|  |
| --- |
| **Plánpro provádění článku 11 odst. 1 a 2Smlouvy o Evropské unii****CS*****Směrem k lepšímu občanskému dialogu EU a zapojení občanů pro lepší tvorbu politik*přijato na fóru nevládních organizací ve dnech 2. a 3.března 2015 v Rize v rámci lotyšského předsednictví v Radě EU** |

|  |
| --- |
| *čl. 11 odst. 1 a čl. 11 odst. 2 Smlouvy o EU**„1. Orgány dávají vhodnými způsoby občanům a reprezentativním sdružením možnost projevovat a veřejně si vyměňovat své názory na všechny oblasti činnosti Unie.**2. Orgány udržují otevřený, transparentní a pravidelný dialog s reprezentativními sdruženími a s občanskou společností.“* |

# **Úvod**

Tento plán nastiňuje vizi, struktury a opatření potřebná pro provádění lepšího občanského dialogu[[1]](#footnote-1) v rámci EU a zapojení občanů a jejich sdružení. Odráží požadavky občanů na lepší rozhodování, lepší tvorbu politiky a lepší správu reagující na potřeby občanů.

Článek 11 Smlouvy o fungování Evropské unie poskytuje právní základ pro tento účel. Orgány EU, členské státy a občanská společnost – jednotlivci a reprezentativní sdružení – musí pracovat společně za účelem uvádění článku 11 do praxe. Občanský dialog má potenciál rozšířit a posílit evropský model demokracie a je klíčovým nástrojem pro zajištění odpovědnosti, dokončení a modernizace modelu.

Tento plán stanoví vizi toho, co by mělo být dialogem dosaženo a jak by to mohlo být prováděno účinně, konstruktivně a realisticky s co nejširší škálou podporovatelů a zúčastněných stran. To vytváří základy pro občanský dialog, v němž mají reprezentativní sdružení rozhodující úlohu a zároveň je využit plný potenciál jednotlivců.

# **Vize pro občanský dialog**

**Víceúrovňovost**

Občanský dialog oslovuje a zahrnuje reprezentativní sdružení a občanskou společnost[[2]](#footnote-2) na všech úrovních – na úrovni místní, regionální, celostátní i evropské.

**Otevřený, transparentní a inkluzivní**

Občanský dialog poskytuje přímé metody účasti, občané organizovaní ve sdruženích zastupujících jejich zájmy se budou moci zapojit do občanského dialogu a přispívat k němu na úrovni, která jim nejlépe vyhovuje. Digitální nástroje, například elektronické platformy a další přístupy nových technologií by měly být použity pro spolupráci spolu s tradičními nástroji.

**Budovat stávající dialogy nebo konzultace a neduplikovat je**

Občanský dialog je zastřešující strukturou pro stávající dialogy a pro ty, jež budou v budoucnu vyvinuty, mezi institucemi EU a občanskou společností se zaměřením na konkrétní témata. Jakákoli záměna mezi dialogem, konzultací a komunikací by měla být vyloučena.

**Lepší tvorba politiky – myšlenky pro novou Evropu**

Občanský dialog je proces pro výměnu odborných znalostí a propojení s inovacemi v místních občanských organizacích. Je to prostor pro stanovení a tvorbu hodnot, zásad a cílů evropského projektu a pro úvahu o nich a pro vytváření evropské veřejné sféry prostřednictvím překlenutí rozdílů mezi tvůrci politik a občany a rovněž pro využití potenciálu pro přímou účast občanů. To povede k lepšímu rozvoji politiky pro společné blaho, která je bližší potřebám a očekáváním občanů a vytvoří větší smysl pro společnou odpovědnost. Úloha občanského dialogu je zásadní při přípravě návrhů právních předpisů, neboť umožňuje posoudit dopad právních předpisů na občany.

**Společné akce týkající se dohodnutých priorit EU**

Místo pro občanskou společnost a instituce EU, kde mohou spolupracovat a vytvářet společné projekty pro lepší provádění politiky EU, přispět k lepšímu porozumění mezi občany o přidané hodnotě Evropské unie a hodnotit dopad politik na občanskou společnost a občany. Měla by se zohlednit hodnota meziodvětvových a průřezových iniciativ.

**Evropská integrace prostřednictvím občanské společnosti**

Občanský dialog je příležitostí vytvořit vazby mezi občany a jejich volenými zástupci z celé EU. Může vést k celoevropské spolupráci, výměně a projektům za účelem změny, které podpoří rozvoj větší odpovědnosti a posílení pocitu evropské identity.

# **Opatření směřující k dialogu na různých úrovních**

Plán s ohledem na čl. 11 odst. 1 a 2 vymezuje tři úrovně dialogu:

## ***Dialog s reprezentativními sdruženími a občanskou společností na vnitrostátní úrovni***[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Struktura (čl. 11 odst. 2)**

Ačkoli národní tradice a právní rámce se značně liší, rozhodnutí EU jsou do značné míry vypracovaná vnitrostátními úřady a mají největší dopad na vnitrostátní, regionální a místní úrovni. Smlouvy jsou pro členské státy závazné a společné závazky a cíle (jako je strategie Evropa 2020) nemohou být dosaženy bez široké odpovědnosti a zapojení občanů. Tematické dialogy, které již na vnitrostátní úrovni často existují, potřebují lepší uznání EU a podpůrná opatření, aby mohly být rozšířeny do jiných členských států. Vnitrostátní dialogy by měly být součástí diskuse v rámci ročního dialogu EU.

**Základy**

Stávající dialogy o otázkách EU na celostátní úrovni, například v oblasti zdravotnictví, mládeže, sportu, obchodu atd., občanský dialog v rámci Evropského roku občanů 2013 (přizpůsobený a restrukturalizovaný).

**Partneři**

Členské státy, Evropská rada, generální ředitelství Evropské komise, země Východního partnerství a přistupující země EU, zástupci občanské společnosti zapojení do dialogů (také prostřednictvím hospodářských a sociálních rad či jiných struktur na vnitrostátní úrovni (pokud existují)).

**Další kroky**

* Shromažďování informací o stávajících úspěšných dialozích na vnitrostátní úrovni. Konzultace se zúčastněnými stranami z odvětví a oblastí s potřebou zlepšení, pokud jde o pravidelný dialog.
* Doporučení Rady vytvořit národní dialogy mezi členskými státy, včetně těch, které se týkají provádění strategie Evropa 2020.
* Zřízení mechanismů pro výměnu a šíření osvědčených postupů, vytváření prostoru pro zamyšlení a kritické myšlení, prosazování určité úrovně koordinace mezi stávajícími dialogy, přičemž budou respektovány jejich rozdíly. Zahájení diskuse o normách pro zajišťování jakosti, kritériích a pokynech pro účast a povinnosti, včetně doby nezbytné pro řádné a účinné zapojení. Podpora občanského vzdělávání o evropských hodnotách, vytvoření postupů otevřené konzultace (offline a online) o tématech EU na vnitrostátní úrovni s předsednictvími EU za účelem dodání každoroční zprávy o vývoji občanského dialogu v členských státech.
* Členské státy by měly nalézt vhodné prostředky pro financování občanského dialogu a posílení kapacit organizací občanské společnosti při zapojení. Evropská komise by měla přezkoumat své nástroje/programy pro podporu organizací občanské společnosti činných v oblasti účasti, demokracie a právního státu na vnitrostátní úrovni. Evropská komise by měla zapojit účast občanů/demokracii do horizontálních priorit svých národních programů, přičemž by měla vycházet z osvědčených postupů pro posílení nevládních organizací během předvstupního období.
* Podpora nových projektů z hlediska informací a praktického přínosu k lepšímu rozhodování a oživení a reformy dialogů s občany EU v celé EU napříč členskými státy EU (které opět začaly v Lotyšsku v lednu 2015) za účelem zajištění širšího dosahu k občanské společnosti prostřednictvím společných závěrů z každého dialogu a zpětné vazby.

## ***Dialog s reprezentativními sdruženími a občanskou společností na úrovni EU***[[4]](#footnote-4)

**Struktura (čl. 11 odst. 2)**

Vhodná pravidelná a strukturovaná fóra pro dialog za účelem propojení všech orgánů EU s občanskou společností za vytváření součinnosti mezi orgány tam, kde je to možné. Stávající osvědčené postupy by měly být rozšířeny a posíleny, aby se zajistil účinný dopad na tvorbu politik. Kromě dalších nástrojů by sem spadala každoroční akce, která by propojovala orgány EU zastoupené na nejvyšší úrovni a reprezentativní sdružení/občanskou společnost, jakož i zástupce odvětvových dialogů a místních, regionálních, vnitrostátních a makroregionálních dialogů (nadnárodní a politika sousedství).

Tato výroční schůze by mohla být strukturována podle vzoru Open Days Výboru regionů s workshopy a tematickými setkáními, jež by vedly k rozsáhlému závěrečnému zasedání a konečnému společnému prohlášení nebo ročnímu pracovnímu plánu a následné kontrole tohoto plánu. Širší zapojení, které využívá inovativní techniky a metody, by mohlo být rozvíjeno v průběhu času. Všechna prohlášení budou předána všem orgánům EU, které by byly všechny povinny vydat formální odpověď.

**Základy**

Styčná skupina Evropského hospodářského a sociálního výboru pro nevládní organizace, styčná skupina EHSV pro Dny občanské společnosti a neformální zasedání Rady pro zaměstnanost, sociální politiku, zdraví a ochranu spotřebitele, které od roku 2000 začlenily širší zapojení občanské společnosti prostřednictvím konzultací – na stejné úrovni jako sociální partneři – ještě před přijímáním rozhodnutí během formálního zasedání Rady pro zaměstnanost, sociální politiku, zdraví a ochranu spotřebitele.

**Partneři**

Evropský hospodářský a sociální výbor, Evropská komise, Evropský parlament a Evropská rada, Výbor regionů, Rada pro zaměstnanost, sociální politiku, zdraví a ochranu spotřebitele.

**Další kroky**

* Je třeba přijmout vhodná opatření s cílem určit, rozšířit a posílit stávající osvědčené postupy a zviditelnit změny v rozhodovacím procesu EU vyplývající z občanské angažovanosti. Je třeba stanovit oblasti politiky s potenciálem ke zlepšení a vytvořit mechanismus na podporu a koordinaci těchto činností a stávajícího dialogu.
* Využít bohaté zkušenosti a důkladné hodnocení získané např. z pilotních projektů financovaných Evropskou komisí pro testování přístupů účasti občanů v rámci programů plán D, Debate Europe a Evropa pro občany a rozvíjet posílené strategie, které jasně propojují participační procesy s rozhodovacími procesy a jinými mechanismy, jako je tzv. crowdsourcing pro politické podněty atd. Je třeba zlepšit možnosti online účasti. Schválení statutu evropských sdružení a vhodné a udržitelné financování ze zdrojů EU.
* Zřízení skupiny/výboru pro občanský dialog a střediska pro zástupce všech zastoupených zájmů za účelem měření a sledování občanského dialogu a míry zapojení občanů s ohledem na orgány EU a přijímání výroční zprávy o této otázce. Přezkum strategie Evropa 2020 nabízí velký potenciál pro plánování/pilotní projekty těchto procesů.
* Neprodleně pověřit konkrétního komisaře odpovědného za koordinaci občanského dialogu a vyčlenit odpovídající lidské zdroje, aby bylo možné ho provádět. Každé GŘ by mělo mít personál zodpovědný za dialog a vhodné finance pro podporu účasti na rozhodování. Rovněž vytvořit specifické oddělení a politickou funkci a zvláštní personál odpovědný za dialog v Parlamentu a v Radě.
* Budovat na základě Dnů občanské společnosti EHSV, přičemž by měly širší dosah i mimo odvětvové dialogy a místní/regionální/vnitrostátní dialogy.

## ***Možnost pro občany a reprezentativní sdružení projevovat a veřejně si vyměňovat názory na všechny oblasti činnosti Unie (místní, regionální, celostátní a unijní dialogy) (čl. 11*** ***odst. 1)***[[5]](#footnote-5)

**Struktura**

Všichni občané budou mít prostřednictvím sdružení zastupujících jejich zájmy nebo jako jednotlivci přístup k občanskému dialogu na úrovni, která jim nejvíce vyhovuje – ať už na místní, regionální, celostátní nebo evropské úrovni. Tyto dialogy by měli občané organizovat sami spolu s jejich reprezentativními sdruženími a organizacemi občanské společnosti s podporou příslušného veřejného orgánu, což znamená, že se dostanou co nejblíže k občanům a pomohou jim omezit pocit izolovanosti a vzdálenosti.

Občané a jejich reprezentativní sdružení/organizace občanské společnosti by sami rozhodovali o formátu, agendě a tématech pro diskusi. Schválené zprávy a zástupci by byli přínosem pro proces dialogu na vnitrostátní úrovni a na úrovni EU.

**Základy**

Sítě nevládních organizací, rady, iniciativy, Národní aliance Evropského roku občanů 2013.

**Partneři**

Veřejné orgány na různých úrovních, oddělení pro evropské záležitosti členských států, hospodářské a sociální rady (pokud existují), platformy občanské společnosti.

**Další kroky**

* Příslušné orgány veřejné moci by měly vytvořit stimulující prostředí pro usnadnění občanského dialogu na evropské, vnitrostátní a nižší než celostátní úrovni.
* Vhodné prostředky a nástroje by měly být k dispozici se zvláštním zaměřením na vytváření koalice, konsensuálního přístupu udržitelnosti jako základu pro vysoce kvalitní vstupy pro lepší rozhodování za zajištění kvality přístupu.
* Zvláštní pozornost pro potenciál nových sdělovacích prostředků. V tomto ohledu mohou jak organizace, tak jednotlivci rozvíjet potřebné součinnosti při své práci a nalézt vhodné příležitosti pro účast, např. zahájením strategie účasti 2.0, která má umožnit výměnu slibných příkladů mezi všemi úrovněmi (místní, regionální, národní a evropskou), stanovit cíle a plánovat kroky pro vytvoření digitálního systému pro zapojení občanů pomocí dialogu založeného na respektu v rámci přísně vymezeného etického rámce.
* Na základě Listiny základních práv a za uznání svobody sdružování podporovat účast na rozhodovacím procesu prostřednictvím pravidelného monitorování stávající situace, podávání zpráv a šíření osvědčených postupů.
* Zvyšování povědomí o evropském rozměru v souvislosti se situacemi na celostátní a nižší než celostátní úrovni a zvyšování motivace pro přístup k výměně názorů.

|  |
| --- |
| **PŘÍLOHY****OSVĚDČENÉ POSTUPY A ZKUŠENOSTI*****Níže jsou uvedeny některé osvědčené postupy týkající se různých dialogů uvedených v bodě 3.1 až 3.3 tohoto plánu.*** ***Příloha 1 se týká „dialogu s reprezentativními sdruženími a občanskou společností na národní úrovni“, příloha 2 se týká „dialogu s reprezentativními sdruženími a občanskou společností na úrovni EU“, příloha 3 se týká příkladů „možností pro občany a reprezentativní sdružení projevovat a veřejně si vyměňovat své názory na všechny oblasti činnosti EU (místní, regionální, státní a unijní dialogy)“.*** |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Annex 1***

**CIVIL SOCIETY CONSULTATION PROCESSES IN EUROPE**

**AND EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CSOs also participate in government-established advisory bodies. These are created on specific matters in order to ensure a continuous dialogue between citizens and government via their representatives[[7]](#footnote-7). With regard to local democracy, citizens and CSOs are called to join in debates held by Municipal Councils where they informally participate in decision-making.

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

For many reasons, mainly historical, the notion of consultation appears in Poland “with regard to general acts prepared by government, as well as local acts prepared by municipalities”[[8]](#footnote-8).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Work with civil society to develop an OGP national action plan;
* Implement OGP commitments in accordance with the action plan timeline;
* Prepare an annual self-assessment report;
* Participate in the independent reporting mechanism research process;
* Contribute to peer learning across the OGP[[11]](#footnote-11).

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

The Compact

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

It was developed by a Working Group that included representatives from leading voluntary and community sector umbrella bodies, representatives from community groups and organisations, volunteer organisations…who consulted over 25,000 organisations about what the Compact should include and the text was agreed in 1998[[12]](#footnote-12).

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

It is also followed by an Accountability and Transparency Guide, “which outlines steps to take at national and local level if these principles are not followed, including dispute resolution, internal complaints procedures and ombudsmen functions”[[13]](#footnote-13).

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

Other Formats for Civil Society Consultation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What’s more, a number of significant reforms were introduced starting in 2003[[16]](#footnote-16), and have gained significant importance with citizens' attempts to respond locally to the difficulties they have been facing since the beginning of the economic crisis, which is particularly virulent in Spain:

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

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

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

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

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

In order to combine national-level engagement politics with European integration politics, EM Germany and the “National Network for Civil Society” BBE[[21]](#footnote-21) set up reciprocal membership to improve the general legal, organisational and institutional conditions for civic involvement in the multilevel European system. Thus, EM Germany adopted BBE’s demand for a “Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-Making Process”.

The close cooperation of EM Germany with the Federal Foreign office has been officially assigned since 2011.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Manabalss.lv is an internet portal (run by the Foundation for Public Participation – a non-profit organisation) that has been recognised as an open government success story all across the globe. It was mentioned by US President Barack Obama during the launch of the Open Government Partnership Initiative, it has been featured in publications such as the New York Times and The Guardian, as well as recognised as "one of the outstanding challengers from Eastern and Central Europe".
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**Annex 2**

**2.1. Civil dialogue in matters covered by the "Europe for citizens" programme**

**2014-2020**

**2.1.1. Description**

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

The group’s tasks are:

• To hold a regular dialogue on all matters relating to the Europe for Citizens programme, including “Remembrance” and “Democratic and civic engagement”, and to implement it.

• To bring about exchanges of experiences and good practices in those fields.

• To contribute to the dissemination of the programme’s results.

• To contribute to preparation and implementation of any event or activities organised under the programme.

• To monitor and discuss policy developments in related fields.

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

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

• Organisations selected to receive an operating grant under the "Europe for Citizens" Programme, under strand 1, “Remembrance”, and 2, “Democratic engagement and civic participation”.

• Organisations which have received an operating grant under the former "Europe for Citizens" Programme 2007-13 and have expressed their continued interest to take part in the dialogue.

• Some organisations/think tanks which have expressed an interest in the Europe for Citizens programme and/or work in this policy area but were not necessarily supported by the programme.

Member organisations are invited to register on the Transparency Register.

**2.1.2. Evolution/lessons learnt**

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

**2.1.3. Links**

<http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/europe-for-citizens-programme/civil-dialogue/index_en.htm>

**2.2. European Migration Forum**

**2.2.1. Description**

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

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

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

**2.2.2. Novelties**

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

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

**2.2.3. Evolution/lessons learnt**

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

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

**2.2.4. Links**

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

**2.3. Structured Dialogue on Youth**

**2.3.1. Description**

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

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

**2.3.2. Novelties**

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

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

**2.3.3. Evolution/lessons learnt**

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

**2.3.4. Links**

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

European Commission webpage: <http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/implementation/dialogue_en.htm>

European Youth Portal: <http://europa.eu/youth/sd_en>.

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

**2.4.1. Description**

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

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

* + 1. **Novelties**

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

**2.4.3. Evolution/lessons learnt**

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

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

**2.4.4. Links**

[How to establish an effective dialogue between the EU and civil society organisation](http://www.socialplatform.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/20100201_SocialPlatform_EffectiveCivilDialogue.pdf)s

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

**2.5.1. Description**

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

**2.5.2. Lessons learnt**

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

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

**2.5.3. Links**

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

**2.5.4.** **References**
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**Annex 3**

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

**3.1.1. Description**

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

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

**3.1.2. Innovation**

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

**3.1.3. Evolution**

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

**3.1.4. Links**

\* [http://www.eyv2011.eu/resources-library/item/39-the-european-year-of-volunteering-eyv- 2011-discussion-paper](http://www.eyv2011.eu/resources-library/item/39-the-european-year-of-volunteering-eyv-%202011-discussion-paper),

 [http://www.eyv2011.eu/resources-library/item/40-eyv- 2011-alliance-position-paper-available-in-different-language-versions-2008](http://www.eyv2011.eu/resources-library/item/40-eyv-%202011-alliance-position-paper-available-in-different-language-versions-2008)

[EYV 2011 Council Decision](http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/pdf/20091127_council_decision_en.pdf) (2009)

[EC Communication on EU Policies and Volunteering](http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/pdf/doc1311_en.pdf) (2011)

<http://www.eyv2011.eu/images/stories/pdf/EYV2011Alliance_PAVE_copyfriendly.pdf>

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

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

**3.2. EYCA and Civil Society Europe**

**3.2.1. Description**

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

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

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

**3.2.2. Evolution**

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

**3.2.3. Links**

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

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

**3.3.1. Description**

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

**3.3.2. Development**

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

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Evropský hospodářský a sociální výbor definuje občanský dialog jako demokratický proces a proces utváření veřejného mínění, který může mít různé formy podle toho, jaké subjekty se ho účastní. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Pojem „občanská společnost“ zde zahrnuje jak aktivní jednotlivce, tak organizovanou občanskou společnost. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Několik příkladů osvědčených postupů je uvedeno v příloze 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Několik příkladů osvědčených postupů je uvedeno v příloze 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Viz příloha 3 dva příklady osvědčených postupů. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. D. Chabanet and A. H. Trechsel, *EU Member States’ Consultation with Civil Society on European Policy Matters*, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, October 2011, p. 43. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Cf. for instance the DANIDA Project launched by Danish civil society and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2014 and in light of the upcoming European Year for Development 2015, for Danish support to civil society in Developing countries, <http://amg.um.dk/en/~/media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Danida/Samarbejde/Civil-org/Dokumenter/Strat/Civilsamfundspolitik_UK_web.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. D. Chabanet and A. H. Trechsel, *EU Member States’ Consultation with Civil Society on European Policy Matters*, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, October 2011, p. 43. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 2013 CSO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia, 17th Edition, June 2014, p. 170-177. This part of the Index was researched and written by the Institute for Public Affairs, European Civic Forum Member in Poland. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Cf. quotes in *For a Democratic Europe Now,* Final Report of the “Real Civil Society Democracy in Europe”, paragraph on the United Kingdom. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
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