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1. Summary of Session 3

On 10-12 December, 162 randomly selected European citizens from different ages, backgrounds, and coming from all across the European Union, met for the third time to discuss the topics of “European democracy / Values and rights, rule of law, security”, continuing the deliberations that took place during Sessions 1 and 2. For this final session, participants in Panel 2 were hosted at the European University Institute, in Florence, with the possibility to participate online. Using the orientations they developed during Session 2 as the basis of their work, citizens produced and endorsed 39 final recommendations, which will be presented and discussed in the Conference Plenary. Of the 162, 26 participants attended and intervened remotely.

Discussions and collective work were carried out in three formats:

- **In subgroups.** Each of the 15 subgroups was composed of around ten to thirteen citizens. Four to five languages were spoken in each subgroup, each citizen being able to speak in their own language or in a language in which they felt comfortable. Each subgroup had a dedicated professional facilitator from the deliberation group or from other external service providers. To support the work of the facilitators, the EUI provided one note taker per subgroup.

1 Disclaimer: this report is the sole responsibility of the authors and does not reflect the views of the EU Institutions.
In plenary, with all participants. Plenary sessions were led by two main moderators from the deliberation group, with interpretation in the 24 official EU languages.

With the support of experts and fact-checkers, their own knowledge, and experiences, and through deliberations, citizens started by examining all the orientations produced by the Panel during Session 2 in an “open forum” setting. In addition to the expertise provided, they were also supported by subgroup facilitators. Each citizen was given fifty stickers (ten green for stream 1, ten red for stream 2, ten blue for stream 3, ten yellow for stream 4, ten purple for stream 5) and proceeded to prioritise up to ten orientations, per stream. Five black stickers were allocated per citizen to prioritise the orientations produced by their own subgroup. Once this prioritisation at the Panel level was completed, citizens were allocated to the same subgroups they worked in during Session 2 and collectively acknowledged which of their group’s orientations had been prioritised by the rest of the Panel and by the members of their own subgroup.

For the development of recommendations, each subgroup was given an indicative range for the number of recommendations of one to three, with a maximum of five. To prioritise orientations at the subgroup level, citizens used a ranking system by which they started to work on the orientation of their substream with the highest support from the Panel. Secondly, they worked on the one with the highest support from their own subgroup, and so forth.

Subgroup work was then dedicated to developing orientations into recommendations. To do so, citizens used a recommendation template:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Signs Limit in EN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Recommendation</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Justification</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elements/questions which the group had to address (not a strict obligation but a strong recommendation) while formulating the justifications of the recommendations were:

1. Why is this recommendation important and relevant to the topics of the Panel?
2. Why is it important to take action at EU level?
3. What are the undesirable effects/trade offs of this recommendation and why do we nevertheless think it is important to do it?

During the work in subgroups, four inter-subgroup feedback sessions of about 30 minutes each were held in order to help participants understand the work done in the other subgroups and to enrich their recommendations. For each feedback session, one participant from each subgroup moved to a different room. This participant presented the draft recommendations prepared by his/her subgroup so far and took note of the comments of his/her peers. The note taker introduced the feedback into an online spreadsheet for the subgroup that authored the draft recommendations to be able to consult it, besides the oral report by their representative.

---

Report from Session 2 of Panel 1 available at: Panel 2 - Session 2 - Report
The recommendations from each subgroup were then voted by the Panel on Sunday, 12 December. Before the vote, all participants received a document with all draft recommendations generated the day before so that they could read them in their own language (automatically translated from English). The voting took place via an online form. The voting process was divided in five slots corresponding to the five streams of the Panel. The recommendations were presented stream by stream. Each slot was 30 minutes long. It started with one citizen from each subgroup presenting the work of their subgroup. The main facilitation read out each of the recommendations of the stream in English to allow the citizens to hear the interpretation simultaneously. The recommendations were voted one by one by all participants. All interpreters obtained in advance the written draft recommendations in English in order to ensure the most qualitative possible interpretation at the time of the vote.

With the results of the final votes, recommendations were classified as follows:

- Recommendations having reached the threshold of 70% or more of the votes cast were adopted by the Panel.
- Recommendations failing to pass the threshold were considered as not validated by the Panel and are included in Annex III of this report.

The video recordings of the Panel Plenary sessions can be found here:

- **Panel Plenary session on December 10th**
- **Panel Plenary session on December 12th**

### 2. Context of Session 3 in the European Citizens' Panel process

The European Citizens’ Panels are a key feature of the Conference on the Future of Europe. Four European Citizens’ Panels are organized to allow citizens to jointly reflect on the future they want for the European Union.

- 4 Panels of some 200 European citizens each chosen through random selection, from the 27 Member States;
- Reflecting the EU’s diversity: geographic origin (nationality and urban/rural), gender, age, socioeconomic background and level of education;
- At least one female and one male citizen per Member State is part of each Panel;
- A third of each Panel is composed of young people (age 16-25). A special link between this youth group and the European Youth Event has been created.

Each Panel meets three times between September 2021 and February 2022. Session 1 took place in Strasbourg, at the European Parliament. Session 2 was held online, using Interactio: an online tool allowing multilingual meetings with simultaneous interpretation in 24 languages. Session 3 will be held in four different Member States: Panel 1 in Dublin at the Institute of International and European Affairs and at Dublin Castle, Panel 2 in Florence at the European University Institute, Panel 3 in Natolin at the College of Europe, and Panel 4 in Maastricht at the European Institute of Public Administration, the University of Economics of Maastricht and the Maastricht Exhibition and Conference Center.

Whereas session 1 was an introductory session aimed at vision-building, agenda-setting and prioritising the topics citizens want to concentrate on, and session 2 was aimed at delving into these
topics and producing orientations, session 3 was dedicated to producing input to the Conference Plenary by formulating a set of recommendations for the Union’s institutions to follow-up on.

3. Main output of the session: Recommendations adopted by the Panel (to be taken forward to the Plenary)

Stream 1 Ensuring rights and non-discrimination

Substream 1.1 Non-discrimination / Substream 1.2 Gender equality

1. “We recommend that the EU provides criteria on anti-discrimination in the labour market (quotas for youth, elders, women, minorities). If companies fulfil the criteria, they get subsidies or tax breaks”.

We recommend enhancing employee’s awareness about:

- supranational and national institutions (e.g. trade unions).
- mechanisms which ensure companies respect existing rules on non-discrimination in the workplace.
- qualification programmes for social groups that suffer discrimination in the job market (youth, elders, women, minorities).

We recommend the adoption of a two-stage EU law. First, provide subsidies to hire employees from certain categories susceptible to discrimination. Second, the law should oblige employers to employ such groups for a minimum period.”

This is because the EU is responsible for maintaining a balance between free market interests and the protection of vulnerable categories which should be legally safeguarded. Heterogeneous groups are desirable for companies as they offer diverse qualifications. Subsidies are an additional incentive to be provided to companies.

2. “We recommend the EU creates an incentive programme that facilitates the creation of affordable kindergartens and playgrounds in big and small companies. Shared facilities are also a viable option for smaller firms to get the subsidy.

We recommend the EU forces companies to create kindergartens in a manner proportional to the number of employees.”

We recommend this because uniting family life and professional life improves job performances, reduces unemployment, and brings parents, especially women, in a situation that enables them to continue their career. Stressing the social dimension, the proposed solution guarantees the safety of the children and reduces parental anxieties.

Substream 1.3 Protecting human rights and the rights of nature and animals

3. “We recommend to safeguard animals' wellbeing and sustainability in farming by amending directive 98/58 EC concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes. More detailed minimum criteria must be defined. It should be specific, measurable, and time bound. The minimum criteria should be set in a way that leads to higher animal wellbeing standards and at the same time enables a transition towards a climate and environmental sustainability and ecological agriculture”.

We, as citizens, believe that it is important to have stronger minimum standards to be harmonized within the EU regarding animal farming. We are aware that the transition might pose problems in some agricultural sectors that benefit from subsidies, and for those are in transition to ecological and sustainable farming. However we find it very important to ensure that this transition happens.

4. “We recommend to promote more environment and climate-friendly agriculture in Europe and world-wide by taxing all negative emissions, pesticides and extreme use of water, etc..., based on their environmental burden. Custom duties on all agricultural goods that are imported into the EU must eliminate competitive advantages of third countries without the same standards as the EU. To promote animal-friendly agriculture, we recommend that emissions caused by long range transport of animals should be taxed”.

By establishing such a system we believe it is possible to support the transition towards a climate and environmental-friendly agriculture.

5. “In the actual context of many fake news, we recommend to promote more independent, objective and balanced media coverage by: 1. Developing at EU level a minimum standards directive for media independence. 2. Promoting at EU level the development of media competences for every citizen”.

The EU must produce a directive to ensure the independence of the media and freedom of speech.

6. “We recommend to stop subsidising agricultural mass-production if it does not lead to a transition towards a climate, environmentaly sustainable and ecological agriculture. Instead we recommend to redirect the subsidies to support a sustainable transition”.

Instead of subsidising the agricultural sector of mass farming, the subsidies should be redirected to farms that are in transition to comply with the new minimum standards for animal welfare.

Substream 1.4 Right to privacy

7. “We recommend that entities that process personal data shall be licensed at EU level. These entities shall also be subject to independent, external annual data protection audit. These entities shall be punished for data protection violations proportionally to their annual turnover in a stricter way than under the current regulation. The license should be lifted after two consecutive violations, and immediately after a serious violation”.

We recommend all this because current regulations (GDPR) are not sufficient and entities need to be better monitored and sanctioned to make sure they do not violate data protection and the right to privacy.

8. “We recommend strengthening the EU competence in: 1) data protection education, 2) data protection raising awareness and 3) protecting personal data of minors. We recommend providing clearer and stricter rules about processing data of minors in the GDPR, including consent rules, age verification and control by legal guardians. We also recommend to introduce in the GDPR a special category for sensitive minors’ data (e.g. criminal record, health information, nudity) so that minors are protected from any form of abuse and discrimination”.

This recommendation is needed because minors are especially vulnerable to data protection and privacy violations and currently there is no sufficient data protection awareness among the general population, especially minors, teachers and legal guardians. They all need to learn how to use online
and offline data related services and how to protect childrens' privacy rights. Moreover, legal guardians often may consent to the processing of children's data without being fully aware or informed and children may fake parental consent. Last but not least, this recommendation is needed because a proper EU-wide data protection awareness campaign targeted specifically to minors, legal guardians and teachers does not exist, despite its crucial importance.

9. “We recommend introducing standardized privacy policies and easily understandable, concise and user-friendly consent forms that clearly indicate what data processing is strictly necessary and what is optional. We recommend that removing consent should be easy, fast and permanent. We recommend forbidding entities to limit their services more than necessary if there is no consent to optional data processing”.

We recommend this because current EU rules are not precise enough, withdrawal from consent is lengthy, temporary and complex, and because entities do not have interest in offering their services to citizens who reclaim their data protection rights.

Stream 2: Protecting democracy and the rule of law

Substream 2.1 Protecting rule of law

10. “We recommend that the conditionality regulation (2020/2092, adopted on 16 December 2020) is amended so that it applies to all breaches of the rule of law rather than only to breaches affecting the EU budget”.

The conditionality regulation allows for the suspension of EU funds to Member States breaching the rule of law. However, under the current formulation it only applies to breaches that affect, or risk affecting, the EU budget. Furthermore, the current phrasing of the conditionality regulation is self-protective of the EU’s budget and of the EU’s institutions rather than the citizens of the Member States concerned. Therefore, we recommend changing the current text of the regulation so that it covers all violations of the rule of law.

11. “We recommend that the EU organises annual conferences on the rule of law following the publication of the annual Rule of Law Report (the Commission’s mechanism for monitoring compliance with the rule of law by the Member States). Member States should be obligated to send socially diverse national delegations to the conference that include both citizens and civil servants”.

This conference would foster dialogue among EU citizens on rule of law issues as well as dialogue between citizens and experts drafting the annual Rule of Law Reports. We believe that in an atmosphere of mutual appreciation and sharing the participants can take best practices and ideas back to their home countries. Furthermore, the conference would bring awareness and understanding to the principle of the rule of law and to the findings and process behind the annual Rule of Law Report. It would also capture the attention of the media, as well as allow citizens to share their experiences and compare them against the findings in the Report.

Substream 2.2 Protecting and strengthening democracy / Substream 2.4 Media and disinformation

12. “We recommend that the EU enforces its competition rules in the media sector more strictly to ensure that media pluralism is protected in all Member States. The EU should prevent large media monopolies and political appointment processes for media outlet boards. We also recommend that the upcoming EU Media Freedom act entails rules on preventing politicians from owning media outlets or having a strong influence on their content”.
We recommend this because enforcing EU competition rules fosters a pluralist media landscape where citizens have a choice. Since the Commission is currently developing a law (Media Freedom Act) for the integrity of the EU media market, this law should also reflect that media outlets should not be owned or influenced by politicians.

Substream 2.3 Security

13. “We recommend the EU institutions to play a stronger role with all the tools at their disposal, including national centers for cybersecurity and the European Union Agency for Cybersecurity (ENISA), to protect individuals, organizations and institutions against new threats coming from cybersecurity breaches and the use of Artificial intelligence for criminal purposes. We further recommend that the directives coming from Europe and its agencies are correctly implemented and disseminated in all Member States”.

We recommend this because citizens feel helpless and are not aware of what is done by the European Union to combat these threats. We recommend this because these threats are a serious national and European security concern. We recommend this because Europe should be a true innovator in this field.

14. “We recommend that, in its relationship with external countries, the European Union should firstly strengthen common democratic values in its borders. We recommend that only after achieving this, the European Union can be an ambassador of our democratic model in the countries that are ready and willing to implement it, through diplomacy and dialogue”.

We recommend this because we have to look inwards before looking outwards. Because Europe can and should support Member States to strengthen their democracies. Because it is also by leading by example and supporting external countries' efforts towards democracy that we protect ourselves.

Stream 3: Reforming the EU

Substream 3.1 Institutional reform

15. “We recommend changing the names of EU institutions to clarify their functions. For example, the Council of the European Union could be called the Senate of the European Union. The European Commission could be called the Executive Commission of the European Union”.

We recommend this because it is currently hard for citizens to understand the roles and functions of each institution of the European Union. Their names do not reflect their functions. Citizens cannot be expected to distinguish the Council of the European Union, the European Council and the Council of Europe. It is important to avoid overlap.

16. “We recommend adopting an election law for the European Parliament that harmonizes electoral conditions (voting age, election date, requirements for electoral districts, candidates, political parties and their financing). European citizens should have the right to vote for different European Union level parties that each consist of candidates from multiple Member States. During a sufficient transition period, citizens could still vote for both national and transnational parties”.

We recommend this because the European Union needs to build a sense of unity, which could be achieved by a truly unified election of the European Parliament. This common election will hold
accountable the Members of the European Parliament and to focus the election campaign on shared European topics.

**Substream 3.2 Decision-making**

17. “We recommend to create an online platform where citizens can find and request fact-checked information. The platform should be clearly associated with EU institutions, should be structured by topics and should be easily accessible (e.g., including a telephone hotline). Citizens should be able to ask critical questions to experts (e.g., academics, journalists) and get factual answers with sources”.

Free access to factual information is of highest value for our society, so as citizens are well informed and protected against fake news and disinformation. We need a credible and independent source of information that is not influenced by political, economic and national interests. Moreover, the platform can establish a bridge (i.e., a direct relationship) between citizens and the EU.

18. “We recommend that there should be an EU-wide referendum in exceptional cases on extremely important matters to all European citizens. The referendum should be triggered by the European Parliament and should be legally binding”.

There should be more direct influence of EU citizens on important decisions on EU-wide matters. However, referendums should only be held in exceptional circumstances because the costs are too high to hold them regularly. We are aware that this recommendation might require a treaty change and the adaptation of national constitutions.

19. “We recommend creating a multifunctional digital platform where citizens can vote in online elections and polls. Citizens should be able to give their reasoning behind their vote on important issues and legislative proposals coming from European institutions. The platform should be secure, widely accessible and highly visible to each and every citizen”.

The objective of this platform is to increase participation in European politics and facilitate citizens’ access to consultation and voting processes. Existing tools and processes are not visible enough, and this is why we need a new integrated tool for these different functions. More participation leads to better decisions, more trust among European citizens, and to a better functioning of the European Union overall.

20. “We recommend that the voting systems in the EU institutions should be reassessed focusing on the issue of unanimous voting. Voting ‘weight’ should be calculated fairly, so that small countries’ interests are protected”.

Unanimous voting poses a significant challenge to decision making in the EU. The large number of member states makes it very difficult to reach agreement. If necessary, European treaties should change to address the issue of unanimity.

**Substream 3.3 Closer integration**

21. “We recommend the EU to make public investments which lead to the creation of appropriate jobs and to the improvement and harmonisation of quality of life across the EU, between Member States, and within Member States (i.e. at the regional level). There is a need to ensure supervision, transparency and effective communication towards citizens in the implementation of public investments and to allow citizens to track the entire process of investment. Investments into quality
of life include education, health, housing, physical infrastructures, care for the elderly and people with disabilities, taking into account the needs of every Member State. Additional investments should strive to establish a good balance between appropriate work and personal life in order to allow a healthy lifestyle.

We recommend this because harmonising the level of life across the EU will improve economic progress across the EU, which will lead towards a unified EU. This is a fundamental indicator towards further integration of the EU. Although some of these mechanisms are already in place, we feel there is still room for further improvement.

22. “We recommend establishing a common basis, according to a set of economic indicators and indicators on quality of life, for all Member States, with the same opportunities and with everyone being at the same level to reach a common economic structure. It is important that the establishment of a common basis follows a clear and realistic timeline set by institutions at the recommendation of experts. Experts should also be consulted on how such a common economic structure should look like. It is also important that indicators defining the common basis are further defined with help of experts”.

We recommend this because if we have a just EU, we will have a more united Europe. To be just, we need to offer equal opportunities and a common basis to all of the EU. A common economic structure can only be reached once a common basis is established.

23. “We recommend taxing big corporations and income from big corporations to contribute to public investments, and to use the taxation to invest into education and development of each country (R&D, scholarships - Erasmus etc.). It is also important to focus on eliminating the existence of tax havens in the EU”.

We recommend this because it will help to prevent tax evasion and creation of tax havens and to help with compliance of legislation.

Stream 4: Building European identity

Substream 4.1 Education on democracy

24. “We recommend that education on democracy in the European Union should strive to improve and achieve a minimum standard of knowledge across all Member States. This education should include, but not be confined to, democratic processes and general information on the EU which should be taught in all EU Member States. This education should be further enriched by a set of differing concepts teaching the democratic process, which should be engaging and age appropriate”.

This recommendation and the reasons which justify it are important because, if implemented, it will lead towards a more harmonious and democratic life in the European Union. The justifications are as follows: young people would be educated on democratic processes; this education could limit populism and disinformation in public debate; lead to less discrimination; and finally educate and involve citizens in democracy beyond just their duty to vote.

25. “We recommend that existing and emerging translation technologies such as artificial intelligence are further developed, improved and made more accessible so as to reduce language barriers and strengthen common identity and democracy in the European Union”.

This recommendation and the reasons which justify it are important because, if implemented, it will help to build a common European identity by improving communication between citizens of all Member States.

26. "We recommend that verifiable information be made easily accessible, in understandable terms, to citizens via a mobile device application in order to improve transparency, public deliberation and democracy. This app could disseminate information regarding, for example, legislation, discussions within the EU, treaty changes etc".

This recommendation and the reasons which justify it are important because, if implemented, it will facilitate communication in terms of more informed deliberation between citizens of the respective Member States, via an app which could have many different functions. This app should be designed to be relevant to all, as well as to stimulate further curiosity and make technical information more accessible and engaging. The app should be understood as a supplementary source, which disseminates information officially verified directly by the EU to improve trust, transparency in public debate and to help to build a common European identity.

Substream 4.2 European values and identity

27. "We recommend that the EU creates a special fund for online and offline interactions (ie. exchanges programmes, panels, meetings) of both short and longer duration between EU citizens, in order to strengthen the European identity. The participants should be representative of the society from within EU that would include targeted groups based on various criteria, ie. demographic, socio-economic and occupation criteria. The goals of this fund need to be clearly specified in order to stimulate the European identity and the fund needs to be evaluated on a regular basis".

We recommend this because these kinds of interactions enable citizens to share ideas, and longer exchanges enable them to understand the different cultures and to share experiences, including professional practices. An EU fund is needed because it is important that everyone can participate, including those who generally do not participate.

28. “We recommend that the EU invests in countering disinformation swiftly, by supporting existing organisations and initiatives, such as the Code of Practice on Disinformation and the European Digital Media Observatory, and similar initiatives in the Member States. The counter-measures could include fact-checking, creating awareness about disinformation, providing easily accessible statistics, appropriately sanctioning those who spread disinformation based on a legal framework, and tackling the sources of disinformation”.

This recommendation is important because misinformation and disinformation, coming from within and outside of the EU, create conflicts among EU citizens, polarise the society, put democracy at risk and damage the economy. Given the complexity of the topic, significant human and financial resources are needed.

29. “We recommend 1) to increase the frequency of online and offline interactions between the EU and its citizens (ie. by asking citizens directly about EU matters and by creating an user-friendly platform to ensure that every citizen can interact with EU institutions and EU officials), and 2) in order to ensure that citizens can participate in the EU policy-making process, to voice their opinions and to get feedbacks, we recommend to create a charter or a code of conduct or guidelines for EU officials. Different means of interactions should exist so that every citizen can participate”.

This recommendation and the reasons which justify it are important because, if implemented, it will help to build a common European identity by improving communication between citizens of all Member States.
We recommend this because several means to reach EU institutions exist (online platforms, representatives bodies), but they are not known, not effective and not transparent. There are huge differences in accessibility between countries. More frequent and better quality interactions will lead to a sense of ownership of EU citizenship.

30. “We recommend that European identity and values (i.e. rule of law, democracy and solidarity) should receive a special place within the migrants’ integration process. Possible measures could include creating programmes or supporting already existing (local) programmes, to encourage social interactions between migrants and EU citizens or involving companies in the programmes supporting the integration of migrants. At the same time, similar programmes should be initiated in order to create awareness among EU citizens about migration-related issues”.

This recommendation is important because social interaction programmes can support migrants in their new life and enable non-migrants to have insight in the daily life of migrants. If migrants live in ghettos, there is no possibility to integrate them into the society of the country and of the EU. A common policy is needed because once migrants enter EU territory, they can go to every country within the EU. Local initiatives should be supported because local governments will use the funds more effectively in comparison to national level.

Substream 4.3 Information about EU

31. “We recommend that the EU provides more information and news to European citizens. It should use any means that are necessary while respecting freedom and independence of the media. It should provide media outlets with resources as well as a broad and reliable information about EU activities and policies. The EU should guarantee that the information is broadcasted evenly across all Member States by National and European media and should ensure that Member States encourage public broadcasters and public news agencies to cover European affairs”.

We recommend this because based on our personal experience and based on the data from Eurobarometer, the majority of European citizens are informed through the traditional media (press, radio and television) and the information currently offered in these channels about the EU is very scarce. The media, particularly the public, have a public service function, so reporting on EU issues that affect the European population is essential and indispensable to fulfill that function. We recommend that the information issued in the different Member States about the EU be the same in order to promote integration and avoid different information on different issues in each country. Using the already existing media channels is more feasible, and less expensive than creating a new channel and achieves the same outcome. The pre-existing channels also have the advantage that they are already known by citizens. No citizen should need to choose between different channels to be able to access different (national or European) content.

32. “We recommend the EU to create and advertise multilingual online forums and offline meetings where citizens can launch discussions with EU representatives, no matter the topic and no matter the geographical scope of the issue raised. Those online forums and offline meetings should have a defined short-term time limit in which responses to the questions are received. All the information about these spaces should be centralized in an integrated official website with different features; such as a frequently asked questions space, the possibility to share ideas, proposals or concerns with other citizens and with a mechanism to identify the most supported ones. In any case, access to it should be easy and a non-bureaucratic language should be used”.

We recommend this because it will create a direct channel between European citizens and European representatives to talk and engage together, giving the citizens an easy access to information about
the EU and making them more aware of the existing information. It will create a more transparent and open EU and will help citizens to share their problems and thoughts, receive answers and policy solutions and allow them to engage and share perspectives and experiences with other citizens.

33. “We recommend the EU institutions and representatives to use a more accessible language and avoid using bureaucratic terms in their communications while, at the same time, maintaining the quality and expertise of the given information. The EU should also adapt the information it provides to citizens with different communication channels and audience profiles (e.g. newspapers, television, social media). The EU should make a special effort to adapt communication to digital media in order to increase its outreach capacity to young people”.

We recommend this because having understandable information will allow the EU to reach more European citizens and not only the engaged ones. By having specific new and modern tools to target specific audiences, citizens will better understand EU activities and policies, particularly the young people who are not feeling close or attached to the EU.

Stream 5: Strengthening citizen participation

Substream 5.1 Citizen participation

34. “We recommend that independent citizen observers should be present during all EU decision making processes. There should be a forum or permanent body of citizens representatives in order to carry out the function of broadcasting relevant and important information to all EU citizens as defined EU citizens. Those citizens would engage with all other European citizens in the spirit of top-down / bottom-up connection, which would further develop the dialogue between citizens and the institutions of the EU”.

Because it is obvious that citizens deserve to be kept informed about any and all issues, and to make sure that politicians cannot not hide certain issues from citizens that they would rather they did not know. This would bridge the divide between citizens and elected representatives by establishing new avenues of trust.

35. “We recommend that the EU reopens the discussion about the constitution of Europe with a view to creating a constitution informed by the citizens of the EU. Citizens should be able to vote in the creation of such a constitution. This constitution in order to avoid conflict with the member states should prioritize the inclusion of human rights and democracy values. The creation of such a constitution should consider previous efforts that never materialized to a constitution”.

Because this constitution would engage young people with politics at the EU level and counteract increasing forces of nationalism. Because it would provide a common definition of what is meant by democracy in Europe, and make sure that this is implemented in an equal way amongst all member states. Because the EU has shared values regarding democracy and human rights. Because this would enable citizens to be included in the decision making process, and allow citizens to identify more as being from the EU - having participated in the process.

36. “We recommend that politicians are more responsible in representing the citizens that they are elected to represent. Young people in particular are specially alienated from politics and are not taken seriously whenever they are included. But alienation is a universal issue and people of all ages should be engaged more than what they currently are”.
Because the definition of what democracy is needs to be refreshed. We need to remind ourselves what democracy really is. Democracy is about representing the people (EU citizens). Because young people are fed up and disillusioned with politicians who they view as elites who do not share their views. That is why people should be included more than they currently are in novel and engaging ways. The education system, then social media, and all other forms of media could carry out this role throughout the lifecycle and in all languages.

Substream 5.2 Citizen participation

37. “We recommend that the EU should be closer to citizens in a more assertive way, which means involving the Member States in the promotion of citizens’ participation in the EU. The EU should promote the use of the mechanisms of citizens' participation, by developing marketing and publicity campaigns. The national and local governments should be obliged to be involved in this process. The EU should guarantee the effectiveness of participative democracy platforms”.

We recommend this because the platform that already exists needs to be made stronger and efficient: there needs to be more feedback to the EU from the citizens and vice versa. There is not enough debate within the EU, both between the citizens and governments. Because the citizens do not engage in submitting petitions either because they do not know that the process exists or they do not believe in the success of such a petition.

38. “We recommend that the EU creates and implements programmes for schools about what is being done in the EU in terms of the existing mechanisms of participation. These programmes should be included in the school curricula about European citizenship and ethics with content adequate to the age. There should also be programmes for adults. There should be lifelong learning programmes available to citizens to further their knowledge about the possibilities of EU citizen participation”.

We recommend this, because it is important for the future of our children. The citizens want to know how to express their voice. It is important that they know the exact mechanisms and how they can be used, so that their voice is heard by the EU. It is important for the equal inclusion of all European citizens. As European citizens, we need to know how to use our rights. By virtue of being European citizens, we are entitled to this knowledge.

Substream 5.3 Citizen participation

39. “We recommend that the European Union holds Citizen’s Assemblies. We strongly recommend that they are developed through a legally binding and compulsory law or regulation. The citizens' assemblies should be held every 12-18 months. Participation of the citizens should not be mandatory but incentivised, while organised on the basis of limited mandates. Participants must be selected randomly, with representativity criteria, also not representing any organisation of any kind, nor being called to participate because of their professional role when being assembly members. If needed, there will be support of experts so that assembly members have enough information for deliberation. Decision-making will be in the hands of citizens. The EU must ensure the commitment of politicians to citizens’ decisions taken in Citizens’ Assemblies. In case citizens' proposals are ignored or explicitly rejected, EU institutions must be accountable for it, justifying the reasons why this decision was made”.

We recommend the implementation of Citizens’ Assemblies because we want that citizens feel closer to EU institutions and that they contribute directly to decision-making hand to hand with politicians, increasing the feeling of belonging and direct efficacy. Furthermore, we want political parties and
their electoral programs to be accountable to citizens.
Annex I: How were recommendations produced?

A. An Overview of Session 3

SESSION 3

DAY 1
- Reconnecting and getting ready
- Prioritizing orientations
- Start transforming orientations into recommendations

· Welcome and agenda
· Input from platform
· Explanation of objectives and process

· Citizens read and prioritize orientations
· Experts and fact-checkers are available for Q&A

· Citizens start transforming orientations into recommendations

DAY 2
- Transforming orientations into recommendations
- Finalising recommendations

· Transform orientations into recommendations
· Feedback from other groups and finalise recommendations

DAY 3
- Working on key Messages for the Conference Plenary
- Voting recommendations

- Working on key Messages for the Conference Plenary
· Closing words
· Finalisation of Key Messages

- Voting recommendations
B. Recommendation production scheme

**STEP 1: ORIENTATIONS**

**STEP 2: CLUSTERING**

**STEP 3: PRIORITIZING 5 CLUSTERS**

**STEP 4: RECOMMENDATIONS**
C. Detailed process for the production of recommendations

Plenary 1

Objective: Reconnecting as a Panel and getting ready for Session 3

Welcome; Floor to citizens; Platform update; Agenda of the weekend; Introduction to methodology of the session

Open forum 1

Objective: Prioritising orientations

Reading the orientations and informal discussion in rooms (no interpretation provided); prioritising orientations with stickers; Each citizen was given fifty stickers (ten green for stream 1, ten red for stream 2, ten blue for stream 3, ten yellow for stream 4, ten purple for stream 5) and proceeded to prioritise up to ten orientations, per stream. Five black stickers were allocated per citizen to prioritise the orientations produced by their own subgroup.
Subgroup work 1

**Objective**: Starting transforming orientations into recommendations

Saturday, 11/12/2021

Subgroup work 2

**Objective 1**: Transform orientations into recommendations

The same methodology as in subgroup work 1 was followed.

**Objective 2**: Giving/receiving feedback to other subgroups from the same stream.

**Objective 3**: Giving/receiving feedback from other subgroups from different streams.

The same methodology as before was continued.

**Objective 4**: Finalising recommendations

In this last phase, an attempt was made to integrate feedback from the other subgroups and from fact checking. The subgroups finalised their recommendations.

Sunday, 12/12/2021

Open forum 2

**Objective**: Work on key messages for the Conference Plenary

The group of 20 Panel representatives to the Conference Plenary worked also between sessions to produce the key messages. To do this, they conducted interviews with other participants to try to capture these messages and to be able to communicate the Panel's findings in a simple way. Key messages should reflect the recommendations and their justifications.

Plenary 2

**Objective**: Voting recommendations

Instructions given to participants:

1. Press a button in the tablet
2. Scan a QR code to access the link of the form with the Stream’s recommendations
3. Check your Personal Identification Number (PIN) that is behind the tablet
4. Introduce the PIN in the form

5. Vote thumb up or thumb down for each of the recommendations in each Stream and submit

6. The recommendations with 70% or more thumbs up from the votes cast are adopted.
Annex II: Experts’ and Fact-checkers’ inputs to support the fact-checking process

The experts’ and fact-checkers’ input was coordinated by the so-called “Knowledge and Information Centre – KICK”, consisting of members of the Common Secretariat and the deliberation group, with the support of post-doctoral students of the EUI. Whenever participants, facilitators, observers or attending experts detected a need for factual clarification, this was communicated to the KICK, which redirected the question to the appropriate expert and/or fact-checker.

A number of experts onsite and online followed the subgroups’ deliberations in order to be able to trigger fact-checking. Besides, experts from the three Institutions were on call in order to reply to fact-checking questions in their respective fields of expertise, in particular as regards already existing regulatory and other policy instruments.

Experts and fact-checkers were requested to respond within a very short delay by returning as clear a text as possible which could be transmitted by the facilitator to the participants upon approval by the KICK.

List of experts onsite and online:

Experts for stream 1 - Ensuring rights and non-discrimination

- Costanza Hermanin, Policy Leader Fellow at the European University Institute in Florence
- Hielke Hijmans, President of the Litigation Chamber/Member Executive Board of the Belgian Data Protection Authority

Experts for stream 2 - Protecting democracy and the rule of law

- Carlos Closa Montero, Professor, EUI School of Transnational Governance/IPP-CSIC, Spain
- Paul Blokker, Associate professor in Sociology, University of Bologna
- Raphael Bossong, German Institute for International and Security Affairs
- Elda Brogi, Professor at EUI Center for Media Policy and Media Freedom. Member of the Executive Board of EDMO, European Digital Media Observatory

Experts for stream 3 - Reforming the EU

- Katrin Auel, Head of the Research Group European Governance, Public Finance and Labour Markets at Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna
- Corinna Stratulat, European Policy Center, Head of European Politics and Institutions Programme and Senior Policy Analyst
- Ariadna Ripoll Servent, Professor for Politics of the European Union at the Salzburg Center of European Union Studies (SCEUS) and at the department of Political Science and Sociology at Salzburg University
- Diane Fromage, Marie Sklodowska-Curie individual fellow at Sciences Po Law School, Paris
- Kalypso Nicolaidis, Professor at the School of Transnational Governance and Professor of International Relations at the University of Oxford
- Ulrike Liebert, Jean Monnet Chair of European Studies, University of Bremen
Experts for stream 4 - Building European identity

- **Hans-Jörg Trenz**, Professor of Sociology of Culture and Communication at Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa/Florence, Italy
- Antoine Godbert, previous head of the Erasmus Agency in Bordeaux, member of the Cercle Erasmus

Experts for stream 5 - Strengthening citizen participation

- **Alberto Alemanno**, Professor in European Union Law & Policy at HEC Paris
- **Dominik Hierlemann**, Bertelsmann Foundation

Annex III: Other recommendations that were considered by the panel and not adopted

Stream 1 Ensuring rights and non-discrimination

Substream 1.1 Non-discrimination / Substream 1.2 Gender equality

“We recommend the EU to actively include minorities in policy-making regarding key aspects of state institutions (e.g. police and NGOs). We recommend the EU should establish an advisory board, directly elected by minorities. The composition should be predominately by minority representatives with NGOs also present. It should have a formative role in training civil servants to care for the needs of minorities. This body should have a veto right on minority issues”.

We recommend this because the voices of minorities are not heard enough. They should speak on their own behalf, self-determined and at a professional level which is why we combined representation by voting and expertise.

Stream 2: Protecting democracy and the rule of law

Substream 2.2 Protecting and strengthening democracy / Substream 2.4 Media and disinformation

“We recommend establishing an agency for monitoring audiovisual media, print and digital media at the European level. This agency should monitor that national media outlets follow an impartial and objective process in the production of their content. To prevent disinformation, the agency should provide a scoring system on the reliability of national media outlets. This scoring system should be easy to understand for citizens”.

We recommend this because we need evaluation of the media and their reliability, but also media diversity in EU countries. An EU agency would be most objective in ensuring this. Moreover, a scoring system enables citizens to make informed choices and incentivises media outlets to provide reliable news. If the scoring system proves insufficient for ensuring the reliability of media outlets, the agency should also obtain the competence of imposing sanctions.

Stream 5: Strengthening citizen participation
Substream 5.1 Citizen participation

“We recommend that there should be a citizen’s representative body created to discuss and inform decision-making in a significant way - whenever there is an issue being decided upon at EU level which is of major significance to European citizens (as decided by citizens - potentially via survey). This should be a diverse group of approximately 100 citizens from all EU countries with equal representation for each country. This should be a revolving group where members are periodically changed”.

Because it is important to avoid issues such as corruption that may arise from a permanent representative body, and that it is vital such a body has equal representation from all countries to avoid unfair decision-making power. Because operating in this way would avoid challenges associated with constantly assembling or using technology from afar.

Annex IV: Clustered Orientations

Stream 1 Ensuring rights and non-discrimination

Substream 1.1 Non-discrimination

1. **1.1.1.1 orientation**: Uniform rules must be applied equally in all EU countries and monitored by the EU. It is precisely the vulnerable who need more protection.

2. **1.1.1.2 orientation**: Minorities must be more involved and better represented. They need to get involved in the formulation of laws and society must listen to them more carefully
   - **1.1.1.3 orientation**: Representatives of minorities should have a solid, self-determined representation in the EU institutions
   - **1.1.2.4 orientation**: Better structures are needed so that minorities can actively participate.
   - **2.3.2.3 orientation**: The EU should improve inclusion, diversity and increase visibility space and voice for people belonging to minorities, because they are not sufficiently represented in public and private institutions and in national and European level events. Today public and private organizations are still too homogeneous and still show too little diversity and inclusion.

3. **1.1.1.4 orientation**: A realistic picture of minorities must be shown in schools, fears must be addressed, information must be provided with facts and dialogue with minorities must be established. This also applies to the workplace. This must be underpinned by a law.
   - **2.3.2.2 orientation**: The EU should push national governments to introduce education against violence in schools, such as lessons on respect for ethnic and religious minorities but also sexual and gender education, because directly linked to the problem of sexual abuse, violence and homophobia.
   - **2.3.2.4 orientation**: The EU should invest resources to support good practices to combat violence that exist in the Member States. For example by supporting public and private support centres that exist in different countries.
   - **2.3.2.1 orientation**: The EU should play a stronger role in ensuring the security of the LGBTI + population against violence and discrimination.
   - **2.3.2.5 orientation**: In education and awareness on violence, we must not focus only on children, but also on the general population.

---

3 In the process of clustering, three orientations were not included in the list by mistake: 5.3.1.1 orientation: Promote education in participation (at a EU level). 1.2.2.4 orientation: The EU must help to rethink constructs of masculinity and femininity. 1.2.2.1 orientation: Cultural battle, acknowledge and understand the privilege of being “male” so that awareness is raised about the implications of being a woman. The citizens were informed accordingly.
4. **1.1.2.3 orientation**: More data about discrimination must be collected in the Member States. It also requires effective reporting, in which States are obliged to gather and forward data on discrimination. The data should be anonymised and made public. In addition, there should be access to help. Multiple discrimination must also be clear on the platform. (There must be control against abuse).

**1.2.3.3 orientation**: Sanctions should apply in cases of discrimination.

5. **1.1.3.1 orientation**: The EU should improve access to the labour market for younger and older people and reduce discrimination.

6. **1.1.3.2 orientation**: Lower the voting age to 16

**Substream 1.2 Gender equality**

7. **1.2.1.1 orientation**: Training needed when women return from parental leave.

8. **1.2.1.2 orientation**: Teleworking makes it easier for women to develop their careers, especially when they have to take care of their children.

9. **1.2.1.3 orientation**: Single parents should have the option to work less hours to be able to dedicate themselves to the family.

10. **1.2.1.4 orientation**: Companies need more kindergartens to facilitate employee work-life balance.

**1.2.1.5 orientation**: Parental leave for fathers should be more attractive

11. **1.2.3.1 orientation**: Men should share responsibilities that have traditionally always been allocated to women.

12. **1.2.3.2 orientation**: Need to also acknowledge other struggles that people go through, such as conditions of disability.

13. **1.2.4.1 orientation**: Educational and communication could be another more sustainable orientation to help share perspectives on rights and freedoms and keep a unified EU.

14. **1.2.5.1 orientation**: Anonymous interviews for employment, so that gender is not a factor in the selection. Interviews could also be recorded so that it can be verified that they are effective.

**1.2.5.3 orientation**: In order to avoid discrimination, employment agencies should be responsible for hiring.

15. **1.2.5.5 orientation**: European legal framework to tackle the work rights violations. The EU should ensure that Member States implement the rules against discrimination so that we can achieve gender equality. Legal counselling by the EU to aid with legal advice to fight discrimination.

16. **1.2.5.5 orientation**: Provide more flexible working hours.

**Substream 1.3 Protecting human rights and the rights of nature and animals**

17. **1.3.1.2 orientation**: Education and communication could be another more sustainable orientation to help share perspectives on rights and freedoms and keep a unified EU.

**2.1.2.4 orientation**: Continuously and consistently incorporating information about EU values/citizenship/structure, etc. into school curricula on all education levels. Investing in European civic education.
18. **1.3.2.1 orientation**: Strengthen the mandate of the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency with tools to protect vulnerable individuals and minorities in all Member States.

19. **1.3.2.2 orientation**: Independence and capacity building of media and journalists could help to ensure a balanced reporting on, for example, minorities and migrants, reflect the positive sides and reduce the exaggeration of stereotyping of migrants and refugees.

20. **1.3.3.1 orientation**: EU should establish common regulations with regards to protection of well-being for animals in farming

   **1.3.3.3 orientation**: An orientation could be at EU level to stop subsidising a large part of the agricultural market that produces and breeds animals as part of mass production under bad animal welfare conditions.

21. **1.3.3.2 orientation**: Animal rights are secondary to issues on Human Rights and Environmental protection.

22. **1.3.3.4 orientation**: Taxing climate negative factors like methane and CO2 emissions from agriculture and harmonising taxation to encourage local meat production as another orientation would help the climate and reduce transport of animals over long distances.

**Substream 1.4 Right to privacy**

23. **1.4.1.1 orientation**: Regular audit of online services to prevent and check breaches and/or abuse of privacy rights/data protection.

   **1.4.1.2 orientation**: Put a fine on companies that breach and abuse privacy rights / data protection; the fine should be proportionate to the market value of the company.

24. **1.4.2.1 orientation**: Regulate providers to share user-friendly and easy-to-understand documentation and consent requests about data protection with users.

   **1.4.2.2 orientation**: Raise awareness of the existence of national and EU bodies in charge of data protection.

   **2.3.3.4 orientation**: The EU should offer mechanisms to protect personal data that can be easily accessible for all citizens.

25. **1.4.3.1 orientation**: Prevent websites from sharing “cookies” information with third parties.

26. **1.4.3.2 orientation**: Review and update current legislation so as to make the use of data proportionate to the actual needs.

   **1.4.3.3 orientation**: Initiate a specific EU-wide decision making process to get clarity on the trade-off between sharing data and prevention of its abuse (with appropriate distinction for each specific sector, e.g. health, security, etc).

27. **1.4.4.1 orientation**: Allow EU’s access to the European Convention of Human Rights so as to guarantee all EU Member States comply with the right to privacy and data protection equally.

28. **1.4.5.1 orientation**: Provide clearer and stricter rules about the use of social media by minors in order to prevent their privacy risks.

   **1.4.5.2 orientation**: Dedicated school programmes.

   **2.3.3.2 orientation**: Education and prevention are a priority. The EU should invest resources in the Member States to educate and raise awareness of children in schools to protect their personal data.

   **2.3.3.3 orientation**: The EU should promote citizens’ awareness and use awareness campaigns on the subject of personal data protection.
Stream 2: Protecting democracy and the rule of law

Substream 2.1 Protecting rule of law

29. **2.1.1.1 orientation:** The EU should urge Member States to actively address this within their national jurisdictions.

30. **2.1.1.2 orientation:** The EU should take measures to combat weaponized anonymity (anonymity that is used to enable unethical practices in publishing).

31. **2.1.2.1 orientation:** The EU should invest in grassroots efforts to strengthen democratic values in Member States.

32. **2.1.2.2 orientation:** The EU should invest in measures (projects) that foster cooperation and exchange between different groups/regions/nations.

33. **2.1.2.3 orientation:** Creating non-judgemental spaces where countries can learn from each other with the aim of improving their democratic practices.

34. **2.1.3.1 orientation:** Creating transnational, European political parties that all European politicians would be able to join.

35. **1.1.2.1 orientation:** There is a need for clear EU sanctions against Member States that are effectively enforced and act as a deterrent. One possibility is the cancellation of EU funds.

**1.3.1.1 orientation:** Combine sanctions and bonus systems and define Member State groups according to their level of implemented human rights, freedoms and equality.

**2.1.4.1 orientation:** The EU should pursue amicable dialogue with non-compliant states first. As a second step, Article 7 of the Treaty on European Union should be used. Finally, EU funds should be withdrawn from non-compliant states.

**2.2.2.2 orientation:** We need to have a common regulatory framework. If this regulatory framework is not respected, then we can use sanctions.

**4.2.1.4 orientation:** Enforce sanctions just as a last resort. If everything else fails - including dialogue. Have a framework and sequence of use of sanctions.

Substream 2.2 Protecting and strengthening democracy

36. **2.2.1.1 orientation:** A common basis in terms of understanding and identifying a case of corruption is needed. When is lobbying appropriate and when does it become corruption?

**2.2.1.2 orientation:** Protect those who fight corruption. It is necessary to protect them and then protect the process by which we can do so. We need to identify how we can do that.

**4.2.4.3 orientation:** Better rules for lobbying in the EU in order to reduce loss of money due to corruption

37. **2.2.3.1 orientation:** All EU countries should be required to introduce a minimum European income, but also a minimum European wage in order to have a decent life. A support for people who need to be reintegrated into the labour market.

**2.3.5.2 orientation:** The EU should introduce a minimum wage at European level.

Substream 2.3 Security

38. **2.3.1.1 orientation:** The issue of balance between security and rights, in particular freedom of expression, is a central problem for security, but also a very complicated problem to address. As citizens, we struggle to position.
39. **2.3.1.2 orientation:** We know that security threats are serious but we think that Europe should avoid taking authoritarian measures and should instead work more at the level of prevention and dissuasion.

40. **2.3.1.3 orientation:** The EU should work in coordination with the big corporations of the web and social networks (Facebook, Google and Twitter) and with police forces of different member countries, to dissuade those who publish dangerous content and to carry out police investigations of the origin of these dangerous content and threat level.

41. **2.3.2.6 orientation:** The EU should encourage Member State education ministries to guarantee psychological aid in schools for all children and families and not only for those who require it or that are addressed by social workers.

42. **2.3.3.1 orientation:** Apply and comply with the General Data Protection Regulation for data protection.

43. **2.3.3.5 orientation:** The EU institutions and Member States should be more coordinated to protect their citizens, their democracy and their values against the new threats coming from the outside, such as cybersecurity and the criminal use of artificial intelligence.

44. **2.3.4.1 orientation:** The EU should strengthen its commitment to exporting its model of democracy and its values out of its borders. Not with weapons but with diplomacy, by sharing best practices internationally and by raising awareness.

45. **2.3.4.3 orientation:** The EU should strengthen its coordination to make dialogue, mediation and negotiation with neighbouring countries more effective for issues concerning borders.

46. **2.3.5.1 orientation:** Protect European citizens against accidents at work and prevent unhealthy or dangerous work environments.

47. **2.3.6.1 orientation:** The EU should do more to impose the transparency of banking and financial transactions.

48. **2.3.7.1 orientation:** It is necessary that EU institutions do more to control and contain the structural phenomena of terrorism and organized crime.

49. **2.3.7.2 orientation:** We propose to constitute a European agency for the fight against terrorism and organized crime (including mafias and new forms of organized crime as international gangs).

50. **2.3.7.3 orientation:** Establish a real European police.

**Substream 2.4 Media and disinformation**

51. **2.4.1.1 orientation:** Politicians should not be able to hold shares in the media.

**2.4.1.2 orientation:** There is a need for a European verification process to prove the impartiality of media companies financed by politicians.

**2.4.1.3 orientation:** We need to create a space of neutral news. News that no longer receives emotional attachments.

**2.4.2.1 orientation:** There is a need for a European verification process to prove the impartiality and objectivity of news. We need to create a space of neutral news.

**3.2.2.1 orientation:** There could be a scoring system or metric which evaluates the credibility of news providers and information released by the EU (articles that have proven to be false, etc. as the metric).

**5.1.2.6 orientation:** Separation of politics and media and control of that separation. Among other things: The parties should not be owners of media platforms.

52. **2.4.2.2 orientation:** It is necessary for new users to be better educated in understanding this informational space. We need to educate children from school and make them understand how news
is created. There is an informational illiteracy and we need to work on this problem. We need media education.

2.4.3.1 orientation: We need training sessions in schools about this subject, educating young people to be properly informed.

2.4.3.2 orientation: We need more training events. Events especially dedicated to citizens living in rural areas, through which they can understand the flow of information.

Stream 3: Reforming the EU

Substream 3.1 Institutional reform

53. 3.1.1.1 orientation: Increase the transparency of the reasons why some candidate countries get accepted into the EU and others are not accepted.

54. 3.1.1.2 orientation: For EU accession criteria, the criterion on the values and democracy should be given priority (as compared to economic development).

55. 3.1.2.1 orientation: Increase EU’s support for the candidate states so that they can strengthen their institutions and economies (in a manner that is closely supervised by the European Union).

56. 3.1.3.1 orientation: European Union citizens should have the right to vote for transnational party lists during European Parliament elections (either a single transnational election list or two lists - one national and one transnational).

57. 3.1.5.1 orientation: There should be a broad review of competences of the European Union and European Union institutions.

58. 3.1.5.2 orientation: There should be more powers allocated to those EU institutions that are elected directly by the EU citizens.

59. 3.1.6.1 orientation: EU institutions should be renamed so that their names are less confusing for citizens.

3.1.6.2 orientation: The European Union should have more distinct symbols (such as logo) that would not be so similar to other international organisations (such as the Council of Europe).

3.1.6.3 orientation: The European Union should be precise in its communications - it should use the word “European Union” rather than "Europe", because Europe is not just the European Union, it is a broader term.

Substream 3.2 Decision-making

60. 3.2.2.2 orientation: Create an online platform where citizens can publish information which they are not sure about, and experts can fact-check the information.

61. 3.2.3.1 orientation: There should be an EU-wide referendum held whenever it comes to an issue of extreme significance to all European citizens.

62. 3.2.3.2 orientation: There should be greater thought put into online voting and online citizen input to affect the decision-making process.

63. 3.2.3.3 orientation: There should be a system of greater or total parliamentary control and accountability in relation to decisions on financial help / welfare / and how community funds are spent in the EU.
64. **3.2.4.1 orientation:** An alternative system of voting should be used instead. Voting 'weight' should be calculated fairly so that small countries' interests are protected.

65. **3.2.4.2 orientation:** There needs to be structural change to the existing treaties, or alternatively, a new constitution which is agreed upon by Member States.

66. **3.2.4.3 orientation:** It is very important that whatever system is created provides relatively fair voting power or 'weight' to smaller countries when it comes to decision-making.

67. **3.2.5.1 orientation:** There should be a mechanism where Parliament is temporarily bypassed and decisions are made immediately by the EU Council.

68. **3.2.5.2 orientation:** There should be a representative body of citizen experts which provides information and guidance to the European Parliament in emergency situations.

**Substream 3.3 Closer integration**

69. **3.3.1.1 orientation:** An expert group first proposes how such a common economic structure could look like and what consequences the suggested common economic structure would have - before we start discussing if we want to have a common economic structure or not.

70. **3.3.1.2 orientation:** It is important to establish a common basis for all Member States (same opportunities, same level) in order to reach a common economic structure.

71. **3.3.2.1 orientation:** We suggest having more public investments in order to improve the quality of life of people (infrastructure, roads, but we could also consider housing/social housing).

72. **3.3.2.2 orientation:** Taxation of big corporations/income from big corporations to contribute to public investments, use the taxation to invest into education and development of each country (R&D, scholarships - Erasmus etc.).

73. **3.3.2.3 orientation:** Progressive taxing of financial transactions and of banks to get income from big financial transactions.

74. **3.3.3.2 orientation:** Pan-EU survey by random sample of informed citizens on which direction to take, pan-EU Information campaign about possible outcomes of such changes prior to it.

75. **3.3.3.3 orientation:** Prepare a crisis scenario in which EU powers would be increased.

76. **3.3.4.1 orientation:** Need to establish what we are in Europe first, only then we can say what we are not (suggestion: It can be done through a survey among citizens).

**Stream 4: Building European identity**

**Substream 4.1 Education on democracy**

77. **4.1.1.1 orientation:** Use artificial intelligence to assist the translation process.

78. **4.1.1.2 orientation:** Utilise a master language (such as English) in order to communicate.

79. **4.1.1.3 orientation:** Create an app that could disseminate information about democratic issues and translate this to the language of the user.

80. **4.1.2.1 orientation:** The encouragement of democratic-style processes within schools - such as student councils which vote on basic administrative matters in school. Using the internet and computer
technology (on-line polls) for raising issues.

81. **4.1.2.2 orientation:** Including EU studies as part of the curriculum across EU-Member States.
   **4.1.3.1 orientation:** The sooner this education process starts the better. Suggestion made from beginning from ages 10-12+. The pupil Council concept should start at 12. Below that age there should be age appropriate engagement
   **4.1.4.1 orientation:** We should not teach political views but teach about the democratic processes of the EU and how it works. The difference should be clear to both teachers and students.
   **4.1.4.2 orientation:** Not all citizens agreed that a cross European syllabus could be agreed between Member States.
   **4.1.4.3 orientation:** We should have a simple process on how to explain the EU to all.
   **4.1.5.1 orientation:** Education systems in the EU should not be uniform.
   **4.2.2.3 orientation:** Uniform school curriculum about the EU already in primary schools.
   **4.3.8.1 orientation:** Create a new subject for secondary education that introduces content on the current functioning of the EU and the measures it takes and how they affect citizens.

82. **4.1.2.3 orientation:** Schools could be incentivised through grants or gifted equipment to encourage schools to implement EU democratic studies.
   **4.1.3.2 orientation:** Subsidies should be paid to schools who introduce democratic practices as part of school life. It should not be mandatory but schools should be incentivised.

**Substream 4.2 European values and identity**

83. **4.2.1.1 orientation:** Search for the causes of nationalism and protectionism of some Member States, especially through the dialogue on values and correct understanding of the related concepts.

84. **4.2.1.2 orientation:** Address the issue of political extremism, which often exploits anti-European sentiment for its own ends.

85. **4.2.1.3 orientation:** Improve continuous communication with Member States’ citizens. Involve citizens more in the process. Citizens should be given the opportunity to participate as much as possible.

86. **4.2.1.5 orientation:** Coordinate the compliance with European rules at all levels, also at national and local level.

87. **4.2.2.2 orientation:** Customize information for certain groups. Change and simplify the terminology.

88. **4.2.4 orientation:** Engage all groups of citizens in different innovative ways.

89. **4.2.5 orientation:** Allow people to travel more, meet and discuss various issues within the EU. Even those who are not financially well-off. Create a special fund for that (like Erasmus).
   **4.3.3.1 orientation:** To create more European exchange programmes or activities, such as the Erasmus programme or this conference, so that people can travel to other countries, meet the people of other countries and have a dialogue about their life and their relationship with Europe.

90. **4.2.3.1 orientation:** Tackle disinformation problem. Pay increased attention to the source of misinformation.

91. **4.2.3.2 orientation:** Support actively Member States in their local problems with disinformation campaigns.

92. **4.2.3.3 orientation:** Solve the migration crises.
4.2.3.4 orientation: Increase internet security - protection against hacking.

4.2.3.5 orientation: Create a common EU foreign policy. Coordinate steps in foreign policy between the EU and Member States.

4.2.4.1 orientation: Improve tax collection process from major multinational companies. Address also the problem of tax havens.

4.2.4.2 orientation: Improve the transparency of EU funds - in Member States and EU institutions.

Substream 4.3 Information about EU

4.3.3.2 orientation: Create online forums and meeting places where citizens can listen, ask questions and engage in dialogue with European representatives, with multilingual translation.

4.3.5.1 orientation: Use communication strategies that communicate in a simpler and more accessible language, accompanying this communication with more detailed, more technical reports, so that whoever wants to can go deeper

4.3.7.2 orientation: Make better use of the key role of social media today.

4.3.7.3 orientation: Analyse who the target audience is, what kind of channels they use to communicate and adapt the communication to those channels (adding links for those who want to go deeper).

4.3.5.3 orientation: Broadcast EU advertising spots at major events (Eurovision, sporting events, etc.) and in prime-time programmes

4.3.6.1 orientation: Getting the EU government to be more open to citizens.

2.1.3.2 orientation: Encouraging national media outlets to cover more EU-level developments.

3.2.1.1 orientation: The media should be strongly encouraged to provide greater air time to European issues, and activities within the European Union.

4.3.1.1 orientation: There should be a news block on public television news programmes about Europe, in the same way as there is a block on sports or other subjects.

4.3.5.2 orientation: In the media there should be programmes, slots, that specifically report on the EU.

4.3.7.4 orientation: Include in TV news a block of information on the EU, as is done for sports and other issues.

3.2.3.4 orientation: Public debates broadcasted by the EU could be a potential solution. There could be newspapers and news agencies that deliver this information to the people.

3.3.3.1 orientation: Improve informing of citizens about the EU: A channel where we find all information about the EU, PR team of EU informing about activities of EU using diverse channels to reach different target groups, also a possibility to engage Member States in active informing about EU activities, include it in school curriculum, easy and fun format.

4.3.2.1 orientation: Create an independent European information channel or agency to transmit true information and counteract fake and biased news.

4.3.7.1 orientation: We need an information channel that can transmit that information (what the EU does and why).

5.2.3.2 orientation: Involve the media in promoting EU transparency mechanisms.
Stream 5: Strengthening citizen participation

Substream 5.1 Citizen participation

102. **5.1.1.1 orientation**: We need transparency about what was discussed in citizen participation processes.

103. **5.1.1.2 orientation**: All the decisions of the EU should be transparent so that citizens feel involved.

104. **5.1.2.5 orientation**: The linking of expert knowledge and policy should be institutionalized. It should be set and transparent, such as consulting or how governmental experts are selected.

105. **5.1.2.3 orientation**: We must make it attractive to vote. We do not want a mandatory vote.

106. **5.1.2.4 orientation**: Constant representation of citizens in the EU Parliament / European Commission; Citizens should be involved in the decision-making process.

107. **5.1.3.1 orientation**: Direct democracy: Define concretely the topics on which direct democracy should be used.

108. **5.1.3.2 orientation**: All citizens should be able to vote on the European constitution.

109. **5.1.4.1 orientation**: The cooperation of the Member States and the EU should improve in some policy fields. The EU’s action fields / competences should not be expanded without reason (“not blindly”).

110. **5.1.4.2 orientation**: Analyse why a loss of confidence between politics and citizens is created.

111. **5.1.5.1 orientation**: Information platform for violations or non-compliance with EU directives and regulations.

Substream 5.2 Citizen participation

112. **5.2.1.3 orientation**: The EU should be receptive to ideas coming directly from citizens, not only national governments. For example: creating an EU-wide platform for starting petitions and civic initiatives.

113. **5.2.1.4 orientation**: Consultation extended to citizens before decisions are taken.

114. **5.2.1.5 orientation**: Improvement of the reporting mechanisms of politicians to citizens and not just their parties. It is necessary to go beyond the annual reports. As preparation of the elections each representative should give a report of what he did.

115. **5.2.2.1 orientation**: Programmes for schools and companies on what is being done in relation to mechanisms for participation and existing instruments.

116. **5.2.3.1 orientation**: Involve the municipalities, local and regional entities to call citizens and promote
their participation in EU decision-making mechanisms. Have special involvement of schools and young people. Not forgetting the adults.

**117.5.2.3.3 orientation:** Reduction of the time and requirements to apply transparency and participation mechanisms in decision making

**Substream 5.3 Citizen participation**

118.**5.3.3.4 orientation:** The UE must promote local offices in municipalities, to get training to be informed and have digital access to EU information and decision making processes.

119.**5.3.4.1 orientation:** Spread the word (also in mass media) about the participation mechanisms the EU has (more specifically when a consultation is open).

120.**5.3.4.2 orientation:** Review the criteria of the documents that cannot be public.

121.**5.3.4.3 orientation:** Information available in different languages of the EU (not only in English, German and French).

122.**4.2.2.1 orientation:** Ensure that every citizen could have access to information (smartphone, internet)

5.3.3.5 orientation: Provide access to the internet to all European citizens (to guarantee digital citizen information and participation).

123.**5.3.2.1 orientation:** Ensure commitment of the politicians with citizens’ participation.

5.3.2.2 orientation: In case citizens’ proposals are rejected, ask politicians to be accountable for that, justifying the reasons why the proposal did not go any further.

124.**3.2.3.5 orientation:** Citizen participation and deliberation like the Citizens Assembly should be held at the local level.

5.1.2.2 orientation: Use citizens’ panels! Prerequisite: Politicians must give detailed feedback on the results of the panels.

5.2.1.2 orientation: Creation of citizens panel with seat in Parliament. Establish the rights and duties of citizens who are part of the panels, in particular the turnover of the places and selection of citizens to be based on random mechanisms. Citizens’ panels must be supported by a structure to support dialogue between citizens and elected representatives.

5.3.3.1 orientation: Define for which political topics a citizen panel/involvement is necessary (priority topics), for example that no citizen rights should be restricted without the consent of the citizen panels (this happened in the pandemic).

5.3.3.2 orientation: Organise citizens panels to enrich political opinion.

5.3.3.3 orientation: Ensure the citizens chosen for the citizen discussion are representative of the population (socio-demographic diversity and also minorities).