.
- A good practice is that National Youth Councils brief the delegates beforehand.

- Poland presented their good practice in selecting a person with previous experience at youth conferences and a person attending for the first time, so that the experienced delegate can guide the new one.
- The example of a previous youth conference, held in the Czech Republic in 2009, was brought up as good practice of consulting on an on-going legislative process.
- The good practice of the Lithuanian National Working Group was mentioned, namely the selection of youth delegates being done half a year in advance and involving them in the whole process of the national consultation (NWG meetings, choice of methodology, running of consultations, reporting outcomes, etc.)
- In the United Kingdom, delegates are selected from among the 6 'UK Ambassadors' – people who work with the British Youth Council during the 18-month process – and they are involved in consultations as well as in the conferences and the follow-up.

3. Please evaluate the structured dialogue on youth participation in your Member State in terms of the process, the visibility and recognition of the process, the structure, the impact, the outcomes and the level of outreach.

GOOD PRACTICES – positive developments in this work cycle

- Innovative and efficient consultation methods: online consultations (with motivating quizzes), system of 'youth ambassadors', local dialogue sessions in different regions, cooperation with diverse NGOs and minority organisations, working groups in the National Youth Council.
- In Finland, besides the National Working Group consultation – where relevant experts are also invited to contribute – an online survey was disseminated in the last two phases in cooperation with the European Youth Cardholders Association (EYCA) in order to reach out to non-organised youth.
- Immigrant and non-immigrant individuals and groups were consulted as well as youth directly affected by the topic of the conference and people with little understanding of the topic.
- Involving organised and the non-organised youth to contribute to the structured dialogue.
- Sending the national report to all municipalities.
- Good cooperation with Ministry for Youth in order to take at national level the joint recommendations adopted at the youth conference.
- Organising consultations together with local, regional and national authorities because, in this way, the authorities will then take stock of the outcomes.
- Having a certain degree of diversity in the National Working Group's composition.
- Diversity of organisations involved in the structured dialogue process.
- Good preparation of the background document and good organisation of the workshops at the EU Youth Conference (the topics were specific).
- Organising press conferences to share the results of the national consultation.
- Polish National Working Group prepared a booklet on consultation tools to be used when organising national consultations (the booklet is translated into English).
- Good preparation on the topic and involvement of youth delegates in national consultations.
- Importance of representative approach: INGYOs and NYCs submit representative inputs on behalf of numerous young people.
- Writing press releases on the outcomes of the national consultation.
- Slovenian youth delegates reported that the structured dialogue process in Slovenia was implemented at a high level (local, regional, national events) and received recognition and positive feedback from policy-makers and media.

CHALLENGES – 'what did not work so well' in this work cycle

- Limited resources for implementing the structured dialogue (main challenge)
- Lack of or difficult implementation of the recommendations (main challenge)

- Structured dialogue on different topics in a cycle challenges the consistency of the dialogue.
- The process reaches out mostly to 'educated' young people. Outreach to involve more young people and especially the target group and non-organised in consultations can be improved.
- Lack of sustainable funding from the government for the structured dialogue at national level, for example for a full time employee to work on the process.
- Lack or low recognition of the structured dialogue process.
- National consultation should not be only online via e-questionnaire or online surveys. The consultation methods should be diversified and selected as to provide the best possible overview of the young people's views on the topic (main challenge)
- It is difficult to involve young people from minority groups, such as young immigrants, in the structured dialogue if they do not have an understanding of the process or if they feel that the process is not inclusive enough (to include them).
- Lack of monitoring and impossibility to measure the impact. Proposal to set up a working group on finding ways to monitor and measure the impact of the structured dialogue.
- Proposal to include structured dialogue topics in the ongoing projects of the National Youth Councils. For this, the NYCs need to know the topics in advance to plan their work.
- Structured dialogue should be communicated in a more accessible language.
- Feedback is needed from the ESC and the Youth Forum.
- Proposal for meeting all organisations that applied for Youth in Action for structured dialogue.
- Linking structured dialogue at national and EU level to the dialogue on local level.
- More involvement of the NWG needed in the final national report.
- 'Stronger and more stable' tools to consult on the topic (not only events or questionnaires)
- Invitation to take part in the consultation was written in difficult language.

Suggestions for improving and further developing the structured dialogue process in the 3rd cycle.

Suggestions for improving the EU Youth Conferences

- Open youth conference to the large public of the host country to raise awareness and promote understanding of the structured dialogue process.
- Background document is crucial hence should be published and presented.
- Increase the involvement of participants from INGYOs.
- Allocate more time for the workshops in future EU Youth Conferences.
- Workshop distribution according to delegates' preferences.
- Disseminate the background documents for the conference well in advance.
- Do not limit the outcomes to 2 recommendations per workshop.
- Better involvement of DGs in workshop discussions.
- National Youth Councils should support the preparation of youth delegates.
- More publicity, visibility and media attention to the EU Youth Conference.
- Preparing another event accompanying EU Youth Conferences so that more local young people can participate.
- Engage National Youth Councils in follow-up activities after the completion of the structured dialogue process.
- Continue including the non-EU countries in the structured dialogue at youth conferences.
- More effective participation in the youth conference through a direct involvement of delegates in the choice of topics and titles of the workshop.
- Make a stronger link to concrete actions that will follow the conferences.

- Define important terms linked to the topic of the conference in the background documents.
- Discuss topics of major interest at the moment of the conference (Youth in Action funding).

Suggestions for improving the structured dialogue process in general

- National Youth Councils should have a say in the choice of the overall priority and the 3 themes of the cycle.
- One priority should be decided for all the Presidencies in the Trio. There should be a real link between the topics of the three youth conferences in a cycle.
- Early release of the guiding questions to the National Working Groups and INGYOs.
- Guiding questions need to be clear, concise and simple.
- Place the focus also on the follow-up and the implementation of the recommendations from the structured dialogue at national and EU levels.
- Sharing examples of good practices between National Working Groups/INGYOs, for example by creating structures where National Working Groups can learn from each other.
- Composition of the National Working Groups should be decided by National Youth Councils.
- Better timing of the process with no deadlines for national reports during the summer.
- Less EU Youth Conferences to allow more time to put into practice and evaluate what has been discussed in the previous conferences.
- Develop an evaluation mechanism and adequate indicators to assess the extent of implementation of recommendations from structured dialogue.
- Organising local and regional events with the support of the Pool of Trainers.
- Face-to-face consultation of young people.
- Outcomes from the consultation rounds should be more measurable and concrete.
- More creativity in the whole process – the viability of the structured dialogue depends on young people being active and interested in the topics and process.
- Further communication between state authorities, NGOs and focus groups.
- More involvement of target youth groups in consultations and youth conferences.

How does your National Working Group plan to evaluate the 2nd cycle of structured dialogue, any actions/measures? What could you propose?

- Discussion among all stakeholders involved in the process at national level, organised by the NWG, to evaluate different aspects of the process, between NWG.
- Organising a national conference to evaluate the cycle.
- Continuous evaluation in the NWG for each phase separately.
- Monitoring the implementation of results done by research institute.
- Round table discussion on the topic of the phase and of the cycle.
- Evaluation report of the youth delegates present at the EU Youth Conference.
- Evaluation within the working group of the National Youth Council.

Proposals:

- Evaluate how the outcomes from the first cycle were implemented.
- Review of all the outcomes of the structured dialogue process so far (1st and 2nd cycles).
- Meeting the Ministry responsible for Youth to further discuss the outcomes of the structured dialogue and the progress achieved so far.
- Evaluation should be done within NWG based on: youth delegates' reports and effective follow-up on recommendations.
- There should be clear perspective for guaranteed use of outcomes of the process.
- Evaluate the need for the conference and suitability of the format.