

Click on the topics to read all the ideas created before and during the EYE2018



Hemicycle of EYE2018 ideas

Ideas for a better future

#EYE2018

Education system

World happiness index : the happiest countries are not based on social competition, they don't have more or less prestigious schools or universities, because of the **common national standard of education**. They are less elitist. To make all EU28 happier, the EP should definitely take this into account!

EU should make an effort together with the member states to **improve the education system**, not only the school system but a much broader sense, like extracurricular programmes that would complement children's education in adjustment to their different needs. Inequality starts at home when children don't get equal support for their mainstream education provided in schools, due to different family conditions that they might have. Member states should be obliged to provide a real mentorship to every child in order for each of them to develop to their fullest potential regardless of the education follow-up that they might or might not have at home.

The **European educational curriculum** has to change. It should include history of the different continents and all religions. As well as contribution of the different cultures to the mankind. This would open minds, expand the knowledge, create better humans and build a better Europe for all of us.

The EU needs a **united education system**. In order to improve the comparison of graduation of different EU citizens and enhance the job market. More unity and connection between all the members.

To improve social mobility: **European Common Education System**. Minimal bases for ground and high school education that will allow easy exchange and share of ideas between young people from different countries. Includes studying of European countries history.

To improve social mobility: Erasmus ++. **Harmonization of high school degrees**; European platform for access to Uni; Funded by the EU.

Common standards. Same educational expectations: Same validation of skills; Same/Equivalent exams, and degrees; Same marking system.

Shaping new schools. A small set of **concrete rules** should be made mandatory for all EU schools. As these would be only essential principles, then the freedom of having different educational systems would still be allowed.

Same education till high school: same standard, same tests, same education and opportunities for all!

A **unified EU framework**. A framework for member states that would incorporate existing diversity while giving a unified level of education across Europe.

My group was concerned with education. I suggest working on **curricula**. Is there a way to supervise them or establish European schools or pay for extra classes in civics or create a program for schools which could apply to get a certificate and extra points in rankings for introducing EU standards?

Curricula could change. Maybe there is a way to supervise them or found European schools or pay for extra classes in civics or create a program for schools which could apply for a certificate and get extra points in rankings for introducing EU standards?

An EU platform for education. Simply accessible and free for everyone; school subject on EU collaboration with different countries in EU; equalize young European students.

EU learning platform. Database of knowledge and educational material for each field, prepared by experts. Opportunity to meet foreign students to study mutual interests.

A small thing: **create a Digital university**. It could be some sort of platform, where you can learn on any subject, with videos, reading, and exercises (with AI checking answers). Basically free knowledge for anyone who wants to expand own knowledge. Even ambitious high school students could use that.

Online platform for high school students. A platform funded by the EU, where: children can exchange with children from other countries, classes can put videos where they explain courses to other classes.

Open access to sources and courses online, in high schools.

Platform to access any topic, lesson, subject in the EU outside of personal compulsory education to acquire new skills, qualification and inspire new interests.

Free shared learning spaces. Both virtual and IRL.

Sharing publicly freeware database of academic lectures online for whole European community. It may help people at work, at preparing exams or just to get people know useful news and share trustworthy information.

Open Integrated Online Platform. There are too many fragmented online knowledge platforms. There should be a platform to combine them all and provide a validity certificate.

I am a strong believer in international and intergovernmental institutions such as the European Union. Following Brexit, there are been discrepancies about the efficiency of the EU and why such institution exists and if there will soon be the European Disunion. What has to be done is to **include the studies of the EU and intergovernmental organizations in an early age at schools** when youths begin to think (like in high school). This does not mean to add a difficult curriculum but a general and realistic view of the greatness of the Unity message the EU advocates for and also its flaws, so as to avoid ignorance in a

way that youth begin to make sense of the world, and not depend on bias media and fake news. The problem is if you do not have an interest in International relations by yourself, you generally do not get to understand the EU at an early age, hence I highly suggest every young person educating themselves about this institution and other ones (eg. UN). This way with analytical and critical thinking, you can create your own point of view and your stand of important issues facing our society and international politics.

Regulated **EU mandatory history programme:** EU history program consisting of all countries in EU. Lesson focusing on 2 countries and how they integrate. With skype the class from the other country can learn with each other.

I believe that in order to promote education (especially bachelor degrees and such), those who study, or have children who are studying, should profit from a **tax break** (at around 5-10%) in order to incite and encourage today's youth to keep studying and therefore contributing to a more educated youth.

To ensure equal education opportunities, **Free education for all:** easy accessible funding for expenses (housing, travelling, etc); no tuition fees all over the Union; encourage non-vocational studies.

Free education: online and offline courses should be offered for free based on family income.

Education is not a business: re-state the value of Education as something of importance to the state/government, rather than keep allowing schools to be privatised.

Equal financing: balance educational privileges; pay all teachers equally; same budget for every school.

Free access to school and university. Free access to materials: books, etc; support for living fees.

The state subventions are rarely enough for paying rent as a student. How should middle, or lower class parents support their children with money if it is even hard to survive yourself. So many children are not able to study and cannot get the desirable schooling they want and they even deserve. The EU can **introduce subventions especially for families in need**, that could lead to equal opportunities, a step in the right direction would be made. **Special Scholarships** could be made to support talents and ideas of young people with no real perspective. Also, the **infrastructure** is decisive for equal education, but with no financial foundation it's hard to get out of you landscaped surrounding into an urban lifestyle with Universities and Facilities to gain knowledge. For that the members states should pay more than 1% of their national income to the EU.

I would like to share my thought too. I believe a way to achieve that is through education. A good idea in my opinion would be to have **no fees for a bachelor degree** in all countries and then not a fix price for masters, as today we see a lot of people going abroad for studies, but not everyone can afford it. EU citizens still pay less than non EU

usually, but considering the cost of living as well, maybe **more scholarships** should be available or other options for students who cannot pay themselves for everything - keeping in mind that the cost of living and the salaries are also not the same in all member countries. In general, I believe the big differences in the education system and mainly its costs should be considered.

Lower Taxes for those in education. If you can prove that you are continuing education while working, your taxes will be reduced.

Equal opportunities for everybody seems like an utopia of life because reality shows that the ladder between poor and rich is spreading further and further and the gap is increasing rapidly, especially in times like this when populism and right-wing parties gain in popularity. For me a first step in the right direction is a **fair access to education**. Of course, the first years of schooling are similar for everyone but especially in this age children are very formative. In My opinion the school system, for example in Austria, causes a lot of inequality in many ways and shuts doors when it comes to break out of society measures. Grades, separation and suppressing talents describes the western (or at least Austrian) way of school and this leads to a complete wrong direction of thinking and to a lack of opportunities in a child's future. Strengths are suppressed and weaknesses highlighted – the guideline which is mediated indirectly is that everyone must be the same and everyone should be on the same level in all divisions. Particularly for children with a social weak background is it hard to break through their parents' house and to realize themselves in this cruel world. So, the EU can and should lead the member states normative in a right direction to support an equal education with a liberal school system in all states of Europe. Not everyone needs to be good at everything, that's why we got professions and specialists on this planet.

In the education field: **promotion of diversity via quotas and scholarships;** free education and more scholarships; civic engagement "toolboxes" in schools; funding for education and research and especially investments in school infrastructure should be increased; universal housing (rent) **subsidies** and a cultural Credit System should be devised.

The main area which can improve the gap between rich and poor is Education: in the past few years it has been my observation that education has been deteriorating and ignorance is on the rise. In observing these things it is my proposal that education in public schools for poorer populations is to see an introduction of preparatory style education that you would find in preparatory schools and schools created for the upper class. This is **bringing in techniques from preparatory schools, free of charge, for the poorer population in order for them to have the same chances in life** as the privileged few with an education that will diminish their inferior feeling and close the division between the classes. The proposal consists of the following elements: 1. basic mannerisms and etiquette from an early age; 2. high-quality teaching with a no-nonsense approach; 3. a ban on mobile phones and devices in schools so that it can ensure that no child is distracted and miss out on education; 4. heavy fines for those who pull their children from school just to get a cheaper

holiday 5. punishments to those who skip school; 6. school camps for correction of their behaviour rather than expelling a child; 7. mandatory sports to keep the children fit and health and get them into the habit of maintaining regular exercise and avoiding obesity; 8. strict policy to tackle bullying and ensure that bullies are punished immediately and ensured that bullying is intolerable in any place; 9. culture subject such as language classes, religious studies, cultural studies of all countries etc. so that children are equipped with information and prevent them believing the hatred that certain people like to tell; 10. finishing school style education for younger children so they are better behaved and know how to carry themselves and do not feel inferior beside a child who was educated privately; 11. smaller class size so that the workload is bearable for teachers therefore they are able to give each child the attention and help they need and deserve; 12. community activities in schools which involve parents ensuring that teachers are dedicated and properly trained as well as performing their teaching duties correctly; 13. safe environment for children by introducing security procedures in school ensure that there are more reliable and accurate resources in school for the children to enhance their intellect; 14. more reading and writing rather than social media and other activities which will not benefit anyone; 15. encourage to write and express themselves; 16. teachers are encouraging the children and letting them know that they can do anything they want to; 17. place a counsellor in all schools that children can confide in; 18. clubs that children can attend after school e.g. sports, music, arts, ensure that children think about their future early on and that they have the ambition; 19. encourage a competitive environment by issuing rewards to those who reach set goals to encourage each child to push for the best in life; 20. have mandatory one-to-one sessions with children to discuss their concerns and education reports etc. Many children are told by parents or another adult that what they wish to do with their lives is unachievable, that it is far above their reach that they might as well give up. In schools there should be **guidance and help available to help the child achieve their dreams.**

To ensure equal education opportunities: **International Universities and mobility.** Access to Universities in all of Europe; Equalization of standards; Classes offered in English; Comparable high school degrees; No financial restrictions; Enough places; Equally open to all Europeans.

I think the first thing that is necessary for this concept is first **initiating knowledge of social impact** in line with concepts that exist such as the Sustainable Development Goals which gives a base of ideas, numbers and achievements that are global, known and trackable. I believe that secondly people need to be thought the different between a business start-up and a social enterprise - a clear cut education program through Social Media Platforms, supporting organisations that teach such knowledge and collaborating, and possible recruiting youths who already have such knowledge as representatives of this knowledge to coordinate trainings with a framework within schools nationwide or even online classes. This will allow the creation of new jobs, the creation and spreading of word and informal education that is necessary and not generally known!

People should receive proper **education in Molecular and Cellular Biology as well as Genetics** during their middle or high school training. All this sciences are quite recent and rapidly evolving and should be taught in an updated version in the population.

To improve social mobility, Time for Yourself - **European Gap Year:** Funded yearly; Get out of your neighbourhood; Accessible for everyone finishing school.

Lifelong learning university education should be free of age discrimination! Financial aid, grants, loans, scholarships and social insurance shouldn't be based on age rather on motivation and needs. So anyone can pursue education at any time without worrying about financing.

To improve social mobility, **Mixing high-school with internships** in Europe: To have from the high school level 50-50 combination of theoretical classes with internships in companies from different European countries. Aim: early work experience.

To improve social mobility, **Inspirational Teacher Programme:** Identifying and recruiting talented teachers to be trained and placed into schools from disadvantaged neighbourhoods with an above average pay.

Standard teacher education in the EU. All teachers in the EU should get the same equal education and schooling before they teach in class. This education could be geared to the teacher education in PISA-leading countries like Sweden.

Feedback instead of grading. Facilitators instead of teachers. Exploring instead of studying.

Revise the assessment criteria in all educational levels to boost creativity and innovation!

1 - For instance, the grading system of projects and individual assignments could be grouped into different categories, each category having its own assessment criteria and grading, similar to university assessment criteria. In this way, the area in which a student lacks more competences is visible and clear, so they know what to focus on improving and the teacher is more clear on where to focus.

2 - **Create additional grades/points** above the "official" maximum grade **for those students who think out of the box** and cannot comply with the assessment requirements. To obtain the extra grade one will have to achieve the goal of the assignment in a way that is fundamentally different from the required method or format. In turn, the extra grade can serve as criteria for 1 hour or more technical training in the field the student in question is most competent and has expressed the most creativity. This can also serve as encouragement for other students to push their boundaries and explore different views and possibilities.

In the context of automation at all stages, Europe should produce more on its own. Electronic factories could be locate in Europe. We need to **show to teenagers that science can be awesome**, or teach kids coding video games. To achieve

this we need to spend more on primary sciences (2% GDP, are you kidding me?). Also, kids should be made "smart" and easy to adapt, and communicate with peers. **School teaching should be more flexible** to let kids follow their passion. Some people are dancers, and such are also needed. Avoid overproducing liberal arts major or managers. At least don't tell kids it is great idea.

Student learn a lot by **explaining a topic to other students**, slip in the shoes of a teacher. Practice at home, online and eventually in another country.

Soft skills- project platform. One platform for all organisations to offer soft skills development opportunities; projects, campaigns, adventure, trips - to teach basics life skills to enable access to knowledge (informal).

Teaching to be curious and creative: Give incentive to create new things and come up with new ideas. Dedicate time every day at work/ school to create new alternatives.

Try and build general knowledge of students by means of **critical thinking** to introduce a framework for teaching and acquiring critical thinking skills for current challenges.

Introduce in all level of educations extracurricular assignments, which would **include work of observation outside the classroom:** students would be given different topics and places for observation, with very general instructions and questions, to allow them to think critically and distinguish their view of the environment. These kinds of assignments not only boost their creativity but also teaches them to be more aware of their surroundings and of each other.

Education currently focuses a lot on intelligence and knowledge but should incorporate **more soft skills.** We see it as 3 stages: general soft skills, Emotional Skills; creativity & problem solving.

Free talent school. Focus on **individual skills and interests** and integrate them into the curriculum. Replace exams through individual projects.

Improve emotional intelligence of European citizens. Bring mind-body balance in class; environment for life; facilitate intercultural dialogue and understanding; focus on the empathic nature.

Our new generation must push this world forward with more **intellectual goals and focusing on education** these are more important as role as we are young, modernizing this season with full ideas and motivation for promoting youth.

Including **non-academic lessons**, such as digital skills, cultural lessons, job preparing lessons and tradecraft and also it includes visit of practitioners to present their jobs and projects.

More money for personal education like BAFÖG in Germany and this depends on social status. And an income of parents and working time (after three years it is free).

Skill-based learning. Schools should place more emphasis on

hard skills (piano, woodworking, etc.) and soft skills (teamwork and reflection). Skills should be recognized.

Pick courses from all member states, online courses, distance learning. **Tailored education.** Pick what you want. Involve companies to close the education-business gap.

Personalized curriculum, personalized ways of learning.

Design and build own learning environment. Equal cooperation with experts and learners, individuality, freedom, appreciation, wellbeing, alternative ways to learn curriculum and hard skills.

Open space to learn **daily life skills** (e.g. cooking, bike repairs, take care of elderly people, arts). An open, creative learning space.

Workshops for kids and adults to acquire skills and knowledge that can be applied in their own lives. This should be free and supervised by a designated and qualified coach.

Active learning through digital resources. Change passive learning to active learning through digitalization. we learn when we do things practically and actively!

Meaningful experiences to educate in museums which show history, art, technology... whatever, with **interactive holograms of real AI characters.** For free. For everyone.

The EU funds/subsidizes the development of **virtual reality education games** to improve high school classes. Those games should be accessible in community centres as well.

Expand subject knowledge through **creation of projects and interactive teaching methodology.**

Take the best from every country and make it available for educational practices. **EU-wide evaluation centre for educational methods.**

Student anonymity. Every student gets a number, a code, so there is no room for discrimination because of class, race, sex, etc. Everyone gets judged fairly, same with accepting new students and scholarships.

Research

Europe could create a European R&AI Agency, which would focus on different applications, such as the structural features of technology or the levels of autonomy in the interaction between humans and machines. The Agency should write a Charter of principles for technological innovation, expressing the goals, values and principles enshrined in EU primary law. Fundamental legal guidelines for the regulation of R&AI would prevent that technology dehumanizes users. Human enhancing technologies should only be allowed if they foster capacities desirable as a matter of policy (e.g. prosthesis for disability, exoskeletons for difficult/dangerous tasks).

Develop, enforce and constantly update rules for testing, certification, design, standardization of (specific classes of) R&AI products, through Expert-Committees dealing with ethical, technological, legal and economic issues, as well as collaborative-governance instruments [Kaminski]. This approach could help achieving various opportunities by regulating technological innovation through narrow tailored, pre-assessed and constantly monitored rules, and promoting ethically-aligned design and users' acceptance from the earliest stages of product-development.

Fund AI security research at least as much as quantum physics (including LHC).

Create a **European Hub for AI and robotics in Health:**

- A dynamic structure that involves multidisciplinary actors from all ages and professions: from the student to the expert. Each participant would be part of the hub for a specific time to work or develop a project, then leave.
- A particular attention should be given on developing economic research on the subject to propose new ways to integrate these technologies to the current system, make them affordable for everyone, evaluate which technologies are cost-effective on a national and European level, and think about new reimbursement models.
- A specific Investment Fund should be available.
- There would be a permanent expert committee that would monitor and evaluate technologies in the field, and be able to kick off promising options to test-in-real-life innovative projects.

Aim : Monitor, evaluate, support, test new technologies, and develop research on the subject.

What can the EU do for Quantum Technology? We don't have rich private players (we have missed the digital revolution). We cannot do like China. We are leaders QT Flagship, hybrid HPC/QT, pilots e.g. QKD, and preparing / exploring larger initiatives...so public **funding at EU level is the key!**

How can Europe do better and faster than Silicon Valley? **We need to build an ecosystem that supports the Quantum Technology economy.** On the side of the Industries, Europe should support R&I, facilitate the creation of start-ups and favour risk taking. On the side of the service providers, Europe could build capacity and pull markets by organising procurement procedures for quantum sensors, quantum communication networks and first quantum computers. On the workers' side, Europe could create a recognised European curriculum study on QT and strengthen the link between industry and university.

One thing is to pump RD spending to 3% GDP. There are other promising topics just as important (GMO, Genetics, AI). **EU needs to be more science and rational** (not forgetting humanism) than political and capital driven. Existing research need to be implemented. Research progress often depends on long term work, so 1 year grant may be not perfect. Some people are good scientists but bad teachers (and opposite). Kids need to have contact with science to know if they like it.

We also need a programme to fast track kid prodigies.

More funding is needed. Schools, universities, **research** projects need funding to progress faster; companies need incentives to invest in education, research project or in new ideas and, local authorities need incentives to undertake new projects and provide their citizens with stability and help them adapt to a new society style. Small changes make a difference. Start TODAY. From an engineer's perspective.

Many countries out of the EU (especially in the Asian continent) are currently far ahead in technological matters overpowering and forcing a strong monopoly in the technological innovations and products as it's heavily noticed in everyone's daily life, due to most telephone companies, electronic appliances, car brands, clothing and just about everything we use has something to do with Asia and their factories. The EU has to step up and start recovering some ground on these matters in order to **maintain a strong place amongst the tech leaders** so that they aren't far behind and dependent on other countries. Innovation is the way to go and so ideas should be promoted and not buried under tons of conservative comments not allowing us to move on. We need to concentrate powers in order to achieve this, and everyone has to play a part in plan with this scale and expectation, to overcome the leaders and current "superpowers" in this industry.

DNA revolution is promising to remove the suffering of human being. There is potential in genetically personalized medical treatment and pharmacy. We could select embryos to remove genetic deceases. Growing tube organs is also promising. When it comes to improvement of human performances much more and faster could be done with the improvement of food quality and availability, having more balanced lifestyle, and more supportive and stimulating society. We could use DNA transformation in order to have products more suitable for our needs.

It might be argued that **Gene-Drive Mosquitoes** is not a legitimate target of EU regulation because mosquito-borne disease is not primarily a European problem. This view should be rejected for three reasons. a) The prevalence of mosquito-borne disease might plausibly increase in Europe as the effects of climate change take hold.

b) Native animal that could be targeted with gene drives might become vectors for new pandemics.

c) Much of the research into the genetic modification of disease vectors is being carried out in the EU, whilst field trials of the products of this research are being performed in other parts of the world. If the EU stands to benefit from this research, it also has a moral **responsibility to make sure this research is being performed responsibly.**

Gene-drive technology is in fact a paradigm example of a case in which there is a clear **need to develop international agreement.** As a leader in the research for this technology, the EU has an opportunity to set an example of global moral leadership, by taking steps towards developing trans-national agreement on the regulation of gene-drives.

European Union should invest massively in gene editing technologies in order to avoid brain drain from other countries (USA, China). Europe is extremely good at forming excellent researchers usually through public institutions paid by the states. In addition, proper financial investments in research and industry in order to stay leader in this rapidly evolving field, would allow EU to keep more negotiating power to control the direction the field will take.

Pre-conceptual screening of genetic diseases should be regulated by EU. There should be a discussion on a European level to keep this development manageable and controllable especially since the private companies are already offering services in this area. EU legislation might be a solution.

EU researchers and international experts could meet in an European **astrobiology and planetary science committee**, which would come up with important guidelines for everything related to space exploration. These guidelines would define for example protocols and procedures to apply in the case extra-terrestrial life is detected (legal and communication issues). Established before future missions to Mars, these guidelines would be shared and discussed with similar committees and organisations around the world. The EU could thereby lead the negotiations on behalf of its member states to agree on rules that would be binding worldwide.

We need to **make space exploration as environment friendly and less resource consuming** as we can (in order to build long-term programs). By working hard and with enthusiasm, Europe can prove in science what it can't manage in politics: demonstrate that Europe has capabilities when working together on a common objective, achieving ultimately great results. And then, not even the stars will be our limit!

The very inspiring presentation by astronaut Paolo Nespoli should wake us up, so **let's be the leaders in space exploration.** It is the final frontier that we face all, so let's go to space!

Space exploration could be more about research as such and increase interest in science in general.

Researchers or research institutions should be more obliged to **communicate on mainstream media** to explain what they are doing, in order to avoid defiance of the population.

Digital education

The European youth should actively take part in the fight (via funding and better regulation of the digital single market) towards **bridging the existent digital divides**: a gender divide (women remain mostly consumers and not creators of technological products) and a geographical divide (urban vs. rural areas, North-South at EU level). This harms financial progress and technological innovation. Lack of relevant knowledge implies that people are not able to harness the full technological potential and that they are falling behind

in terms of societal inclusion and everyday transactions. Technology permeates our lives increasing both opportunities and threats (online abuse, virtual hate speech or exploitation of personal data) and a digital skills deficit is undoubtedly nurturing the latter.

IT Skills training at young age. Students will work more and more with computers and need basic skills like typing in their daily life (emails etc). It should become part at the age of 10 aka early on. It can include other IT skills.

Increase funding for tech devices for schools.

Progressive programme for computer science. Compulsory programme, consistent across EU, same curriculum to develop computer science skills, data, coding etc. Not graded.

In many countries, the public schools lack funding as well as technology. Education also shouldn't exclude/miss out on **digitalization.**

IT classes with robots and teachers.

Digital Education Licence. Every user must get a licence to use internet. Digital education must be a key in school.

Teach to children **how to use Internet at schools connecting it with human rights.** Teach coding as an instrument to keep peace and to raise awareness.

Internet Education: Educate pupils on how to use the Internet also in terms of hate speech and diversity.

Having **internet classes** as mandatory with social sciences, communication, history, etc. Also, on safe use of internet.

Create **free access to technology.**

Strengthen **digital literacy in order to support inclusion.**

I think we have to keep **moving forward with the technology in our schools in Europe.** Right now, I am an exchange student in the USA and here basically everything in the schools is technologized. Because of that, teachers and students can communicate easily by a school e-mail that everybody has and the technology makes class better because of things like Google Classroom. A smartboard in every class and a computer for every student, it just works really good. In Europe we have to keep moving forward, a lot of our schools still don't have smartboards or computers in a lot of classrooms, but we need them. They can help us a lot. No, we don't have to totally technologize our schools so that kids have never seen a chalkboard, we just need a good mix of technology and "old school" because both have their good points.

I believe that **adapting our educational system to the digital era is a rather wrong approach.** It is not about how we teach; it is about what we teach. Starting already in Kindergarten, education does not simply spread the right information, it shapes and creates how we think and view our surroundings. Education is simply empowerment because it equips us with the right tools to further develop our society. It is as more about what tools we are given, rather than how do we use them.

Set up funding programmes that promote and invest in **adult-/non-formal education** in order to qualify citizens so that they can profit from the changes caused by **technology**. Create a **fund** for adult education at EU level: exploit and scale up already piloted Erasmus+ projects. This would upgrade digital skills and understanding among all generations active on the labour market, thereby creating the foundation for a balanced approach to labour market policies.

We should think more about **re-educate adults. Retrain**. Especially when it comes to heavy machines operation. Accept that adult need 1 year to retrain and it is valuable for society. There is always something to do. Countries are just not good at spending money on right things.

When it comes to new opportunities, a **more skilled workforce**, able to contribute and adapt to technological change and new models of work is essential. This is difficult considering the need for rapidly changing skills and frequent, rising unsuitability of skills in the EU labour market. Investing in education and training systems, prevision of skills, abilities of matching and guidance are indeed crucial, in order to raise productivity, competitiveness, economic development and reduction.

Attending **sessions in town halls** and local communities to learn life skills such as use of technology, filing taxes, and communicating in modern age. Open to all ages.

Intergenerational learning. Youngers teach elders and vice versa (new technologies, ways to engage with life and society): mutual exchange of life skills, languages, cultural language, rewarded by incentives.

Educate all healthcare stakeholders and the population on robots, and raise public ethical debates: integrate education to these technologies and ethical discussions to the education and training of all healthcare stakeholders and students. Promote interdisciplinary by creating more bridges between studies of all healthcare actors (whether medical, business, public health, economics...) and AI & robotic studies, to create new profiles that combine both expertise. Raise public ethical debates in Europe, and educate the public on the advantages and risks of these technologies.

Medical education of today does not fit the technological challenge of the future. New degrees at the university should be introduced. For example degree in 'Medical Robotics'.

How to adapt our education system to the digital era? We **need to teach medical science, compute technology (AI related), hard science** (engineering, chemistry, agriculture). More teenagers should be exposed to ethic or social knowledge or knowledge theory (to spot the fake news). There is potential in freeing the knowledge (Free the Books) and generally **remove tax from information sharing**. The faster we can exchange information the smarter we can get. There is potential in **"discussion clubs"** or project sharing. People need time and access to lifetime learning. Some subjects require VR support to learn (like simulation where we can operate the human or experiment in virtual world with toxic explosives).

Safe and productive social media use to be taught at school.

New **school subject dealing with limits, threats and consequences of the internet and social networks**. Make sure (especially) young people know about what they are dealing with.

Learning by tweeting. **Social media designed specifically for children aged 7-12** to be used in schools possibly with links to international schools.

An **online code of conduct** for youth organisations, political parties and NGOs to ensure no abuse is happening on our own social media platforms - Sharing of best practice and building a network.

Help young and old to **understand, create, navigate and evaluate digital content**.

Schools should be adapted to the digital era by firstly, giving students a general picture of the different subjects and **teach them how to orient themselves** in this vast sea of information instead of mere facts that can easily be found with a quick search online. Secondly, schools should also teach students how to **distinguish between true and false information** online and how to defend themselves by threats and scams. Thirdly, **coding must be taught to everyone** right from very young age.

My only concern in regards to digital learning is the amount of digital distractions there are for our youth to be distracted by while learning. So, if we could find a way of **taking away those distractions** while class is in progress then it would be a wonderful idea. I think **technology skills** should be taught to all our youth so they have that knowledge to be able to survive in a digital era.

We should focus on providing basic necessary knowledge for people to adapt to the digital era, rather than focusing on adapting the educational system to fit the digital requirements. European countries should **introduce legal history and national law as mandatory subjects as early as the 6th grade**. This will provide a basic knowledge about our duties and rights in society and teach our future generation of how our society actually functions. It is crucial to know where do rules come from and what is their purpose. We might then have a better shot at living in a peaceful world in the future.

In this digital era, Millennials (my generation) and Baby boomers have to **deepen and improve their knowledge and confidence with technology**. Universities and schools can play a crucial role in digital literacy. In my opinion, we have already several useful tools and online resources or platform that enrich our background. I recently created a **chatbot** for the financial literacy, the first example in Italy. My credo is simple: artificial intelligence (AI) and men can walk hand-in-hand in order to boost our financial education and our training towards future. A chatbot is a simple tool with which we can interact on everyday Instant messaging apps (e.g. Facebook messenger or Whatsapp). We can ask "him/her" questions about finance, markets, banks, accounting. Also universities and banks are

experimenting this kind of tool and future will see - according to many studies and report - a boom of chatbots in EdTech too.

Videogames as part of our cultural heritage. They need to be recognised as such and therefore protected as any other form of art. We should also start a serious debate about piracy and emulation in the videogame, the musical and the movie industry.

Mobility

Obligatory 3 months studying abroad before beginning University, to learn cultural and life skills.

The EU coordinates and financially assists **exchanges for middle-school students**. The school itself finds another school somewhere in the EU. The students get connected and get then to travel there.

To **increase mobility** for study and work in different countries there should be a **European framework to acknowledge your skills and knowledge**.

Education as a key to social mobility: New, creative, innovative models to create a stable society in bad neighbourhoods.

To ensure equal education opportunities: **socioeconomic and cultural mobility** at all ages locally and union wide. Mixing rich and poor and mix countries and backgrounds.

Social Mobility School Network. Obligatory exchange between students from rural and urban areas. Students carry social projects together with support of companies, institutions and organizations associated in the network.

Increasing funds allowing also the poorer to travel and take part to Erasmus and other projects.

More Erasmus projects.

I think **Erasmus funding should be kept in place for UK students**. This will weaken the UK government position and strengthen the EU while giving hope for UK joining again in the future.

Erasmus+ marketing: More publicity for Erasmus - a lot of people still don't know it, it needs stronger marketing to attract more participants.

There are still many administrative barriers to mutual recognition of diplomas and further steps are needed to build trust among Member States in this field. **Mutual recognition of diplomas should also be envisaged in EU trade negotiations with third countries or regional groups**, e.g. within the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy or the EU-ACP post-Cotonou negotiations. At the same time, the **EU should enlarge the regional scope of its Erasmus + programme** to promote cross-border mobility and facilitate, through scholarships and traineeship programs, legal access to its territory for third-country students or young professionals. The recognition of professional qualifications is key to boost human mobility and facilitate the mutual exchange of human capital with positive impacts on socio-economic development for both countries of origin and host countries.

The EU and the UK government should work together to secure UK access to **the Erasmus+ programme, the Marie Skłodowska-Curie** postdoctoral fellowship and the next European research framework programme (Horizon Europe 2021–27) on mutually beneficial terms. Outward mobility from UK is an area for improvement, and increasing the numbers of students and researchers going abroad would strengthen links between UK and Europe. The exchanges could even start earlier to encourage wider participation in all countries, for example by **expanding Erasmus to include younger students and/or shorter exchange periods**. Increased promotion of Erasmus+ in institutions outside of universities would also be useful.

Free movement of students and researchers should be developed and negotiated between the UK and the EU. **UK should at least exclude students from any net migration targets** to demonstrate its openness to students from across the EU and beyond. At the same time, the UK government should work with universities to ensure a **fair, transparent and rigorous student visa process** and provide clarity as quickly as possible about future fee levels for EU students and any necessary arrangements for students coming to the UK (health insurance etc).

The young people don't know how the EU works, the first thing is to teach in the schools and high schools how important is EU in our lives. I think ERASMUS programme is the best thing to feel European, but this is in the first place a thing of the academic world. It could be great to **facilitate interchanges in all the education period**.

Youth and jobs

Have a **universal definition of youth employment**.

Reform the **EU's Youth Guarantee to focus on job quality, rather than quantity**, by ensuring that it only subsidises opportunities for young people which provide a guarantee of secure employment for a period of at least 18 months, to provide them with both a reliable source of income and real skills which they can add to their CVs. Such a requirement would also incentivise employers to only take on young workers who they genuinely need and to equip them with skills that make them more useful to their organisations;

Focus Youth Guarantee on **decent jobs** only: Ensure quality criteria for all Youth Guarantee measures, especially for ones being funded by Youth Employment initiative. The focus should not be on "any kind of jobs", but rather decent jobs. The measures should aim at long-lasting solutions, permanent jobs and decent work conditions.

Another example would be the creation of legislation that demands from countries the development of **programmes to support young people** (easy access to loans for unemployed young people, the creation of very cheap housing options for young people with low or even no income, the mandatory creation of legislation to facilitate the employment of young people, the creation of good conditions for students like allowances and cheap or free housing for people that come from family in the threshold of poverty, mandatory development of projects that create jobs and studies for young people in isolated parts of the countries to avoid the big obstacle of moving away from home and the costs that it means). Member states shouldn't be allowed to think of young people like they have a support system because many of them don't have it. Everyone should be allowed to at least try to start their adult lives, regardless of their family's help.

It would also help if the EU would create programmes that could **help young people to start their adult lives** regardless of their family's financial conditions. This is already done with Erasmus+ and paid internships in the EU but it can be developed and improved very much, for example through the creation of **paid positions for young people in different sectors** not only in EU institutions but also in every member State with EU funding (or the allocation of a percentage of EU funds that each country already gets).

Agenda for potential professional paths: During high school, students are given an agenda to pursue the career they want (incl. leadership roles, politics etc.)

Modelling progress paths for careers and opportunities throughout the EU, bringing all systems together.

There needs to be more support for young people and their mental wellbeing, ensuring they have the resilience and support to go job hunting and work with their peers to create a more supportive, **peer led approach to find a job**.

In order to encourage young people to set up their own business, the EU and its MS should **inform** them clearly of the **opportunities available** to them and have guest speakers attending universities etc. I think the biggest problem for our youth is that they're told they cannot do this or that. I propose that we ensure that they know that anything they want to do is possible. With a suppressed mind set they will never pursue their dreams. You will find that many people want to start a business but believe they can't.

It has become the main trouble for an average graduate, after taking home their diploma. Universities have solely taken the role of providing theoretical knowledge, however lack of experience sets high barriers in the labour market. There's a poor cooperation between the two sides that burdens students in finding a job as soon as they graduate. How can students have 2-3 years of required experience in a job that they need to GAIN beforehand? **Universities must become the "trampoline"** for their students, ensuring them that they will have a job as they graduate. There's a simple, yet critical miscalculation in the ridiculous requirements students face, as they enter the labour market. In order to have years of required experience, a student must begin internship during their second year of studies. However, having lectures both in the morning and afternoon, it burdens any flexibility for devoting time for work. After graduation, students are reluctant to long period internships as they are pressured to pay bills, and worse, student loan. Thus, it should become part of University's offering: ensuring workplace after graduation. **The universities should seek and obtain contracts with companies** that will employ a specific minimum percentage of its students as their graduate. They may pass paid training agreement, where they can quickly apply their fresh knowledge into practice and carry on with full time position. It is also important to enforce paid internships during studies programmes. University should make this a criteria when negotiating terms of employing their students. Minimizing this large gap between University's system and labour market can potentially decrease youth unemployment, and also motivate youth to pursue studies.

Education is vital to securing a job and progressive flourishing in our youths. It is also vital for there to be **apprenticeship opportunities and training programmes** that allow our youth to learn and gain experience. The most common thing employers ask for is experience, however, this is redundant because how can one gain experience without being given the chance to do so? Therefore, I propose that there be more apprenticeship programmes and opportunities for the youths to gain valuable experience and become better equipped for work.

Even in lower education (ages 8-18) students should do **mini-internships** at companies to see where their passions lie. The program starts at elementary school with mentoring program, and then internships.

I believe that in countries with stronger economies they are more likely to have better quality of life because their country is able to provide them with good jobs and good conditions and rights in those jobs. To shrink the "happiness gap" between EU countries I think that it would help if the EU would create legislation that obliges countries to **improve their labour law**, to meet the standards that some EU countries already have in that subject (like Sweden and Denmark for example). As improvements to labour Law I would suggest obligatory improvements in youth employment conditions (reducing the discrimination and slavery of young people), overall improvements in work conditions like work hours, security in the work place, respect for the tasks and responsibilities agreed upon in the job contract, creating simplified instances for the workers to defend their rights (while also making those instances and procedures known to the workers in an accessible way). I also think that it would help if the EU would create obligations for the member states to create good opportunities for young people, like for example making it mandatory for the member states to have a percentage of the job vacancies being destined at young people, to hopefully lower the drastic disappearance of entry level that has been happening. I

Increase funding for Erasmus + and for supporting schemes for youth employment (Youth Guarantee, within European social fund, etc.). Especially in the MFF, more investment should go to programmes for youth and employment.

Another point that is crucial for youth employment is not only the **acquisition of soft skills** through mobility programs as Erasmus+ but also and even more importantly their **RECOGNITION** by the employer. The European Union should promote the Erasmus+ program to future employers and guarantee that they are being valued. The Youthpass is not enough to ensure that.

I believe it would be beneficial if all the companies, any state and public institutions, non-governmental or governmental organizations **create the special department for youth**. This department should draw out a special program for young people to perform a job in particular parts of that company or institution which is nearest to their profession. These programs should be some kind of curriculum for the newly accepted young people who would follow it and grow professionally, get experience and become ready for the higher steps. The requirement for accepting young people on such programs should be based on motivation and academic performance, personal characteristics/general mindset, not on previous working experience. Best result would be achieved if the academic institutions would cooperate with companies and other organizations to create these programs in order to better blend theory and practice together. This would be both-sides-beneficial experience: increasing the chances for employers to get relevant employees for their company/institution

as they teach them necessary skills on place and increasing chance for young persons, upon successful performance to acquire relevant job. Creating this kind of department must be obligatory for any kind of institution.

De nombreux jeunes ne sont pas employés faute de première expérience professionnelle, et le chômage des jeunes explose en Europe. Mon idée est donc de remettre en place le **Contrat d'Insertion Professionnelle (CIP)**, mais cette fois-ci à l'échelle européenne et avec un soutien financier de 20% des États sur chaque salaire d'un jeune recruté par une entreprise. Avec le CIP, les jeunes seraient payés à 80% du salaire minimum en vigueur dans le pays par leur employeur. C'est une incitation à l'embauche de ces jeunes car ils coûteraient moins cher qu'un salarié normal. Le reste à charge serait payé par l'État (les 20% restants). Et c'est bien là, la différence avec le CIP de Balladur de 1993. Le jeune ne serait donc pas moins payé au final qu'un salarié normal. Il n'aurait pas de perte de pouvoir d'achat et de précarité et il ne descendrait pas non plus dans la rue pour dénoncer cette précarité ou cette perte de pouvoir d'achat comme ça a été le cas à l'époque en France. Sans le soutien des Etats membres ou de l'UE cette mesure ne pourrait être efficace (et il vaut mieux que l'État paie 20% du salaire d'un jeune que son allocation chômage à 100%). Enfin cette mesure s'appliquerait seulement pour le premier emploi trouvé qui donnera cette expérience que le jeune n'a pas. Et si l'entreprise décide de garder le jeune elle assurera 100% des frais.

Ban unpaid internship - starting in all EU institutions. Encourage member states to adopt legislation banning unpaid internships.

Having no less importance is to **FORBID** institutions to provide **UNPAID INTERSHIPS**. It is absolutely out of the logic being not paid when you work even part-time and especially for 6 months! To whom should we ask for money, parents? Relatives? Or shall we work at night to earn some living? It is discouraging to work in your professional field and not get paid even from the beginner level. Least amount of salary must be provided (growing according to competences). Well, at one glance, this plan might appear hard to accomplish but it will, certainly, have long-term beneficial impact if implemented step-by-step right now!

Ensure quality and **greater protection in traineeship** and apprenticeships schemes. The framework is already there and being developed, but there is a lack of quality, specially lack of providing payed opportunities.

We are in a day and age where digital technology is on the rise. Many fear it, many do not know what to do with it, many overuse it and allow it to consume them, and others prefer to ignore it completely. All those things are the wrong way of thinking. We should embrace the digital technology we have in our grasp but also not overuse it. There are complains that technology is taking people's jobs and they are not wrong. This is why we need to find innovative ways to maintain an even balance between people and technology. However, all the blame is not down to technology alone but also down to the lack of people's motivation. This lack of motivation and defeatist

attitude is the fault of governments in power. Governments in power have ignored the complains of the people which tell us that they are finding it hard to find a job and constantly keep getting either job with no pay, rejections due to lack of experience or no response at all. This is disheartening, therefore I propose the following element to be introduced in order to show people that we do care, to raise motivation and give the public hope, inspiration and allow them to succeed in life: **put an end to unpaid internships**/severely limit them to avoid youths being taking advantage of and introduce apprenticeship programmes – this will allow people to go for the job they want and gain experience and training on the job while being paid fairly and not having to struggling with a job without pay.

Between many problems included in the subject, I think that it is particularly unacceptable that unpaid internships still exist. The fact that the job market is highly competitive means that someone with no experience will have to submit themselves to basically slavery in an unpaid internship that is most of the times the only opportunity that they are accepted for, which they obviously see as their only choice as a start, but which often means that only people with family financial support can take these positions. It is completely unacceptable that young people are expected to go through a step in their professional lives that obviously only take if they don't belong to the so called poor class. It is necessary for the **EU to create legislation forbidding unpaid internships**, making it mandatory to have at least some symbolic payment in every position in which a person provides work force, as everyone deserves to be remunerated for its work and young people are no exception.

Working conditions

Reaching high employment is not an easy job when: competition on the workplace is high, AI is slowly replacing lower tasks that used to be assigned to new hires, Internship legal agreements are tarnishing lives... I think employment should not be a goal but rather full **economic independence**. E.g. why should we all work and harshly compete when the next economic model could, instead, consist of being shareholder (or mutual funds investor) and living off dividends? There could be bespoke investment firms for this purpose and, by saving on education fees - as compared to UK/US universities - I think this could be a nice starting point for discussion.

It is hard to participate in social activity if there is no money to live or you have no time for that. So the work needs to be done to **fight unemployment and reduce working hours**, possibly using automatisation.

It could help to have shorter work hours (more like 30h/week) since that leaves more time for social activity or family. There could be a way to **work part time for old people**, so they still can work, but at less hours.

Develop an **index to measure the value of labour**, consisting of worked time, needed qualifications, efficiency and other factors. Then have companies calculate an index which would correspond to how much each person should gain.

AI will do what we program it to do. Europe could use it to **automate boring tasks** which are below human expectation. In time human could do things which machines can't, or which are just fun to do. There is potential in human-AI cooperation to speed up thinking, but keep human decision making. But don't give emotions to cleaning robots.

There is another huge problem of our society: a major **difference in the salaries**. Constitutions should support not the bankers but the manual workers. Everybody deserves a chance for a worthy life, such as young people who need support.

There should be a regulation which forces transnational companies to **share their profits with their workers**. The first and obvious one is through wages by declaring that a certain percentage of the benefits of the companies will be distributed to the employees, rather than keeping the benefits for the management level. I believe that companies which want to be attractive to the labour market have to share their profits with their employees – either via giving direct money, giving shares on the company or offering several benefits like payed holidays, cover insurances offer health promotion.

Social protection for any kind of work: ensure social rights and social protection, regardless of a work form/ type of work. Especially in gig/platform economy. Encourage countries to correspond to the changes at the labour market and new forms of work, by regulating those sectors and ensuring social rights.

It is key that conditions for flexible, agile and diverse forms of work are created. Alternative forms of work are already creating increased flexibility for businesses who can leverage expertise that exists outside the organisation and for workers who can adjust their career paths in line with their personal preferences. However, flexible work should not come at the expense of economic security. My proposal is that **the EU should establish a "portable" system for worker benefits**. How would it work? Well, the scheme would create individual accounts that follow workers throughout their career and enable them to change the nature, structure and intensity of their work while continuing to have access to social benefits based on individual preference. The EU should take the lead and pilot this scheme setting clear standards, providing legal certainty for all and ensuring that the scheme is universal in its application, meaning its supports the growth, development and movement of people across organisations, industries and countries. The EU should act as a mediator, gathering stakeholders to define: who will contribute financially and how much? Who can administer such a scheme? What type of regulatory action is necessary to enable such a model? As alternative work arrangements continue to grow, it is important that social security systems are adapted to ensure a high level of social protection for all forms of work and workers.

Companies have to share the profits which are made out of automatized work via taxes with the society. For automation we need **new forms of taxes or fees**.

Robots' work time for social spending: every minute of human work that is replaced by robot work should be counted. A certain amount of the wage that the replaced person should have earned will be spent on public social spending. The fear of unemployment is reduced.

Automation causes unemployment, especially youth unemployment, because human workforce is steadily replaced by artificial workforce, and this is an undisputed fact (take a look at Yahoo!, one of the biggest multinational enterprises, that employees only 8.500 people!!! Now this is ultra greedy) The solution is: **Automation tax!** Since enterprises use automation to make profit by laying off employees (therefore paying less in salaries) and increasing production, we can tax their profits so we can pay for the welfare and unemployment benefits for all the people, especially the younger ones, that will either lose their jobs or be unable to find a new one. We can also use these tax payments to invest in other sectors of the economy, help create more jobs at them, and redirect all the people that cant find work there. In addition, we can invest money from the automation tax in education, **to re-educate people** and youths unable to find work so that they learn about something that can be useful in the new era of automated production.

As the biggest beneficiary of globalisation **transnational companies** (TNCs) should have a key role in the **redistribution of globalisation gains**. They should be forced to invest in lifelong learning programs, in school education regarding computer skills and also by the compulsory redistribution of shares through improved labour regulation as wages and social benefits. This could be done by an **automation tax**. There should also be an agency that matches TNCs with NGOs in which they would need to invest to reduce the negative aspects of globalisation. To prevent tax evasion there should be social minimum standards in all the European countries! This goal would also be served by an **international transaction fee** so TNC who choose a low-tax land for their headquarters while they produce in another would still need to pay their fees.

Une petite idée qui germe en moi depuis longtemps...je ne suis plus si jeune mais futur employeur. Il faudrait dénoncer ces contrats figés depuis des décennies et penser : **contrat de collaboration !** Voilà de quoi motiver les " Skills " .

Make people learn and **work in teams**. Having people from all backgrounds work together in teams in the workspace in order to share knowledge, skills, experience.

We should introduce a rule that you **cannot hire your family/ friends** or anyone close to you instead of hiring someone else because this is creating an unfair advantage to those related or friends with the employer or employees already working there. All applicants must go through the exact same process as those who do not have anyone employed with the company they're applying for. End zero-hours contracts as

they are unfair to those employed by them. It leaves people without work and money to live on for weeks/months.

I don't think that the EU is trying hard enough to help the young people. There is a lot of space for employment and education is just the first step of the former way. But we should stop thinking of the classical way of working. The century of nine-to-five-jobs is over. We should start to make a new kind of **home-working**. Nearly everything is digital today what means that you don't have to be at your office to do your job. For example, a young mother could work from home creating a software or something else while she has her family and maybe her children by herself.

Skills

As technological advancements and digitalization rapidly change the types of jobs and skills needed in the labour market, it is vital that we continue to build on EU initiatives and funding mechanisms that promote lifelong learning and new skill development (for instance, New Skills Agenda For Europe). Particularly, we need to leverage and elevate these policies to address issues around the shorter life of skills and new jobs. Therefore, my idea revolves around how we can make lifelong learning more practical and targeted. As a start, I would propose **establishing an EU-level network of experts** (from business communalities, education etc.) that are responsible for monitoring and **mapping** out, by country, by-industry and by-sector, what the **future skill needs** are in each, to identify and address potential future skill gaps. In parallel, **career transition pathways** need to be defined that instruct and guide workers by charting out viable career change options (based on their current skillsets) and what skills need to be developed to transition to other roles. Why is this important? Well mapping career transition pathways and reskilling needs will provide perspective to not only workers, who will uncover personalised, learning and career opportunities and overall direction, but also businesses and national governments who can prioritise their reskilling actions accordingly to country labour market needs.

Soon, for the first time in its history, the EU's workforce will contain people who belong to 5 different generations, with different experiences, strengths and weaknesses and views, that will need to work together harmoniously in many large organisations. The EU should encourage them to set up **intergenerational workforce charters** that would operate like a voluntary code of practice which would commit organisations to harness the combined skills of their workers by for example encouraging practises such as intergenerational mentoring and also reverse mentoring (where the young help to educate their younger colleagues), by making adjustments that would enable older workers to remain in the workplace for longer and making it easier for younger workers to balance their working lives with other responsibilities such as caring for children and older relatives. One very important problem would be addressed, too - the average EU citizen still retires a year before the national state pension age, and in Belgium and Italy the

average is over four years. These charters could also improve intergenerational relationships – according to Eurobarometer, both the young and old have quite low opinions of each other in many countries, which creates a barrier to productive co-working between them.

Within the framework of AIESEC and having credibility in internships and volunteering experiences we would like to develop **youth leadership** worldwide by implementing projects that contribute to the development of our communities. The 4 stages of implementation are:

1. Research: the European parliament will conduct a survey in pilot countries to assess specific needs and AIESEC with partner organizations we will make sure that enough data is collected from young people themselves, education institutions and employers
2. Analysis: the results of the survey: we will analyse together the kind of skills that are required in the labour market, the expectations of youth and the needs from the education institutions.
3. Creation of the project: create a program for leadership development that can be taught to youth located in high schools of vulnerable communities. Progress needs to be measured and accountability is key, too.
4. Implementation: opening opportunities all around Europe for young people, via the different internship and traineeship opportunities.

2 main goals we want to achieve: young people having access to international networks and internship opportunities and developing their leadership qualities

A company needs to reassess the skills of its employees and to train them new skills in order for them to adapt to the changes of the labour market. Developing of **life-long learning programs** in companies is crucial not only for the further development of the companies but also for the employees to be attractive on the labour market. Use a part of the company benefits to finance skills and lifelong learning. Re-skilling workers make them more competent and earn more.

Support initiatives that **bridge the gap between university and industry**. Force universities to set-up funds/support/facilities for spin-off proposals; both to encourage spin-off companies and to keep companies longer attached to the university (sharing location is easier collaboration). Invite established companies to share the time-consuming aspects of certification that could be replaced with safe faster alternatives that are currently not accepted for certification (and investigate/consider the proposed alternatives).

Offer **paid training courses** to Europeans 30-55 years old to educate them & solve problems e.g. technological incompetence, thereby protecting them from issues like unemployment but also bringing them together.

To ensure equal education opportunities: **YouTube.edu**. A free series of channels for free language education, requalification courses and education in skills, art etc.

Paid education time: Every citizen gets four weeks to spend

on education according to his choice. Every company must offer it and pay the normal salary. People that are unemployed receive their normal benefits + incentive.

Soft skills e.g. effective communication and critical thinking as well as presentation skills, independent learning. Integration of digital media in a positive way and improved digital literacy.

Howtowrite.eu. A digital, interactive, example-led, gamified education tool to improve writing skills. A website with an example essay, with which you interact to understand structure and main components.

Knowledge of languages helps to secure employment. Schools in the whole EU should screen DISNEY MOVIES (in the target language with subtitles in the same language), this will be at least 100% more effective (and at least 500% more pleasant and interesting) than the current methods of teaching languages (there is a lot of research supporting that). Language learners should also be taught how to learn and not just present themselves with boring contents, since interesting contents are available on the internet for free. A related idea: to increase literacy in the national language, all **television channels should display SUBTITLES BY DEFAULT**, this way people will read several thousand of new words every day.

To overcome the East-West divide within the EU: it's not understandable how we all learn English, French, German, Italian and Spanish, but almost no one **learns an Eastern European language!** #equality

Esperanto through Vlogs and short films giving European citizens opportunities to discover and introduce different culture to create connectivity and build bridges.

Online platform where employers can explicitly state what skills they are looking for and direct them to **open online courses**, apps or websites for them to gain this aptitude.

Having **village institutes** that Turkey had before, every country gets free and effective education upon the job they want to do with 21st century skills and no one gets left without a job.

We have thought of some suggestions in order to help reduce unemployment due to automation. The **EU should provide benefits to companies that offer programs like Erasmus** or other job employment programs in order to encourage them to keep offering these programs. Science should have more capitals invested in it so that more business and economics sections and more jobs could open up. Human workforce should be integrated in these automated systems in order to constantly keep them up and running and also have a balance in the workplaces. Adults need to be retrained to go along with the new trends and youth has to be educated in the new methods to keep up with technology. Startups need to be supported and new ideas encouraged in order to keep the youth dreaming and opening new businesses in order to create new job openings and decrease unemployment.

World became a smaller place because we have internet and maybe it is a way of making inter - academic programs. We

students can cooperate in various industries to get useful qualifications. For example cooperation of students from universities of technologies can design together with support from experts working in high - tech companies such as Airbus of Audi and even from some American experts from Boeing, NASA or NTSB.

Unemployed people from the cities could go to rural areas and start new jobs as farmers or orchards or start any other manual jobs. This will enhance the housing in the rural areas, where there will be new farms...farm schools... summercamps...

We should provide **occupational therapy for those unemployed** and use the information gained from those therapy session e.g. if someone says they want to become a teacher. With that information, we can create courses for people to train and help them achieve their set goals. Unemployment is high because of the fact that it's not what you know it's who you know. This must change if we are to be given a fair chance to make unemployment a memory of the past.

There is a great lack of skilled workers and people are leaving the rural areas. Why don't we support young adults to do an **apprenticeship in a rural area?** E.g. employment agencies and/or the regional government should fund part of their salary for the first half a year, so that's a win-win-win situation for the government, migrants and employers. Besides it will be easier for migrants/unemployed people to get integrated (learn the language, the culture,...) in a community in a rural area than in a big city. And also the rural community will get some profit: their prejudices against other cultures/migrants may weaken.

Entrepreneurship

Young **entrepreneurs** often have great ideas but not so much knowledge how to make them work. The most important support is to **educate them what are the opportunities.** To let them know how incubators work and where to search for networks. They should be able to get **mentor**, providing feedback on their work, to improve the idea before launch but also to learn from mistakes. In some countries universities still teach only theory from the books, without much practice so students after graduation don't know how to use their degree and obtained knowledge on the real market. We shouldn't only learn theories and frameworks but how to actually use them in real cases, not to be afraid to try.

The EU needs to start an **Entrepreneurship programme for young people** to get them into the mindset. It should be implemented in the education system as soon as possible. Europe needs the Entrepreneurs! Especially in social, sustainable and impact business.

With my organisation VULCA we aim at building a mobility program (inspired by Erasmus +) destined to a wider portion

of society, around the idea of **Making for FabLabs**, with three missions:

- To facilitate MAKING by bringing together various profiles (hobbyists, engineers, artists, designers, hackers, and craftsmen) around a common Making project;
- To allow any citizen to TRAIN on Making technics (digital, traditional) in a European context;
- To INCREASE COMPETENCES of Fablabs (and other maker spaces) by encouraging the mobility of more skilled citizens from one Fablab to another (Management, Financing, Communication, Community Building, etc.).

A 1-2 day **conference** held in each European country where high school students and university students can learn about the proper ideology, skills and application of skills required to begin a startup or to engage in an **entrepreneurial lifestyle.** There would first be **inspirational speakers** to help spread the mind-set and ideology required to enter entrepreneurship. People speaking of past experiences, failures, successes and emotions involved in being an entrepreneur. Then there would be **skills sessions with financial literacy, marketing, leadership,** etc. The people leading these workshops would be entrepreneurs or people working for companies who specialise in such areas. There could be real-life scenarios, mini-projects or small competitions to put these skills to the test. During the conference, there would also be **networking opportunities** and the chance to speak to mentors about ideas, problems or questions the youth have about entrepreneurship. The main point is to enable youth who either show an interest in startups, have tried and failed, are missing motivation or who feel public schooling is not giving them the application of skills required to succeed in the world. High school teachers and university professors can choose which students they believe would benefit from such conference. The people speaking, mentoring and giving the skills sessions would all be volunteering their time to spread their knowledge and experience with a younger community.

Support **entrepreneurial education** and initiatives at secondary/high school level.

Support entrepreneurial activity at universities by making co-investments (in the form of small grants and convertible loans) alongside family offices, that support entrepreneurial set-ups within universities, into student-created startups, based on the model developed by UnternehmerTUM .

I propose that the EU create a set of directives for **incorporating entrepreneurship, creative thinking, leadership and EU financing options, into education systems** at both second and third level in EU member states. This would be done by creating directives with guidelines which member states can adjust according to their own economies, current presence of these subjects in curricula and the sectors which need most development. The plans would not provide precise lesson plans but rather **criteria which have to be met** in terms of topics covered and modules provided.

In many of the member states which I have researched, including Ireland where I am currently studying Business and Economics at second level, the educational practice is to teach interdependence rather than independence. There is little if any information or learning material taught in mainstream schools that would allow for one to start their own company after second level. Even more concerning is the fact that, many courses in universities across Europe related to Commerce or Economics do not provide optional or compulsory modules on these needs.

My idea is based on a principle of **making education more life applicable**, in terms of giving graduates a platform of knowledge, contacts and practice which they can use to grow ideas from simply thoughts to business models. My proposal has the backing of Foróige (one of Ireland's leading youth organizations), Superheroes (an company which sets up young Estonian girls with a platform from which to grow their own businesses) and I have considered the educational practices of many countries including Sweden, Italy and Greece in developing my plans.

Students from universities of technologies can design a **students' entrepreneurship program** together with the support from experts working in high - tech companies such as Airbus of Audi and even from some American experts from Boeing, NASA or NTSB.

Looking at youth entrepreneurship, I believe that the problem trickles down to a lack of useful connections, and a lack of funding or the opportunity of thereof. From a connections viewpoint, the EU should actively **support the gathering of like-minded individuals** through networking events, conferences and challenges/awards. This would allow young entrepreneurs to connect with industry professionals, mentors, innovators and investors during these concentrated events which could significantly boost their chances of success.

The EU already offers many streams of funding for start-ups and SMEs, however, access to these funds is limited and wrought with bureaucratic obstacles. **Funding solely for students** should be made available and actively advertised at universities and networking events.

In order to nourish an environment where failure is not frowned upon, the EU should discourage young entrepreneurs from pursuing their startup goals through funding from financial institutions as this is highly risky and creates unnecessary burdens. Rather, the EU should **promote entrepreneurs to use their own funds or offering financial rewards and official funding**.

Simplify and unify regulation across the EU around **taxation, labour laws and other business** – related regulation in order to make running a business more accessible and comprehensible, also to young entrepreneurs

We need to reverse the rise of inequality, by allowing the middle class to breathe away from excessive taxation that stops them from consuming, saving, investing for a home, creating their small business. European governments need to

reward job creators, not punish them with excessive taxation.

Simplify and unify R&D transfer laws across EU to facilitate commercialization of intellectual property created at universities and other research institutions.

It should be up to EU and EU investment agencies to make sure that start-ups in different EU counties have the **same funding possibilities**.

Grants for startups could be sector selected, focused on field where we have lacks, like renewable energy.

Diversity and inclusion of **newcomer entrepreneurs** in Europe. EU funds and EU focus on the issue.

There are a few ways that I would like to propose which I believe could help young entrepreneurs: provide a **no taxation for start-ups until they reach a certain salary**. This gives them a chance to build their business and gain a steady income from it.

In order to encourage young people to set up their own business, the EU and its MS should provide **funding for start ups and guidance** from those who have been successful in the industry through a mentor programme.

First of all, we must **encourage young people** who want to start a business, but let them explain that the very best way is to **open up on a domain that they master, to create collaborations and to be open to internationalization**. Generally, we have noticed that most companies that have access to internationalization are only those with very high capital and allow themselves to cross the border. But as the Erasmus + program encourages exchanges of experience among young people, so small businesses - StartUps should be encouraged and supported. Well, for example at an international level, you can not take the lead as a small StartUp to an economic mission because no one gets caught up. Why? Because you are young, you are at the beginning and you do not have the necessary capital mentioned above. I participated in economic missions in the world even in South Korea, but under the tutelage of an International Cluster, not a small StartUp. It is true that these exchanges and supports are now not made even for all small businesses, for example, for breeding. But some start-ups in quite important areas globally need to be encouraged. I want to grow this start-up, I'm preparing myself as a specialty all the time. I have a few topics of interest that I have been constantly studying and studying, such as: Blue Economy, Global Objectives - Agenda 2030, etc. All these initiatives must be supported.

I would suggest that start-ups should be able to go into a practice like a bigger company, perhaps a multinational. A **start-up is also part of a project, perhaps it could offer some services to larger companies**. Through these approaches, they can have a source of income and start-ups, lobby for multinational giants, develop a domain, and so on. Otherwise I do not see how we can develop this area of start-ups. What we do, we get the money, and then we shut the company down because we can not get some sources of income. At international level, start-ups must also be supported, they should also be

part of research committees, etc. There is always talk of that silk road in Europe with Asia. Small businesses should also be encouraged to participate in these business lines. There are many things to discuss on this subject, but I wanted to present something I faced as a young entrepreneur.

Being a student with an aim of studying economics, I definitely believe that the strength of experience is undoubtedly more useful and essential than the knowledge we are taking throughout our books. EU should support us because we are the future of this planet and if we don't take the overall knowledge needed now, then our lives will steadily lead to decadence. EU can **promote some competitions** where the terms of collaboration, responsibility and entrepreneurship are used. Also EU can offer free guidance from experts, conferences and scholarships as rewards. Consequently, students will not only show interest in taking part in these competitions but they will also learn from an early age the difficulties and the obstacles of being a business. Only in this way they will get prepared and eliminate the chances of failures.

Europe could have some form of **European Court of Business**, for enterprise to fight if they are unfairly threatened in local court. Judges would be elected by the European Parliament. Judges would need to have experience in national courts. This could not be a tool for multinational corps. (these are not our friends, not always, and often not). It is not always about startups, sometimes it is more important to promote middle size companies to rise, and be more competitive and ready to trade. Companies generally work to offer some needs. Some needs need to be fulfilled by government, since they are not profitable enough, but have high outside effect (not reflected in price), like transport service, health, education, pensions.

Economy

Mon idée est la suivante. J'aimerais proposer la **création d'un registre reportant le nom des bénéficiaires effectifs de chaque actif immobilier ou financier européen**. Pourquoi créer un tel registre ? Pour lutter contre l'évasion fiscale et les paradis fiscaux. Partons d'un exemple concret. Grâce aux fuites de documents bancaires tels que les Swiss leaks et les Panama papers, Alstadsæter, Johannesen et Zucman ont été en mesure de quantifier l'ampleur de l'évasion fiscale dans les pays scandinaves. Leur travail montre que l'évasion fiscale ne représente en moyenne que 3% des recettes fiscales des pays scandinaves. Mais, pour les 0.01% des scandinaves les plus fortunés, c'est-à-dire les scandinaves possédant plus de 45 millions d'euros de patrimoine, l'évasion fiscale est extrêmement élevée et représentent 25% à 30% de leurs impôts. Un tel niveau d'évasion fiscale concentré au sommet de la distribution des patrimoines a trois grandes conséquences. Tout d'abord, l'évasion fiscale induit une perte de recettes fiscales importantes pour les états. Ensuite, en permettant aux individus les plus fortunés d'échapper à l'impôt, l'évasion fiscale induit un accroissement des inégalités. Enfin, et c'est sans doute l'aspect le plus important, l'évasion fiscale érode la confiance des contribuables envers la capacité des états à mettre en place un système fiscal redistributif juste. La création d'un registre européen sur les actifs financiers et immobiliers permettrait de pallier ces déficiences. Enfin, j'aimerais souligner que cette idée s'inspire très fortement des travaux de Gabriel Zucman et de Delphine Nougayrède.

I propose that the EU adopt policies of **"radical transparency"**. I call EU to adopt regulation that will require all member states to fully open up business and land registries and allow them to be searched not only by name of the company or address of the property, but also owner's name or nationality. I also call EU to establish a register of ultimate beneficial owners not only of all companies registered in EU, but also all offshore companies doing business or buying properties in the EU. This register must be public.

Fact is: Crime, corruption and money laundering are global, law enforcement is not. How can they fight it? The truth is: they can't. I call EU to adopt regulation that will require members states to reform their criminal codes of and allow law enforcement to obtain **business and land records online**. This will help make investigations more efficient. I also call EU to allow Europol to conduct investigations across the European Union and not just assist member states. I call EU to require member states to report all large transactions that go through EU banks. This registry should be public.

We should think about the ways taxes are collected to **address tax evasion**/tax avoidance problem. My idea: Tax as an admission-fee for a multinational to access the EU market.

In order to **tackle tax havens and tax evasion** Europe needs to step up and **enforce charges** both upon those who commit the crime and who aid the culprit in committing the crime. The ways to enforce this that I propose are: 1. When discovered the company will endure a heavy fine for harbouring the crime and allowing it to take place in the first place. In addition to this, the culprit should be brought in front of the European Parliament (or court of their own country but if they are in front of the European Parliament then the European Union is setting a good example that it will not be tolerated) and be forced to pay every penny of the tax back to their country if they refuse to do so they face imprisonment for tax evasion/fraud. 2. If the companies who harbour the tax evasion continue to harbour the individuals committing the crime then they will be forced to close down and those involved in the scam will be prosecuted. These are the only ways you will be able to set a firm and fair message that tax evasion is not acceptable.

Lower income tax on low income families. Europe need to learn how to **tax capital** (not let it evade to tax heaven), and embrace Europe tax (from CIT, capital gain, or stock operations).

Move to a "harnessing globalization" rhetoric, as the EU recently did in a reflection paper on trade, social & competition policy.

Europe should **use Euro currency as an economic tool** - one of many - not milestone itself. Should study hard Optimum currency area theorem by Robert Mundell. Common currency requires labour mobility, and risk sharing mechanism. One banking system. Euro bonds. Union tax on corporate income, capital gains or Tobin tax, to fund euro budget. Need fiscal tools to help regions lost on integration or suffering from shocks. It is discredited to use Euro currency as PR stunt, without thinking about common budget. Other than that: Use cooperative business to combine workforce with minimal capital to company size able to compete. Create public services (housing, education, healthcare, transport, some other services postal?) as frame for startups to rise. Be leader of technology growth and implementation. Tax more high capital owners, tax less low income workers. The second will consume their wage anyway. If unemployment still high produce basic good locally.

Others support the idea of a **united banking system**, that could theoretically work wonders, but it's also a **great threat** due to the fact that, if one country's economy goes down then the whole system goes down, taking as an example the recent Cypriot Economic crisis where the failure and wrong investments of the banks and the whole banking system in general along with false handling of the government drove the country to a a €10 billion bail-out where most of the people lost money, hard-earned money lost not due to their fault but due to wrong handlings, this case would become a minimal example in what a European Union bail-out would be.

Le problème des entreprises est qu'elles fonctionnent sur un modèle capitaliste, au service des actionnaires qui ne prennent pas en compte l'intérêt général dans leur production. La seule vraie solution est la **socialisation des moyens de production par la propriété d'usage des travailleurs sur leur outil de travail**. Qui est mieux placé pour bien produire que les citoyens eux-mêmes ? On voit empiriquement que les entreprises gérées par les travailleurs sont plus écologiques, socialement plus juste etc...il faut aussi la **renationalisation des banques** pour que l'on puisse contrôler le crédit et choisir démocratiquement quels projets nous voulons financer plutôt que de croire en la bonté fictive du capital. Ce n'est pas des incitations de l'état qui changeront quoi que ce soit. La vraie solution, c'est que ceux qui créent la richesse aient vraiment le pouvoir dessus. Voilà comment vraiment émanciper le travail et assurer le bien commun !

We propose to enhance the role of the **UNESCO sites** that insist on rural and intermediate areas to make them become poles of management and organization of the territory. The identification of the universal value of UNESCO, from a declaration of excellence, must be translated into a physical space, a natural hub of experimentation that supports the discussion and exchange of ideas, supporting a **rural regeneration**. The UNESCO sites will thus become areas of boost, able to lead the development of economic activities promoting the emergence of social, cultural and creative start up. In this way, the social and economic value of culture becomes the fulcrum of socio-economic development of marginal areas.

EU should focus on **overall fairness**. It means many things in many contexts, so just a few examples: - merit and work should be rewarded more than ownership of capital and real estate. If free market is not able to fulfil this requirements, laws and regulations should help, such as regulation of real estate prices. People living and working in attractive areas can no longer afford to buy or even rent a property, because of market pressure exercised by tourists and investors. A rule fixing the ratio between properties available for tourists and available for locals could be defined, with some ceiling price to be applied as per type and some attributes of the properties - goods produced and imported from countries where labour protection is extremely low makes it extremely difficult to be competitive for European companies which respect European standards. The same applies to pollution rules etc. A law could impose a tax on goods coming from countries which do not respect fundamental rules which European companies MUST respect - taxes on inherited goods should be progressive, taking into account incomes of persons who inherit the goods. Just imagine that an average local guy inherits a house in an area which had become praised by tourists and as a result, extremely expensive. Now, the tax that the guy has to pay is based on the market price of the house, and as he has not such huge amount of money, he can not pay, so he leaves the area and sells the house...to a tourist (sorry - "investor"). At the end, this contributes to create gaps between the rich and the poor. - In some countries, like France, you can not rent a flat, if you don't have a guarantor. It is unfair to people, who

don't have rich parents as guarantors. Such practice should be banned. Instead, state should be automatically considered as guarantor. In case the tenant refuses to pay the rent, state would pay the landlord and then get the money back from the tenant. In case the tenant is in difficult economic situation, the money could come from some approved welfare benefit. - single mothers need extended help - orphans need extended help - old people with low incomes need extended help - homeless people need extended help.

Migration

I have a good friend ... she is Georgian and even though she did all her brilliant studies in Europe for 7 years, speaks 3 EU languages perfectly and knows EU law better than most other Europeans, she can't find a job in Europe. The reason why? She is not a European citizen. The companies keep telling her, "You have a great profile, but it's too much of an administrative burden". When you know that in some countries like Malta, you can buy your EU citizenship for six hundred fifty thousand euros, don't you think it's unfair that the right to live in Europe is subordinated to the money you have in your bank account rather than your attachment to the EU as a community of values? That's why, to correct this non-sense and make Europe stronger, I support the right to have a **European residence citizenship**. So far ... every person who acquires the citizenship of an EU Member State automatically becomes an EU citizen. The European residence citizenship would dissociate the citizen status from nationality and attaches it to residence. It could be allocated to someone under certain conditions such as at least 5 years of residence and work or obtaining an EU diploma, and so on and so forth. The European residence citizenship won't only benefit third country nationals like my friend but the EU as a whole:

- First, it would reinforce the feeling of belonging to the EU and the community of values.
- Second, it would solve the problem of UK citizens who want to remain EU citizens.
- And third, it could help the integration of refugees and everyone who came from abroad. Because they will feel that Europe is their new home and that its worth to become active, to participate in public life. In conclusion, the European residence citizenship would solve our aging continent's demographic issues by attracting young and motivated people from all over the world to our prospering Union.

We can reuse the existing passport infrastructure to give migrants a **passport-like document** (linked to their fingerprints and other personal data) to avoid the problem of documents being thrown away and people re-applying once their cases have been rejected.

The Cotonou agreement entails a joint declaration by ACP and EU member states in which they commit to strengthen and deepen their dialogue and cooperation with regards to legal migration including admission, mobility and movement

of skills and services. However, while EU nationals can travel to all ACP countries without a visa, only five Caribbean states are presently privy to short stay visa-waiver agreements with the EU. This therefore not only hinders inter EU-ACP mobility but also regional integration in the Caribbean where French and Dutch overseas departments and territories share a common space. In the upcoming post-Cotonou agreements, stakeholders should discuss **having visa policies relaxed for ACP member states**, especially in the Caribbean space. Relaxed visa policies would facilitate greater mobility for nationals of ACP countries and would ultimately grant them access to educational and professional opportunities in countries of the EU. More specifically as it pertains the Caribbean, it would foster a greater sense of cohesion in the region as it would demolish the barriers that visa restrictions have erected between Caricom countries and the European overseas departments and territories.

I'm advocating the **save-and-return and the save-and-offshore-screen policies**. Refugees fleeing war or persecution by violence can be given asylum. Economic migrants are returned and told to apply through legal routes. Those granted asylum are then further processed: 0. Create a common database across EU for asylum seekers 1. Take their fingerprints 2. Name, occupation, education, former home, country of origin, close family. 3. DNA sample collection 4. Passport picture 5. Social security number if one exists 6. Issue a "refugee passport" with a refugee ID number 7. All the information is shared with EU state police, immigration offices, border guards etc. 8. After screening we choose where they go, avoiding to send everyone to the same place 9. Courses in language, culture, feminism, laws, and the consequences of breaking the law. Fostering of mutual respect and understanding. 10. Zero tolerance to serious crime (rape, murder, burglary etc.) Failure to comply with laws will lead to expulsion from Europe. 11. Regular education should be provided for those who require it 12. Strict screening in database – sanctions if they are expelled and try to come back 13. Apply across the EU the Italian model for pre-emptive interference with possible terrorism. 14. Help them, but avoid the "benefit trap" - pay for their living to such an extent that they avoid work. 15. Prioritise getting adult refugees into working life as quickly as possible. Conclusion: we have a moral and ethical obligation to save people from death at the sea, but we have no obligation to accommodate economic migrants. We have a moral obligation to accommodate people fleeing war, but we must not give them special treatment beyond that which we give our own citizens. We must properly screen and share data across EU borders. We must prioritise safety and avoid creation of slums and a population of "outcasts".

We don't need to totally close our borders, there are people on the other side of the border, that need our help. I think, we can not take every immigrant, it is just not possible. **We have to choose directly**, if somebody can come in or not, we can not let them wait for years, that just makes the situation worse. Yes, that will cost us a lot of money because a lot of people will have to work in that field, but I do not think that it is cheaper to let people stay for several years if those people are just waiting for a decision to be made.

European countries should have much **stricter boarder control** and should **only accept genuine asylum seekers**. But we must make a proper distinction between economic migrants and asylum seekers. People displaced from war-torn countries should seek asylum in neighbouring countries. If you refuse help from multiple countries in order to take a dangerous trip to a country where you will rely solely on the government welfare system instead of trying to give back to the country that has taken you in, you are no longer an asylum seeker, you are an economic migrant.

Push our MEPs (Czech, Polish, Hungarian, Slovakian) to contribute positively to the discussion on migration - it will lower the tension in the society - it will make the **distribution of responsibility equal**.

The European Union is currently dealing with a regional problem, the migrant crisis, on their home turf. While the migrant crisis is a global phenomenon, it has regional roots in war, famine and poverty. Rather than dealing with the large global phenomena as a series of regional ones, the EU is doing nothing but waiting for the problem to come, quite literally, knocking on our door. And the waves of migrants have forced Europe on its knees and are taking a lot of her resources to handle them. The thing is, we aren't seeing even the worst of it. As I said, the problem is regional, so the worst effects are understandably, on the region. For the uninitiated, if you think the treatment and conditions of migrants are bad here, it's nothing compared to what it is down there. Some of the **refugee camps** are humanitarian disasters on the scale of the concentration camps, with limited access to food and water and hardly any rights to talk off. The agency responsible for these people is the United Nations Human Rights Council, which not only has a budget wholly incapable of dealing with a problem of this size, the budget isn't even fully funded! Imagine being told that you'll have to feed a thousand people with a budget able to cover only 500 and then finding out that you only received enough money for a hundred. That's the UNHRC at the moment. I see two options, though more might exist. The EU steps up and the **Member states collectively start administrating these camps**, maybe alongside the UN, maybe on their own, while negotiating better conditions and rights for these people in their current country of residence. If that sounds like too much, the EU could at least do something about the **funding of the UNHRC**.

European hubs in Lebanon and around Syria to guide safely refugees. European countries could open their boarders. Europe could, based on GDP, poverty, growth and size of the country bring safely and humanly refugees to their own countries using **own boats**.

Europe could make several **bilateral agreements with the Countries that are involved in illegal migration**. Europe has to send qualified staff explaining to the local organisations how to manage these critical situations. Europe could provide with incentives the growth of new reception centres.

We have to give them new opportunities, new chances. They should have and easy-way to live in Europe and learn

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

a language, because that's a great issue for an immigrant. Work can be a good way to let new citizens live in European countries: they can have jobs like in the agriculture sector without receiving money but only **a place to live and food for a period, a year for example**. In this way, immigrants will learn a European language, culture, and so on and our economies will be stronger in the global context.

Europe should **accept new citizens generously**. It is not people fault if they were born in some dictator run states. But Europe needs to be clear that if you want to settle in here, you need to become European. Also while there is no war in EU, it is not like everything is easy. Some people (like kids) could adapt more easily. We can seek a solution which is moral, but it should also be beneficial in the long term. Having more population is generally beneficial. But Europe needs to send back radicals.

Migrants are one of the main topics these days and it divides Europeans in two. There are the ones who want to open our doors to the incoming people, and the ones who do not want them. A lot of Europeans say that migrants take away our jobs and destroy our culture with their own; and many politicians use these accusations to become more powerful. However, there are real arguments in favour of the migrants. First, the convention of Geneva of 1949 says that every citizen in danger because of war or other humanitarian disasters has a right to flee for his life and to be welcomed by a country to live in safety. We **cannot let migrants live in inhuman conditions** and deprive them of their fundamental rights. Any sense of solidarity, humanity and love is essential in this humanitarian crisis. On the other hand, the European Union should also **solve the problems and conflicts in the affected countries** and help establish stability and social safety. This will stop migration and allow migrants to return to their country. Until that goal is achieved, we should see migrants as normal citizens by **giving them a place to live, work, money, medical care and by sending their children to our schools**.

Welcome migrants...reduce their suffering. Social inclusion in every country: through **languages or job insertion**.

In order to make the most out of diversity, it is important that **refugees have their qualifications recognized** to be able to continue their studies or to find a relevant job. They have useful skills that all parts can benefit from. These qualifications need to be recognized by qualified credential evaluators that have knowledge about the refugees', as well as their own, country's education system to assess level placement of the refugees' education. This will also be useful for a successful integration.

Between 1 January and 31 March 2018, 1.163 children arrived in Italy by sea, of whom 927 were **unaccompanied and separated children** (15% of all sea arrivals). Unaccompanied and separated children do not need any act of charity, but chances and opportunities to fully affirm their nature and potentials. In order to give young migrants the concrete chances to be free and play an active role in the civil society,

scholarships and equivalences of diplomas should be conferred to them.

Integration of migrants through education and employment, **replicating EURAXESS** (pan-European initiative delivering information and support services to professional researchers) in the Education sector.

Due to our competitive job markets, new citizens usually are not able to find a job and struggle economically. With **increased welfare aimed specifically to immigrants**, we can make sure that they will not be marginalized due to poverty caused by unemployment.

Measures to **improve migrants' life** style and integration and to decrease fear of the different.

In order to show to people that we care and give them some motivation I'd suggest to introduce **mandatory programmes that teach immigrants/refugees the language of the country** they live in so that it is easier for them to find work, understand and communicate with others. It also allows them to integrate.

People are searching a place for necessity, not for pleasure. We need to think they are living a war, and they just want to leave the horror. We should be able to search a place and give them the opportunities like if they were one of European citizens. There is enough space for everyone, we should be open minded and accept these people like us, **give them the resources they need so they can start a new life**, a life everyone would like to live.

Taking care of children, unaccompanied, separated or already part of the diaspora in Italy and Europe, means to **integrate those kids through education and sports**, which are the two major tools that a child needs. According to the UN Demographic and Social Statistics Division, from today to 2050, European population will contract by 4,07 % and, in the same period of time, African population will grow up by 28,6%. So we must invest in better integration processes, which can only be done through enlightened political choices able to foresee the gigantic power, benefits and opportunities for a more sustainable and human future for all.

In my opinion if the new citizens had some **tutor/angel/buddy**, that could be a person or an entire family, to guide, welcome and help them it would be an excellent integration mechanism. Just imagine if the new citizens find any obstacle or problem they would have a more friendly face than the social services of that country, they would also understand more easily the traditions and costumes of the culture they are in. To help this mechanism there could be some financial or taxes relief, but honestly, at least me I wouldn't mind helping people, it's what characterize us as European people.

First of all, we need to change the European people's perspectives about this issue. Many Europeans think that the migrants are stealing our jobs and that some of them are terrorists. That's entirely not true, but events like the Brexit shows us the power of xenophobic rhetoric made by political

parties. We must oblige the national governments to adopt **awareness campaigns** on this matter in order to stop this kind of propaganda. If we can solve this problem, everything becomes easier and we can implement measures like: creating the initiative **"One new citizen, one new friend"** in which European families receive new citizens in their homes during a period of adaptation (for example, the first 6 months) for the refugees in their new country or creating the European Refugee Day where European schools dedicate only one day of the year to discuss and learn about this matter.

The large and expanding supply of angry, alienated young men and women, driven by a fanatical hatred of the values and power of the institutions they have no access to, is the risk we run if we fail to enable these encounters whenever possible. The failure of European countries to integrate recent immigrants from North Africa and the Middle East, compared to the relative success of the United States in absorbing its Latin American immigrants, runs the risk of confronting the old continent with a large contingent of enemies within. Hence, **enabling each and every citizen and resident of the EU to share in the ideals and values** is of indisputable importance and urgency. An individual in the rule of law must become an active, engaged subject. This is the only path to democratic consolidation of different beliefs and belongings.

With proper policy and operational actions implemented by EU government, we can **accelerate the process of integration** according to our humanistic objectives. First of all, EU government role. After reinforcing equal opportunity law in the EU system, we should **provide Cultural Center in selected major cities**. The model of this one-stop-facility can follow the concept of City Tourism Center where everyone can come, see and understand the main attractions of the city. Likewise, here guests can see citizens (new and current) work together shoulder-to-shoulder on cultural/sports event/project organized by the Commission. Secondly, the current citizens role. As this is part of a project funded by EU, it is fair to say everyone who participates should get some benefits. Everyone loves traveling. So why not give them chance to do it. For example a chance to involve in Cultural Center Prague for 1st semester and then in Cultural Center Bratislava the next period. Finally, the new "kids in the block". New citizens are encouraged to do voluntary jobs related to the projects performed by Cultural Center while improving both of their soft skill (i.e. language, communication, entrepreneurship) and hard skill (i.e. basic math, gardening, painting). Then they must come up with their own project plan on how to carry-on their life in Europe. Which of course they must do! Through these activities new citizens can get a job and/or start their business rather sooner and most importantly, integrate to the society better and more humanly.

The problem with migrants and local population is that migrants cannot understand the local populations' "mood" as they are just arrived and are not, on average, educated. Moreover local population are better educated but on average not so much tolerant towards migrants and the "mistakes" they make. To sum up more **education "in everything" should be pursued in the EU action**.

The **more population Europe has the more powerful it will be**. For old population benefit, we should accept new people who want to become Europeans, so they can work and take part in European growth. The challenge is to make Europe for many not only few, and to keep democracy ruled by citizens, and not by some foreign powers.

Development

Promote **exchanges between European and African start-ups** by finding partners.

How to bring positive change to Africa? **Support start-ups instead of a "charity economy"** and drive forward alphabetization.

Encourager les **femmes dans les pays en voie de développement à entreprendre dans le Tech** : en créant des programmes spécifiques avec des femmes entrepreneures dans le tech en Europe comme mentors.

Aider les startups les plus prometteuses à s'implanter en Europe et ce à 3 niveaux :

- Faciliter l'ouverture d'un compte bancaire et réduire l'apport financier initial avec plus de souplesse en terme de paiement d'impôts;
- Résoudre le problème de circulation et alléger la procédure et les délais pour les entrepreneurs tunisiens (L'accord de libre échange nécessite libre circulation alors que aujourd'hui l'entrepreneur tunisien et ses salariés attendent 6 semaines et payent 200€ pour obtenir un visa);
- Améliorer la culture des VCs par création d'un réseau de correspondants startups et innovation entre la Tunisie et l'Europe pour faire des updates sur la situation du climat entrepreneurial en Tunisie.

How to better support African start-ups? There is a need for **flexibility in financing**; free trade requires free movement - e.g. an Algerian needs 6 months to get a visa to the EU; there needs to be a network of awareness in Europe for what's happening in African countries.

How to bring positive change to Africa? **More exchanges between African and French universities**.

How to bring and keep capital in Africa? There need to be **programmes to help young African diaspora to invest in Africa**.

Improving human capital & technology talent: the EU should actively engage in the African technology ecosystem (for e.g. allow exchange programs for African computer science students to visit European universities and vice versa). Promoting talented European developers to work for African start-ups or offering services on a pro-bono basis to incubators.

Improving movement of financial capital: encouraging larger European institutions to invest in upcoming business

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

ideas aimed at tackling African challenges for e.g. European banks have technology incubators focused on entrepreneurs coming out of London, Paris, Amsterdam, Berlin etc. They should consider expanding the span of these incubators so financial capital can also actively reach talented local entrepreneurs with promising ideas along with the necessary operational support.

Future development cooperation between Africa and Europe: **enlarge the scope of ERASMUS** programs or also the multinational programs of the Franco-German Youth Office.

In order to help developing countries in Africa a solution could be: lending for private businesses. There are projects already around the world for **microcredit style loans to help build businesses**. Giving out "free" money doesn't incentivise productivity but microloans do. Giving loans with low interest (interest equal to or slightly above inflation) will incentivise the recipients to make good of their business which will increase African productivity and wealth.

Low interest Infrastructure loans to African nations and **civil engineering training and assistance** from European civil engineers and teachers.

In order to help African nations EU should set **more trade deals with African nations** in general.

In order to help African nations a **EU-African anti-corruption agency** should be set. In order to help Africa we should **push corrupt leaders to stand down** or move for impeachment on the grounds of corruption and withholding public funds for their own personal use. Once we clean up Africa's political system there will be more money to fund important things.

In order to build new and better connections with Africa we must first tackle the problems at hand which are: lack of education, corrupt leaders who are stuck in the dark ages. The lack of attention given to Africa has caused it to become neglected. Therefore my proposal is: **build more schools** for children showing they can achieve their dreams - Shine a light on Africa and expose the problems that are at hand along with solutions to help solve them and put pressure on the leaders to deal with the issues at hand.

Fair trade

The solution of Africa's real problems must start with ourselves. As a European citizen and with respect to our history it is difficult and not my motivation to pretend what the Africans should do or need to change. In my view, it is a moral and historical responsibility that we carry. We analysed, researched and travelled. Some of us know about the people and their problems. We know the reasons why many parts of Africa are very difficult to develop. As long as we face each other globally as competitors, there will be always winner and losers. And you do not help the losers by trying to integrate them into a system where the most powerful and the winner

make the rules. One of the main change that needs to be done is **Fair trade instead of free trade**. We should stop destroying local markets and people's basis of life by importing waste meat, milk powder and others products. The EU should set partnerships at eye level instead of classical development aid and profit-driven technology transfer.

If Europe wants to really do something useful for both Africa and the world it should stop immediately the **Food Dumping** which destroys the local food market there. Farmers are not able to sell their products because the leftover food from Europe gets sold by far less than the local prices. I think this is a point where Europe can take a stand and ban this activity, which beside the consequences mentioned above it is also not environmentally friendly.

Europe should **not allow European companies to do land-grabbing in Africa**.

Europe should make sure that **European companies operating in Africa are not exploitative**, make sure there is no child labour and also respect the health standards which they would respect in Europe. And lastly I want to say that we should really understand, that the problem is not Africa. The problem is that Europe thinks it should or can or has the right to change Africa. It is a sign and stand of supremacy which Europe in my opinion does not and should not have.

I will begin with saying this: I am a mixed person, half European and half-African, so this issue of European-African relations is very close to my heart. To get to the question: we must first understand that Europe cannot and should not try to "fix" Africa. This sort of excess outside interference is often not helpful and can be harmful. We can help African nations "fix" themselves. Let us not think about handouts as if African countries were some beggars on the street but let's treat with them fairly. The first thing to do is **ban unfair tariffs**. For example, there are high tariffs on processed cocoa products, this means that African producers/farmers can only sell raw cocoa to Europe if they want to make a profit ; lowering the tariffs would help them create a new industry in Africa and would supply us with cheaper chocolate.

The EU should make its **supply chains transparent**. How else could Europeans be sure that the EU truly cares for a sustainable and human economy? The EU should hold its suppliers accountable to the highest ethical standards, which necessitates this call for greater transparency.

To design a **new trade agreement between the EU and the ACP countries**, we should foresee provisions to hold negotiators accountable (check delivery on key provisions); Increase democratic accountability of these agreements.

In order to make trade more inclusive, continue to promote open conversation about trade and how to make it work for all/ It would stimulate a **wider discussions about trade**.

In order to promote fair trade, making **textiles supply chains fair** through binding human right due diligence legislation so that all companies that sell textiles in the EU need to take

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

steps to avoid human rights violations / It would ensure better compliance with ILO norms of textile products sold in the EU.

In order to promote fair trade, include a **chapter on fair trade policies in EU trade agreements** / It would institutionalize fair trade and establish joint schemes, which can be promoted by the EU.

Making **Sustainable Development** a true objective of EU trade policy.

Europe alone is big and has variety of products. However, we should **cooperate with countries which are likeminded** or who have no bad intentions against us. China or Russia are heavily driven by leaders offensive towards Europe. Europe could also cooperate with Mediterranean or Black Sea, Middle East and Africa countries in various ways, even more if they follow human rights in our way.

The EU can **avoid deal with organizations who invade other countries, break human rights, abuse labour, and pollute planets**. The EU can strengthen ties with countries who are more human-centered and peaceful.

Solidarity

As the great Mahatma Gandhi once said "Be the change that you want to see in the world". If we ourselves are not willing to change and stand up for what is right, how do we expect others to do so? If we sit back and allow others to get away with the wrongs that they do, how do we expect them to stop and change? How do we expect to win the fight against inhumane acts, suppression and a threat to our civil liberties? The answer is we cannot. **It all starts with us**. We have to fight for humanity, freedom, liberty and peace. A person who sits back and watches is just as bad as the culprit is. We need more action, more guts, more strength, we need more people to stand up and fight for what is right.

Without **solidarity within the young generation**, there won't be much being achieved in Europe's joint future. What we need is a solid basis; one common aim that covers the ideas and **ideals of young Europeans** like a dome covers the precious content of a snow globe. Once the young Europeans unquestionably feel "united in diversity"-that the original image of a United States of Europe is the ultimate way of defining one another- we can move forward in a much more efficient way because of identification. After that, urgent matters such as a joint handling of the refugee emergency, reprogramming of the monetary union and common labour market, equalisation of ALL identification groups, climate protection and the construction of a sustainable energy collective throughout the EU and further beyond, can be tackled effectively. If we start to think as a collectivist young people society, issues like self-distrust and self-hatred inside the Union will vanish and the continent will again act out of mutual self-assurance.

Un **compte citoyen** : l'objectif est de donner la possibilité à tous les citoyens européens à avoir plus de temps à consacrer à l'exercice de leur devoir. Le compte citoyen se réinitialise tous les ans, il permet de consacrer du temps à une association, un parti, un mouvement, une collectivité.

School Volunteering Initiative: if we want to create a culture of Volunteerism, as a normal activity, as something that comes up naturally and authentically to everyone, we should start from scratch. When we are thinking about change we always think about what we can do right now to change our future. But what about the Next Generation? How can we guarantee that all those children are going to have this culture as a genuine characteristic? What if, we create a movement...What if we establish a Project, where children from primary schools in cooperation with students from Universities, together, create Volunteering actions and compete with each other for the most impactful volunteering action. The top 3 of them would come to the European Parliament, to present these actions and being awarded with a learning prize that can capitalize on in order to grow their actions to even a bigger impact for the next year to their countries.

Students doing online volunteering (e.g. translation, giving advice, being mentors). Should be included in school programmes.

To strengthen European solidarity: **Collective European Civic Service**. Travelling in groups and helping on a local scale, organized by the EU.

I propose to make pupils aware and value the culture of engagement and '**Education Populaire**'. Education Populaire is the life skills that one person develops throughout his/her life, engagements, responsibilities, experiences and opportunities. It is not through school education, but through extracurricular activities that you develop those skills. **Volunteering** should be promoted, and the **skills acquired should be recognised**. Nowadays, too often young people are accused of not making a commitment and being simple consumers. However, your job needs to allow time to do something else is important - and only a few have time and financial means to make a commitment outside of work. This is why I want young people's engagement to be recognised, facilitated and seen as a real participation in society.

International Volunteers Day / Cultivating Communities. We have so many wonderful examples, a good example is "**Let's Do It! World**". It's a movement that began in Estonia in 2008 when 50,000 people united together to clean up the entire country in just five hours. Since then, Let's Do It! has spread this model—one country in one day—around the world. To date, nearly 120 countries and 20 million people have joined us to clean up illegal waste. That 50,000 people, created a Community that was so strong and impactful, that has inspired many more people from other countries to follow. What if, we could convince the European Parliament, to create a similar movement on International Volunteers Day where all the countries in European Union could create social actions, making this a Kindness Revolution. €volution of volunteering

actions that could inspire thousands of citizens across Europe to be more active and engaging in Europe's initiatives.

Young people are not given the equal opportunities to participate, in the sense that only well-educated young people have the access to the information and to the resources that enable them to become part of the European Solidarity Corps or other volunteer or educational possibilities (Erasmus+, etc.).

Creation of a European civil service after high school for the duration of 2 months up to 1 year in either your own or another EU country could work. Young people from all layers of society and with different educational and financial background will be able to participate. Thus, the volunteer model will become more inclusive.

Compulsory social services. An effective system of volunteer social work to help out in schools, kindergarten, elderly homes, hospitals and to increase solidarity amongst people.

There needs to be **funds for social service NGO action.**

We should support others' human rights, by **donating to organizations** that uphold victims of human rights abuses, or by volunteering through a group, that promotes the defence of human rights.

Implement a **Euro-Dividend scheme** for all citizens of Eurozone to receive direct cash transfers enough to cover the basic needs and a life in dignity, without any work-related or other conditions, giving citizens the freedom to choose meaningful jobs without fearing for their survival!

High school graduates who are not disabled, single mothers, disadvantaged in some way should **work** (build habits) **for some time before being able to touch basic income.**

A **cryptocurrency** issued by the EU that distributes 100 "tokens" a month to every EU citizen. Governments could for example allow citizens to buy ID-cards and passports with these tokens as well as basic needs such as food and shelter. It should be fully tradable. As it gains mainstream adoption, it would be a sort of a European Universal Basic Income.

The **European basic income** is a Euro-Dividend meant to develop a fairer, more stable and more effective social model for the whole European Union. Paid monthly to all European citizens, and at a modest amount (200 euros on average and modulated according to the standard of living in every member state). It would be complementary to the introduction of a national basic income and would constitute a systematic support by the EU of the social policy of its member states. This Euro-Dividend would address 4 major priorities: 1. Reduce poverty and disparities of income; 2. Supply a supplement to the national welfare programs for unemployed people; 3. Reduce the excessive economic and social imbalance between Eurozone countries; 4. It'd be a demographic stabiliser by reducing the financial incentives that push some to emigrate or establish. Finally, it would be an actual realisation of European citizenship and establish a "social Europe" at several levels. Funding opportunities: Tobin tax, Carbon tax, EU-wide progressive wealth tax, EU corporate

tax, EU-wide VAT and other sources to explore such as: Tax on fossil energy, tax on luxury goods, reallocation of (part of) the ESF, increase of budget contributions, money creation (QE4P)...

An alternative pilot proposal could be the experimentation of a **European Child Basic Income** Scheme. Such a policy will target all European children under 18. It will consist of a cash transfer, made to the mother by default, or to the legal responsible person instead. We propose this transfer to be a 100€ monthly payment. As any EU social policy, this grant will be given to any legal EU resident, regardless of nationality. It would represent 1% of the EU budget. Age range: 0-17. Studies have already been conducted on the effect of such measures on **child poverty.**

A European basic income to cope with Euroscepticism. We do think that the European Union needs more direct relationships to its citizens. By creating a European solidarity scheme aimed at citizens directly, possibly creating an ecosystem around it, including a European ID card for example, the European Union will provide a meaning to its existence to many citizens. By receiving money directly from the EU, citizens will manage to provide a simple answer to the question "What is the European Union doing for me?"

One effect of a UBI would be to reduce the differences between wealth in different parts of the country - in Britain, for example, the South is far wealthier than the North. For it to be **adequately funded**, it needs to be accompanied by **monetary reform**, on the lines proposed by Positive Money: stop private banks from creating the money they lend, and make a government body responsible for creating all the money needed by society, and crediting it to the national Treasury to be spent into circulation, without creating any debt in the process.

Instead of UBI, there could be **some public services funded by the European budget**, which means that Rheinland will find some services in South. Generally Rheinland benefits from common currency with lower exchange rate even with positive trade balance, on the other hand South production is more expensive thanks to higher euro exchange rate for them. The solution is a constant transfer from center to periphery; as long as system is running it is good. The prime services to Euro fund are: Research (5% GDP) divided into grants, some of them needs to be multi years one. Army (2% GDP) common army might as well be founded by Rheinland, Healthcare (10%?) Euro citizens deserve good health in general. Nature preservation (1% GDP?) in the end we all benefit from nature and air. There is a risk of giving money directly to fellow government, since they could really waste it. Direct specific fund is more resistant to local populist.

The natural process follows that automation will take over more and more jobs so, if we do nothing, we will have less and less taxpayers to hold an increasing unemployment system. This will collapse the system because taxpayers will lose acquisition power and unemployed people will receive smaller and smaller subsidies. Therefore, we need to **guarantee a basic income** system for all the citizens held by the owners of the means of production (robots). This will ensure the survival of the

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

unemployed and avoid that the workers are taken over by competition.

You just need to educate wealthy people that a **basic income would increase the demand in the real economy and increase their wealth...**full stop.

Creation of a **special fund to run research and pilots exploring the concept of UBI as a transformative tool for the 21st-century society.** The EU could create the **"Human capital investment programme"** by gathering multiple sources of EU structural funds.

Universal Basic Income (UBI) is a fairer and more efficient investment, by investing directly in human capital rather than the capital. UBI would be more effective economically, because evidence shows that the competitiveness of a company is strongly correlated to its capacity to innovate and to create. Yet, the figures show that the public money is invested up to 60 % to the capital and not into those who actually create it. **We could start implementing partial basic incomes sector by sector before a full UBI.** This gradual approach could be a could way to bring about a change in behaviour and the wanted impact on the economy.

Measuring the impact of UBI on social cohesion, health and education. The idea would be to test in one or several municipalities what kind of influence universal, unconditional and individual basic income has on a community of several thousand people. More than a purely economic evaluation, this experiment would focus on "social multipliers" being the result of the UBI. We are talking about shared prosperity, greater well-being, fewer hospitalisations, an end to stigmatisation and the shame linked to receiving social benefits.

The higher consciousness of right and justice we have, the higher level of basic human rights it enables. Today we consider for instance the right to elect to be a basic human right; we can also understand the right for money – basic monetary allowance for everyone without any exception as a socio-cultural minimum of advanced society. When a state contributes to someone with social or other allowance, it discriminates some people in favour of other people. In front of the law we are all equal. If this is not so, it leads to violation of legal conscience of an individual human and his moral and ethical attitude. So if some people not only think but also want to carry through some aid, allowance, money for certain group of people or individuals – it does not matter how human it might seem – then we can understand it only as an impetus for a deed within society, but not as the deed itself. If we want to put it into practice we shall think it through so as the other people would not be ill-conditioned, disadvantaged in front of law nor mutually between each other. And it means to **provide this allowance, money to all without conditions** or making differences. If this does not happen then it leads to an exemplified injustice within the state, slavery of the "weak ones" and violence of the "powerful ones" – we have no right to force anyone to work against his/her will. What quality has a work performed by someone under compulsion?! If we have compassion with

the weak, ill, pour, then to help them, to give them money from common till means at the same time to provide such an aid equally for each one. Not only to the weak who need money, but also to those, who give money, from whom the state takes money through taxes, as the money actually come from them, as it is actually a common till, not a private one. It is a matter of new human right – money as a right; it is the issue of participating on common property. It is an issue of our mind, not in means of something uncertain, general – the state is us - but a very real deed through providing monetary means, allowance appointed to each human being and paid each month as a share on commonly created value through specialization and distribution of work (not within the sphere of production or commerce, but) within the whole society. Today we are considering allowance of 250-330€for SK. There is no need to confiscate property, restrain people or compel them to work or support red tape. It can be done by banks in a form of percentage (for SK ca. 0.7%) from each payment and there should be established cashless payments (today it makes ca. 70-85%). Today we have reached such a point and on its basis we also act – the law are money, money move the world – but that accounts just for those having money. If we want to live in legal society, then **money as a basic right cannot be denied to anyone.** To except, understand and realize this means to implement a society based on conscience.

PUTTING EUROPEAN WORKERS ON AN EQUAL FOOTING TO LIMIT OFFSHORING. The European Union, 123 million of people are at the risk of poverty according to the NGO Oxfam, meaning a quarter of the population. We have to put an end to the economic reasoning that guides the European Union in its choices. We have to fight for a social Europe based on solidarity where employers do not put workers in competition. We want a **dignified minimum wage and tax harmonisation** (a common ground for taxation) within the European Union. The only way to achieve these objectives is to **fight against social dumping** (employers putting workers in competition, between rich and poor countries where labour is cheaper). Such fight must be complemented by a **social protection** based on solidarity between European countries, backed by the European Union using the example of the French solidarity system. Such battle must later be fought on a global scale.

I created an **application for helping poor people** around the city or the country. Citizens will have to register to the application with all the needed information about themselves. So, they will make an ID profile with a photo included. As a quick description of how it works, if a citizen, a member, finds someone who is in need eg of food, he will pinpoint the place in GOOGLE MAPS which will be connected in the application, with a description of the situation. The pointed location in the Map, goes to every member Citizen's profile and if someone is close to the pinpointed place, takes the opportunity to go to the place and give the person all the needed assistance or any other help. It works like eg the UBER application and thus anyone could help everyone.

To strengthen European solidarity: **European social care system.** Fighting the social tourism by erasing social care

inequalities. The fairness of this system will increase solidarity across Europe.

To ensure equal education opportunities we should set up **Mentoring programs, Civil society** support to disadvantaged groups, provide role models and inspiration; and build bridges between backgrounds.

Sustainability: food from farms and orchards near the city... all eco. Free house for women with domestic violence or gender or single mothers. Equality jobs man/woman. New family with no work...go to small villages.

Investment in social housing. I believe there should be investment from public and private sector for this purpose because public funding is not going to be enough to keep up with the amount of homes that need to be built. If we can manage to convince private sector investors to invest in building more social housing for the community and convince them they can get a profit from it we can have more social houses built. On the well-being matter we should look into having a non-profit organisation which the new migrants of the country can go to and seek support, guidance, encouragement and the facilities they need to start their new life in their new country. This organisation can also provide language assistance for those who struggle with the native language of the country. In addition, the organisation can also provide free fitness classes (for those who cannot afford to pay for classes otherwise just advice alone) and free fitness advice and also free healthcare advice and guidance. Encourage the appearance of community events and projects which allow both the youth and the elderly and the middle-aged etc. to come together and interact with one another.

I think that housing is definitely important for equality of opportunities. We tend to underestimate its importance. Let's think of two families. One can afford to rent or buy a decent house, that offers safety and security, the other family (usually poor and/or part of a minority) can only access housing with poor living conditions, that takes a significant chunk of the family budget. In the first case, housing helps the youngsters in the family make a better use of all the other resources and activities they have, while in the second case, housing is a source of stress. Since education is one of the main ladders of social mobility today, children that are raised in the family that is in the second situation can have their performance at school affected by their deficit in housing - which is already affecting other areas of their lives, which in turn affect education (e.g. space for privacy, thermal isolation which is related to comfort but also to health). If we move on to the case of people in homeless, it becomes even more clear how housing is central to life in society. Many people cannot find jobs because they can't access a home, and because they cannot have/rent a home, they cannot find a job or get access to some services (they are often stigmatized). I am sure that the EU can do much more in favour of the **right to housing** in its Member-States. Current EU policy in the area is extremely weak. EU bodies, such as the European Parliament and the Social and Economic Committee, have called for the adoption of concrete measures to fight homelessness.

None of the major recommendations, such as an **European agency to fight homelessness**, seem to have been adopted. The European Social and Economic Committee has called for more money from the EU funding instruments to be dedicated to address homelessness and even the lack of housing. A very concrete suggestion that I can make, although not perfect is: an **EU programme that recovers abandoned buildings**, in partnership with local authorities and even businesses, and that transforms them into social housing projects, with the collaboration/participation of potential beneficiaries.

Europe can create mechanism for embracing social entrepreneurship and encourage member states to create legislation that helps **business** to create bigger and long-term **social impact**.

As the best leverage to reduce inequalities is in Education, and that Education orientation depends mainly on the environment surrounding each young individual. I believe that the best way to mitigate inequalities of birth places and social background, is to allow **young Europeans to mix and share among them**:
1. **Partner kids** (middle and high school) from different European countries and allow them to exchange via controlled online platforms and social networks.
2. Promote **city-twinning**-based cultural summer exchanges, and if possible in relation with the above point.

Well-being

J'aimerais proposer la création d'un **observatoire européen des inégalités**. Cet observatoire aurait pour mission de produire une base de données européenne permettant d'étudier les inégalités en Europe. Les inégalités sont un enjeu central de politiques publiques. Elles recouvrent de nombreuses problématiques qui s'inscrivent dans la thématique de cette session. Malheureusement, il est impossible d'apporter des réponses claires à ces problématiques pour le cas européen. Pourquoi ? Parce que les chercheurs ne disposent pas de données harmonisées et accessibles pour aborder ces questions ! Il y a toutefois un espoir. Les administrations des pays scandinaves et des États-Unis ont fait l'effort de développer un appareil statistique sophistiqué accessibles aux chercheurs afin de favoriser les travaux sur ces questions. Pourquoi ne pas en faire autant à l'échelle européenne ? La création d'Eurostat, l'institut de statistiques européen, a permis aux citoyens et aux chercheurs de disposer de données et d'indicateurs économiques harmonisés au sein de l'Europe. Je propose de continuer dans cette lancée en lançant un grand programme européen de développement statistique. Ce programme aurait pour but d'appareiller et d'harmoniser les données des différents ministères de l'éducation, de la santé et du logement avec les données fiscales de chaque pays européen. Et surtout de rendre accessible ces données, préalablement anonymisées, aux chercheurs. Un tel outil permettrait enfin de mieux comprendre l'évolution et les déterminants des inégalités en Europe et de pouvoir mettre en place des politiques publiques adaptées pour répondre à ces enjeux.

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

There is a need to look at gaps within countries across different groups of the population (gender, age, education level); collect further data in order to have a **better grasp on the trends**: are the gaps narrowing or widening?

In order to better understand the impact of social policies on happiness and wellbeing, EU needs initiatives for better **evaluation of the impact of social policies** (including of national policies and local initiatives) so that EU could transfer and promote the best practices more efficiently. EU's role in relation to social policies is limited, mainly to promote good measures – Can support good local practices and initiatives; Can guide member states and transfer knowledge of good practices between them. Eurofound's role is to provide comparative information in the EU level and assess the quality of life, but it is also important to evaluate local practices and policies. With better information on the impact of social policies, EU could transfer and promote the best practices more efficiently.

We should have a **more social Union**, because that would help people FEEL that they are European. The EU should give help to people, so that they would see that it is on their side.

Education is key and should teach us to have **social responsibility**. Social responsibility is key to increasing happiness.

I would propose EU to include a **commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction in both villages and rural areas**. By improving basic education, health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation. Address the special need of those who live in Landlocked areas. I propose EU to achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all especially those who stay in villages and the rural areas, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communication to them, strengthen their security systems, ensure their environmental sustainability, assist the farmers both financially and technologically because agriculture is one of the key factors toward economic growth. Make sure to establish an open commercial and financial system that is connected, predictable and non-discriminatory for anyone. Those who live in the rural sides can make a great impact in the development agenda of European Union but they should be given the equal opportunities.

Peripheries need sustainable development improvements through social changes. The rural societies vary depending on the region but it is the society that implements change. In my opinion the EU should bring the local communities together by **programmes that would at the same time integrate and educate the population**. As the citizens of villages do not entirely depend on the external entities influencing their habits or customs, such events should be co-organized by the locals. This could help identify problems within the communities, such as using poisonous materials for heating which would decrease the air quality in the village. As people could actually smell the pollution directly from the air they breathe they would be more determined to get rid of a problem. Therefore they would ask the programme supervisor to help the family

that releases the pollutants through providing the resources of greener energy. It is important that the programmes do not focus on penalties (which are not affordable for impoverished rural inhabitants) but on the delivery of proper resources for the greater good of our globe.

Rural regions should not suffer from low quality public service, they still need transport and train transport, post offices, high quality schools, libraries or other cultural houses; but there is a limit how much you can move to rural areas. Sometimes the answer is **good connection with nearest city**. EU should be more like network.

Promoting the importance of **support services for young people**: Even though social policies can differ between the member states, there is a consensus (and Eurofound is also currently conducting research on this) that support services can be critically important and can foster the positive development in young people's lives. For instance, access to (not only) job counselling and advice, but also information and support on health issues, including mental health services, housing services, support in crisis and in case of bullying, harassment, further education, etc. can make a crucial difference in different life situations of young people. It would be important to further explore and highlight the role and importance of variety of support services on the lives of young people in Europe.

When looking at the **"happiness gap"**, there is a need to go beyond subjective well-being to **include some of its drivers** (social connections, work-life balance, etc.). C.f. OECD framework.

We should reconsider how we live: adopt a holistic approach to the issue; we need to **decouple happiness and income**. Income is not a guarantee for happiness but other things.

Generally, happiness is a matter of perspective but in regards to living standards the main thing is that poorer feel they had not get the same opportunities as those who have money due to the fact of expense, so there needs to be more **training** that the poorer population can afford. People also need to be encouraged that they can achieve their dreams regardless of their social class or how much they have in their pockets.

In my opinion the minimum index of happiness is: to have an house where to live, to receive affectivity (from family or from other people), to be healthy, to have money to satisfy our needs, to be satisfied of our own life. We have to concentrate our attention on these points. In order to make people happier, I propose the creation of **social houses** in the Member states paid by the EU to give to families or group of people with serious economic difficulties.

Happiness comes from within. It does not depend on external factors, those are just excuses, a nice car and a pretty dress would not be sufficient for you to be happy in the long-term. It is by learning how to deal with our emotions, with the people around us, our surroundings, the opportunities and challenges that we will encounter in life that we will be deeply happy. Thus, **teaching to children how to deal with their emotions** is paramount. Encouraging **mindfulness** in schools, workplaces

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

and society in general will foster not only happiness but also compassion, understanding and solidarity. This is the true key of a happy society.

Between member states of Europe there is a "happiness gap". The major reason of the gap is that some countries have stronger economies than others. To shrink this gap Europe should first make youth employment conditions and fight against unemployment. Also, it should make the citizens **feel safe by improving the security**. Last but not least, Europe must find strive for EQUALITY so that all youth have the **same opportunities for studying and living well**.

Nowadays more and more people in specific European countries lack happiness and therefore a "happiness gap", between these countries and the remaining ones exists. Poverty, unaffordable governance measures, discrimination, the economic crisis are the main reasons which lead countries to unhappiness and depression. In my opinion, Europe should **support these countries financially** and send European representatives in order to help them overcome their problems as soon as possible. As it concerns the reduction of the discrimination, EU can take some measures and have an authorised person responsible for checking the extent to which these measures are being implemented. Another possible solution that will definitely have positive effect on the wellbeing of a country is the promotion of different European events and festivals. By making this happen, not only a friendly atmosphere among all European countries will be developed but also a feeling of support and collaboration.

We should care about each member of our community. Social standards are not for charity, but in order to have healthier workers, smarter kids, more fearless start ups, the **community has to be involved in policy making**.

Orientation years. Years to discover new personal opportunities, made possible by a basic income. An opportunity, any time in your life, to look at where you are standing and where you are heading to.

Make wider **access to the arts** - make access to art affordable. Art makes people happy.

Scroll-Free September: **no use of social media for a month**.

Pop-up heavy usage warning in order to avoid mass using of social media.

There is no alternative to real psychological treatment, young people are vulnerable for psychological problems and too much stress from pressure. Doctor Instagram will not cover that.

Create mindfulness and **awareness around Social Media Use**.

Society could focus more on doing cool things in real life, if there is no game field in the streets, the entertainment will move to virtual world. Icelanders have some achievements to make real world more appealing. The use of social media

depends on the user (human capital), if capital is high they will use it to seek people with similar interest. New social media are not a problem on their own. There may be a problem with culture in which only people on very top are respected. We can teach people to seek happiness in their own action rather than likes.

In order to make people happier, I propose an **Erasmus plus** project for people of **all ages** in order to make people of different ages meet and share their experiences. In this way people who normally don't receive **affect** can create new friends and share emotions with them. People who don't speak English could also participate thanks to the linguistic and cultural mediation of qualified teamers.

European welfare system: Basic healthcare provisions should be free.

Create a **European Electronic Medical Record** which: contains the main medical and administrative information of the patient; in which both the Patient and Health professionals can add and modify data; could be easily Portable, like a credit card; storage system should be designed in order to store data in a normalized and structured way to allow interoperability and a longitudinal follow-up of the patient. The storage system should allow the creation of European registries, and dynamic analysis of the spread of a disease or an epidemic in Europe. If countries start by building their own Electronic Medical Record, they should be designed in order to allow flexibility and interoperability in the thought of merging the systems in the future by creating a European Electronic Medical Record.

ALLOWING YOUNG PEOPLE TO HAVE **ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE** REGARDLESS OF FINANCIAL MEANS OR STATUS. All health related speculations and speculations in the medical world should be forbidden in order to remove any form of commodification of health care which prevents us from being treated.

Some **taxes on junk food or added sugar product** could be an option.

Obesity has become a big problem in some countries in Europe and our sedentary lives increase it. Every kid must have sport at school, and I recommend that every **company** imposes at least **two hours a week of sport**, like some companies already do in Sweden. Most of all, we must let trees and public gardens develop in our cities, to encourage people to go for a walk or a run on a sunny day ; and we must build public stadiums and fields open to everyone so that people can play sports with friends whenever they want. Picture it: you live in a diverse peripheral area of the city. It is a sunny Saturday morning, you take the tram line to the city center, you go for a run with your friends and then, you come back home, take your electric car and go to the closest store. On the car park, the batteries of your car reloads while you buy what you need in a store that isn't too big and where most of the products are sold in packaging without plastic. At the exit, you give back your used plastic bottles and you collect the money. You eat dinner, cooked with products of the urban farm, with your neighbours on the roof

of your house. The night is cold, but no problem, your solar panels produce enough electricity to keep your apartment warm. This life is possible, both citizens and leaders have to work on it and to invest time and money in those new cities. I didn't invent these propositions, I only looked at what already existed in some places and tried to make all of these initiatives work together. This is a long-time investment and it is time that we start planning a better future.

In order to make Europeans happier, the EU should finance the **cure of people affected by serious diseases** with the priority people affected by a more severe disease.

Include a youth preventive perspective in the social pillar, including the right for youth to live a fulfilling social life and the right for youth to live a life in an environment **free from drugs**.

In high school, if students want to smoke cigarettes or drugs in countries where it is legalized they should first **meet people knowledgeable about drugs** during one day. At the end of this day, interns would receive a small card with their name stating that they have been informed about the consequences of smoking.

If someone is arrested with Marijuana, it could be an interesting idea, instead of fining them, to require them to **spend a day within an association fighting against drugs** or to assist this association in supporting addict people.

It could as well be beneficial to organize every trimester or so a meeting at the European Parliament to talk about drugs, not from a political perspective but from a **medical and neuroscientific one**.

Every semester or so, one hospital in every country in the European Union **should invite young people to visit a drug unit** and to speak to drug addicts. La Pitie Salpetriere hospital could be the pilot.

Marijuana should be legalised at the state/country level. EP/EC shouldn't intervene too much into such specific laws. Better to leave countries to make some decisions, especially if the topic isn't essential. There shouldn't be any EC/EP level legal barriers for cannabis, and from EC/EP point view trade and commercial production should be allowed. However, if something has health and medical benefit it should be legal from EC/EP perspective. Recreational marijuana should generally be legal, since it is not worse than alcohol or tobacco. Also, it is easier to use well known drugs, than new ones like meth.

The use of marijuana hardly seems to have a negative impact on Dutch society does it? With the USA legalising it one state at a time, it surely is now only a matter of time it is **legalised** here in Europe.

Cannabis is one of the most known illegal drugs in the world and it is one of the most important source of money for criminal organizations. It was convicted to be illegal by the development of synthetic fibres industries, it isn't more

harmful than alcohol or smoke, and it can be a new source of money and work places. In this historical moment we have the power to control by telematic way who and how use it (for examples by the use of health card to buy it) so it can be useful to help and prevent. It's really a foolishness that we don't use it to develop new way to work, to use it in health sciences and in other way. History teach us that **Prohibition isn't the right way**. Make it legal.

I think we must make **marijuana legal**. There would be a lot more benefits to the country. If marijuana becomes legal, there would be much less crime, and less young people who stop school. E.g at the economic level France could collect billions of euros which would thus help to modernize hospitals, recruit people, more teachers and the construction of new structures. But marijuana must be well controlled, we could put a marijuana tax for consumption (not for health). Marijuana traders should have a license approved by the government. We should set a legal threshold to prevent over-consumption and an age limit. A **buffer card** could be a good idea, meaning that every time a consumer wants to buy marijuana, I swipe his card to track his consumption or do it with an electronic card.

On one hand if Cannabis was legal, people would consume more quantity but the **money would go to the government** and we suppose it would be better for us since the government would use it to improve our country and to have a better life. On the other hand if Cannabis would remind illegal, the money would go to smugglers.

We are pro-legalization of marijuana for many different reasons. The first one is an economical reason: if you consider that only in France each year, around 2.5 billion euros worth of marijuana is sold, you can imagine how much money the French government could make if it makes dealer a real job. Also, they could create taxes on marijuana, which would enable them to get a part out of these 2.5 billion euros, that could be reinvested in the hospitals or simply be used to increase French people's salaries. This is just an example but it works for all countries around the world. The second reason is that if you think about it, some people only smoke cannabis because it is illegal and so they would probably stop smoking if it is legalized. Another reason is that it is not as addictive as people imagine it is. It is different than heroin and other drugs to the extent that they directly release dopamine into the brain, whereas marijuana is addictive just like video games or sports could be, the addiction is more or less intense based on the behaviour that people adopt towards it. Cannabis can also help people who have a very difficult life to surpass their problems and feel happier instead of becoming depressed. Another advantage of this plant is that it has incredible medical virtues, such as reducing the pain of patients who have cancer or even asthma ; and in fact, even if it is illegal, the policemen patrolling out at night in the city who look out for smoking teenagers or young adults allow them to keep what they have if the quantity owned is small, so actually, legalization would change a lot, and eliminate the waste of time of the policemen out at night. Our last argument is that more than one million people smoke marijuana in France even if it is illegal and are pro-legalization, so make it legal !

Should cannabis remain illegal or be tolerated as part of the European way of life? In every country of Europe alcohol is already legal but we know for a fact that it is more dangerous than marijuana. The most dangerous thing that happens when you smoke marijuana, is that you might fall asleep or just laughing uncontrollably. Whereas alcohol is killing people. Also by legalizing marijuana, every country could make a huge profit out of it and at the same time use it for medical purposes and therefore help some people with for example chronic pain or insomnia. It is true that there is some downsides with for example a risk of causing depression or dementia. But is any medication safe besides placebo? We personally do not think so and it could just create so much money that I just think it would be worth it to legalize it. Furthermore it is already used by a lot of people in Europe thus it does not need to create its market. We can just use the existing one. If it becomes legal people won't be tempted to try other illegal drugs as they will already be doing a legal one. We think that it is already mostly part of the European way of life, because as we already said, it is used by a lot of people. It could also easily be introduced in the European way of life to maybe be used instead of a lot of antidepressants that people are using. For example France is one of the biggest consumer of antidepressants and those medication are very addictive which is a problem in its own. Maybe by using marijuana instead it could help those people not having depression anymore and also stopping to take their pills for depression.

Marijuana should be made legal. It is not a dangerous drug, and has many **medical benefits**. Alcohol, a much more dangerous substance, remains legal whilst marijuana remains illegal. Marijuana is very easy to access in our modern day society, so those who seek to use it can still easily get their hands on it. By making marijuana legal it can be monitored, users can seek help without fearing legal repercussions and the government can regulate it.

Cannabis is one of the most known drugs to date. It is also illegal in most countries around the world. Aside from being a drug which a lot of people use as a scapegoat from their everyday life, it is also a drug which have been proven to be less harmful than alcohol and tobacco. In addition, it has also been proved to be an effective medicine for certain diseases/disorders such as depression, pain relief, cancer and aids. There is a common misconception that substances like cannabis are incredibly addictive. This is simply wrong, there has been several reports that have documented addictive behaviour as the main factor in drug addiction relating to cannabis and other illegal substances (e.g psychedelic substances). What this means is that addictive behaviour is the driving factor for the addiction and not the substance itself. In contrast, opioids (such as heroin, morphine, fentanyl etc.) releases massive amounts of dopamine which creates an euphoric experience. Over long time use, this will stop the brain's natural production of dopamine since it gets massive amounts from the substance. Therefore, individuals who stop using these substances will get withdrawal symptoms and possibly develop illnesses such as depression due to the lack of dopamine. This is also why these specific substances

are banned and deemed as dangerous since they have high dependency rates and horrible side-effects. This is not the case with cannabis, it does not create this effect and therefore it is not as addictive. People who have addictive personalities can be addicted to almost anything. Therefore, I believe that it **should be legal**.

Not all cannabis acts like Marijuana. The media and educational programs (Schools) have failed in teaching about the differences between the cannabis sorts and their effects. Therefore, one could make **some legal but not all of them**.

As for most of the issues, there are **both pros and cons** in making cannabis legal. On the one hand, prohibition of cannabis is undoubtedly a huge government intrusion into individual and total freedom of choice. Furthermore, it is not like cannabis is more harmful than alcohol or tobacco for our health and they are both used legally, not to mention that cannabis is proven to have medical benefits for cancer, AIDS, glaucoma and other diseases. Crime and violence are greatly increased due to illegal selling and buying of cannabis, thus legalization would eliminate such behaviour. Statistics show that many arrests are related to cannabis, while drug bursts offences often carry harsh penalties that can cause severe social harm with lifelong consequences. Last but not least, cannabis is one of the top- selling agricultural products, so if it was legalized billions would be saved annually. On the other hand, many people believe that cannabis is immoral and that their moral standards should be adopted by all the Europeans. In addition, long term or abusive use of cannabis can be harmful to a person's health and passive smoking of cannabis can turn out to be harmful to others. Moreover, cannabis can lead to addiction, that can have as a result use of more harmful drugs such as heroin and cocaine. Additionally, according to opponents of legalization, individuals involved in illegal buying or selling are highly likely to be involved in other criminal activities. Finally, law enforcement agencies don't want to be interpreted that they support drug use.

The consumption of Marijuana is a fact, especially at our age. Who would profit from a legalization? First the consumers, because they could have a better quality of Marijuana (quality control). Secondly, the state because it can impose taxes and the police and judges would have less work. Thirdly, the economy because they can earn money with new products. Who profits from illegality? Criminals. Of course, Marijuana is not healthy, but alcohol and cigarettes are not healthy too. The use of medicaments including Marijuana shows also the comparatively low level of harmfulness. Keeping **Marijuana illegal is bad for all persons involved**.

I think we can make **marijuana legal**, it's not more dangerous than alcohol or cigarette and cannabis-related traffic could be less important by favouring marijuana distributed by the state while being beneficial economically. We can also add the medical benefits of smoking cannabis that helps calm and relieve the patient's pain.

Ladies and gentlemen, this drug-situation should be embraced and used in a productive way. So many people talk about

SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

marijuana being legally allowed. Do something about it. Use this people's strong wish in order to get what you want from them. For example, "yes, you can buy and consume marijuana as long as you want, but...". And there it goes, this "but" will allow you to manipulate the people that choose to smoke it. "You are allowed to buy and consume marijuana, but you must pay some fees and taxes, you must visit the doctor twice a month specifically for this matter" and so on. **Impose your conditions**, make sure the people will accept this idea, by fulfilling their wishes. Taking in consideration that marijuana is not as harmful as the abuse of alcohol, I think that by making it legal is not a bad idea at all. Another fact I want to highlight is that, by allowing the consume of cannabis you will know entirely the amount bought, and there will not be necessary to hide and buy it from the black market. These kind of actions will be discouraged. In conclusion, I spoke up and told you my point of view. I hope you have the time to read my opinion!

Marijuana is a drug which is frequently abused and has devastating effects due to the psychological effect it has on people. If this is made legal then it would create less devastating effect due to the fact that it would be **regulated by medical professionals** and there should be a rule implied where it should not be sold or taken by anyone under the age of 25. The reason for this is because when you are under the age of 25 your brain is not fully developed therefore the psychological effects of Marijuana will affect you in a negative way. It should also be regulated so that individuals do not become addicted to the drug.

I believe that we should make marijuana legal. By doing this we will eliminate a large percentage of the black market and we will be able to save the money that would have been going into criminal hands. Also, marijuana can benefit you in several ways. For example, it can be used as medicine (cure depression or anxiety) and according to a study done by the American Medical Association marijuana does not damage the lungs unlike tobacco. In addition, studies have concluded that no one in history died purely from the overdose of marijuana. To summarize, we should make the use of marijuana legal because its benefits although the necessary precautions need to be taken.

It is ALREADY in the European way of life, everybody has heard of it, seen it, or tried it. And nobody died. Except people involved in traffic. So yes, we should definitely **tolerate it**, and offer medical support to the users, like with any other drug.

Should we legalise a substance which is less dangerous than tobacco and alcohol, and which can be used as an analgesic, anti-emetic? It could be used for anorexia treatment and has been shown to have a slowing effect on specific brain tumours. I don't see cannabis as a public health risk. Cannabis is used to fund criminal organisations and it is a huge lost, taxable commodity. The best thing we could do is legalise cannabis, tax it, put it in stores with an **age restriction of 18-21**, and make sure the **police confiscate cannabis from younger people**. Education is also key!!! Also we need to study cannabis more, for its harmful effects and medicinal effects.

Marijuana should be treated as like any other drug - a lot of young people are just curious about the behaving effect after using it. There is plenty of addictive substances not illegal, because their side effects is just temporary and after some time, there shouldn't be any bad health results. Narcotics are different - it is harder to create it and controlling someone after taking them- that's why **marijuana should be completely banned**.

Social media do overexpose teenagers (everyone in fact) to a constant online feedback and idealised images. I believe that **anyone under the age of 18 should not be allowed to be present on social media** so that they are given enough time to adapt to real life, adjust their mind-set realistically and have little distractions so early on at school. The later they are introduced to social media the better the chances are for them to develop a stronger mind-set and friendships in real life rather than only online. They will also be given a chance to develop their interpersonal skills in reality. There is also a need to ban "fake news" completely and do something about media outlets spreading false news online and spreading it around because this is miseducating our youth and creating unnecessary division which is creating hate as a result.

Energy

The EU needs to establish a stable **long-term framework for phasing out coal**. This framework should include: 1) An end date for coal mining (even if far in the future) – individual end dates for member states (considering national circumstances) are also an option. Such end dates could be displayed by a “no coal countdown”, including a “no more coal party” or day of celebration; 2) A long-term pathway to reach this end date (budget approach); 3) Networks facilitating dialogue between concerned regions, including the views of mayor stakeholders and residents – the European Network of Mining Regions (ENMR) and the Mining and Metallurgy Regions of EU (MIREU) should be strengthened; 4) Financial options should be made available for creative innovations and ideas

While pushing the coal exit, how do we prevent importing energy from other countries? We should use **virtual net metering** as an alternative to building long unnecessary electric pipelines across countries.

Europe should make sure that all citizens have access to renewable energy. I would like to focus on two tools for the renewable energy directive: Virtual Net-Metering and Renewable Energy Communities. 1) **“Virtual net-metering”** is a legal system that allows electricity credits generated in one location, for example from a solar installation on the rooftop of the European Parliament, to be bought, sold, or just transferred to the electricity bill of another location, for example to the electricity bill of my flat; 2) A **“Renewable Energy Community”** is a legal entity which is created and controlled by a community who owns a renewable energy installation, for example a small wind park, or is developing such a renewable energy project. The main focus of a Renewable Energy Community is not to provide financial gaining for its members but rather environmental, economic and/or social benefits for them and/or the local area. If these two tools are easily accessible for all Europeans, we can all support actively the European Energy Transition and help to decrease energy poverty.

To cut greenhouse gas emissions and shift from dirty fossil fuels to clean energy sources, the EU should extend special **support to entrepreneurship in the area of clean energy technology in developing and emerging economies**. Such support should facilitate easier access to capital, awareness, easier risk assessment for private investment. 1) Grant funding/soft loans: There should be dedicated instruments (e.g. as the SME-Instrument under H2020) to support organizations with this profile as they have a significant potential for the future position of Europe in the clean energy transition; 2) Network and support programs like Climate KIC should be formed for start-ups active in transitioning economies.

To strengthen the EUs position in the transition from fossil

fuels to clean energy, there should be dedicated financial and non-financial instruments of the EU for the **support of start-ups** that are between the proof of concept phase and scaling phase. Such a “theme” should focus on facilitating: Integration with large companies; Mapping out economic incentives across different European countries; Provide high risk, patient capital for the “missing middle”.

In my opinion, we should shift from dirty fossil fuels to clean energy sources drastically and right now. I would first suggest an **increased investment in research in green technologies** and in its implementation. There are already several of them waiting to be marketed on large scale, such as solar glass, offshore wind power, and some devices such as hydrogen cars. Actually, scientists know that if everyone had electric cars it would be impossible to find enough power to supply them, so we really need alternatives or other energy sources. We could even create more government investigation teams. This is like war, red alert to our planet, so it would make all sense.

We must **improve worldwide deals** and to take environmental measures together with other nations. A way to make it easier would be to increase our power by **investing** on the energy sector, the **green energy sector**. If we could, through green energy, to become more energetically independent, it would help. We also must stop taking symbolic measures, and try to move other countries to do the same. We must most of all give the example and be no longer tolerant about this subject.

I like the way you move! A type of **technological floor/pavement** that uses piezoelectric materials and can be used in busy areas and dancefloors which transfer footsteps and movements like vehicles into kinetic energy.

Circular green economy. People will **produce energy for the city by cycling at gyms**. People become healthier and energy is renewable.

Water energy transfer aka “The Waterfall”. Buildings in cities are getting higher and higher, so we could use energy that comes from water falling down from great heights in buildings. This can be done by putting turbines in the pipes.

Brain-inspired **Artificial Intelligence for energy efficient smart cities**. In UCA we’re working on applying a new form of AI inspired from the brain’s behaviour to implement intelligent and thus energy-efficient wireless sensors that only send information when necessary.

Greenhouse gas emissions can be just reduced if the industry would produce less per day and use little energy. Fossil fuels are not the main problem when we consider that, there is the EURO-NORMS for car manufacturers which were already designed in the mid 90’s. At the moment we have the EURO 6 until 2020, after that maybe EURO 7 will be appear. For that reason everything is calculated, but we have to give the citizens the possibility to **change their fossil fuel cars**, and this would

ENVIRONNEMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

be achieved through European **micro credits offered by the European central bank**.

Stop investing in dirty fossil fuels! We have to change the market and investing in green energy sources. Another point would be to ban BP, Shell etc. to provide **offshore in the Artic**.

Transports

Call for a **EU-wide tax on fuel emissions** and for an **end of diesel tax breaks**. A tax on transport fuels would change the price differential between fossil fuels and renewable transport technologies. Current mineral oil taxes do not focus on greenhouse gas emissions; They often privilege diesel fuel. Current EU minimum taxes on mineral oils should be raised; Tax breaks for diesel need to be cancelled. Revenues should be used to support innovations in low carbon mobility (e.g. sharing economy apps, sustainable drives etc.)

A **new way to transport products**. Products could be transported through the public transport or in special trams. There is also the idea of pneumatic tubes to transport products and things all through the city.

Cities above ground. A one floor or more structure designed as following: columns are skyscrapers, they will serve as elevators or transport system. Relieve the existing city from traffic and citizens green transport.

Cars replaced by **Eco-tram**: trams that utilize the space **above ground** (and operates on solar energy), giving back the space to nature and pedestrians.

Create a **pathway network along the buildings** allowing pedestrians and bikers to move up on different levels.

City streets are entirely made by **horizontal escalators and exclusively for non-motoric vehicles**. They move at different paces and have different destinations and can be installed at any level.

Power Roads. To generate renewable energy, a system will be implemented to **collect sun rays of the streets**, that for instance could be used to power free public transport.

Highways for bikes only, with solar panels to charge the bikes. Plus, panels that can **create energy** while biking on them. Stations with shared bikes, for everyone to use, with a card.

Some people cannot afford a good bicycle that is safe and comfortable to ride. The idea is to give each person one **free bike** once in a lifetime so there are not excuse not to ride more anymore!

Help to change our **mobility** with individual **subventions** and fee reductions. Individual subventions to change car, buy bicycles and pass for transport / symbolic price for every distance.

Cycle your Life! **Help budget for enterprises to promote usage of bicycle as a daily transport to work**: construction of installations, showers. Reorganize Infrastructure. Promote usage of bicycle instead of motorized vehicles.

Smart Bike. **Bikes that recharge themselves with electricity while cycling**. Electricity that can be used to charge phones or help the next cyclist in the slopes.

Develop **free public transport**. One free bike per person; safe and free parking for all; free bike rentals; free Interrail; free national railway.

Test out the idea of **free public transportation** in more cities than it's being implemented right now to really measure the potential positive impact.

Predictive demand **optimized public transport**. Public minibuses (5-10 pers.) will be available for residents of a city using an app. The rides are minimized by an Artificial Intelligence using all past data. Thus, the total distance driven is reduced greatly.

One of the main problems regarding air pollution and/or climate change is traffic in big cities. To create a sustainable city, a suggestion to fix this could be a greater focus on public transport. By creating a **better offer on the public transport** factor, fewer people will drive private cars which will lead to less air pollution. Another suggestion is to offer bikes which should be available for everyone and facilitate roads for bikes. New cities should focus on a green future.

Reduce transport pollution by making **public transportation free** as any other public service should be.

It would be much better if the EU would provide **public transportations** to keep the prices low for the consumer, also people would think twice if they would go by car or by train (or bus) if they have a delicate offer!

Transportation solutions: **bike highways, abandoning cars**, gardening during bus rides, innovative public transport such as **cable cars**.

Free Interrail passes to all students.

The city is a village: Cities are organized to **minimize commuting** by "mixed use areas". Plus, community centres provide exchange of tools, services, practice and knowledge.

Get rid of car ownership through self-driven electric taxis/ buses. In 2050, cars will be electric and self-driven. Like Uber does, with an app one can book a taxi to go anywhere from anywhere. People wouldn't need to own cars anymore and the service would be public.

Bicycle boats & buses. A **bus with lots of pedals and seats**, lightweight. More people = faster environmental groups can use, all should use. Good when you are in a rush. Free bus shows the location where others can join.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Modulable Car. Imagine an electric car that can be big (for 5 people or more) or transform in a little single place car (transformative car according to the needs).

DRONUBER it's a shared-drone system that delivers, mails, personal belonging and people/drones. Examples of drone transportations, Tokyo (people) Amazon (products).

Shuttle home <-> work. Finance the enterprise to develop a shuttle system for their employees. Work on the shuttle and count the time as working time

It is the duty of the EU leaders to safeguard the future generations. Concern about the planet is something all people share regardless of their nationality. The **transport sector should be more supervised, private cars should be banned in polluted city centres.** PROMOTE public transport, make it more affordable, sustainable and most importantly, the first choice for citizens.

Traffic in big cities is one of the main problems we have regarding air pollution and climate change. So I would like to propose a **ban on driving private cars in big city centres.** At the same time, I want to extend public transport in these centres to make it possible for people to still be mobile.

The idea is to erase almost completely the **cars from European cities.** Only the main axes would be kept for transport. Zones in between are dedicated for bicycles and public transportations.

We need to reduce air pollution and noise pollution in our cities. For that, we need to **ban cars from the city centers** and only allow electrical buses and tramways there. We should also have bicycle stations so that **people can borrow bicycles with a season ticket.** We also have to encourage everyone to buy electrical cars: the best way to do so is to install electric charging on every parking space. But we have to go further, because in lots of countries, electricity comes from the nuclear power. A solution would be to **install solar panels on every building** and to put the extra electricity produced in the city electrical network.

I am an engineer student and I am writing my master thesis about a **new system for driving cars.** It is based on hydrogen produced splitting water into its primary components. It works, it is reliable and safe and in the short-term period can make conventional cars cleaner and in a further future it can be a good solution for only hydrogen fed vehicles. The company which is working on this technology is called Hydromoving. With this system, it will be cheaper having more public transports and reduce traffic in cities.

We should **stop financially supporting airplane business.** We should make sure not entirely to lean on technical advances in the field of e-cars. That would only let the sale of cars increase. We have to keep in mind that they are not environmentally friendlier than standard cars.

Urban ecology

Green urban planning. Pedestrian zones, larger cycling lanes, proximity of goods and services (city at eye level, reduction of the numbers of journeys) limitation of speed limits and better connection of public transport.

Green-grey-ratio: **High-rise is used for ecology:** Roofs become parks or solar panels, high buildings have to contain a certain number of park- and farming-levels. Streets are carless and get water-parks.

Urban gardening/roof gardens (using unused space); Interaction between different generations; Urban gardening communities; Parks & gardens without human influence.

Hanging gardens to provide every flat with a garden/nature spot, pyramid building. Creating a better connection to nature. 100% green housing.

Bridge of to the future. A **bridge with no pavement but grass instead, and a hanging garden under it** to exploit all the space underneath the bridge. It could also contain an air filtration system inside.

Making Change Count. City policy where business participate in allowing customers to **round up purchases to next full Euro.** "Income" will be invested in a fund for green & start-up businesses.

All new **buildings have to fulfil strict rules:** compostation for collective heating, rainwater collecting systems, insect-hotels, white painting, renewable energies, green spaces.

Installing **compost garbage pipelines** in housing estates which produce natural fertiliser for use in community gardens and green attics.

Imagine the **city centre without any car traffic** - only pedestrians, bikes and public transportation surrounded by green spaces and calm, clean atmosphere. Free centre - free mind.

Look green, feel green, be green. Mandate for creation of amount of green space (parks, gathering spaces) per square km in urban areas. Establish **quotas for the least number of trees** in a residential, industrial, etc. blocks.

Where the wild things are. **Expanding wild natural spaces into urban areas.** Make existing parks "wilder", less decorative, more natural. Let nature take back unused spaces.

In order to motivate cities to implement eco-friendly changes, we should create a **ranking of cities** improving the fastest and award them.

Introduce requirements for **rain water collection** in residential and public buildings for e.g. toilet flushing, plant watering, car washing, etc.

ENVIRONNEMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

In most modern cities, we face another issue: poor families all live in the same neighbourhoods, rich families in others; some neighbourhoods are safer than others and there is not enough social diversity. We need to work on what **gathers people**. Education, sport, arts. By increasing the public transports from the outskirts to the city centers, we develop connections between people. Art is also a way for people to connect, thus I propose to give walls to graffiti artists and to create places opened to anyone who want to share their passion. This could be a room open to everyone in a public building. Another way to connect people is through urban farms : everyone can grow and collect vegetables together. These are ecological and safe meeting places for people with different backgrounds and lives.

Despite the high quality of life that some of the so-called developed nations have achieved, the truth is that the world, considered as a group of countries located in a fragile and geographically limited biosphere, is threatened with extinction due to human conflicts and the depredation of the environment. Notwithstanding the good and very important actions taken by groups and individuals in favour of a better world, deterioration at all levels continues to increase dangerously. After more than thirty years dedicated to these matters, and since "an image is worth a thousand words" we have come up with a novel idea of designing a **model city** that has all the characteristics of infrastructure and organization inherent to the peaceful and sustainable society that we want for ourselves and our descendants, whose representation in the form of scale models, animated series, feature films, video games and theme parks, would constitute a model to follow to generate the necessary changes. The prototype that we present has some characteristics that are opposed, sometimes in a radical way, to the religious, economic, political and educational traditions and customs that have been transmitted from generation to generation, yet are the causes of the aforementioned problems, and therefore must be transformed. If you are interested in knowing about this project, or even participating in it, we invite you to visit our website <https://elmundofelizdelfuturo.blogspot.com> where we are working in that sense.

The traffic in the big cities have the most pollution, the way this should fix this is to make cities which are better for the climate. This city should use more of the nature, like **solar panels**, but then the city do not need the huge skyscrapers, and have smaller houses and apartments. This will make it easier for the solar panels to do their job. The traffic should be fixed by using **biogas for the busses** and have more electrical cars.

A way to further develop the life and future of sustainable cities would be to promote a mix of **ecotourism and sustainable tourism**. Ecotourism aims to develop the knowledge and leisure industry around small local cities, natural environment and wildlife. Yet even though this type of tourism has good intentions it has some rapid negative consequences on both local communities and the environment due to the rapid growth of this sector over the past few years. Sustainable

cities are more incline on receiving massive ways of tourism and their sustainable approach can reduce the impact on the environment caused by tourism. Sustainable tourism is in itself related to sustainable cities. The aim is to visit places without having any negative impact on the environment. Thus sustainable cities could promote the green aspect and leisure aspect combined to be more attractive to masses of tourism. Yet if sustainable cities need to accept this role, the community needs to be developed to a maximum as mass sustainable tourism would require a large amount of control over every aspect of the leisure. The positive impact on sustainable cities would be a great rise in the city's economy. Furthermore, the leisure industry requiring manpower would develop the city's daily life with the creation of shops, restaurants and services. This could go from electric taxis or trams ensuring the traffic in the city to sustainable hotels on the model of the Hi Hotel in Nice for economic leisure or the Hotel Punta Islita, Costa Rica for luxury leisure, thus attracting a wide variety of tourist and further developing the city's economy.

Cities should be concentrated to some degree. Like 5-6 flats high. That allows public transport or just walking around. Endless suburbs and family automobile steals commuters life and kills planet. There should be some form of **public housing for young families**. So they could move around after jobs. There should be **entertainment zones, parks, playfields**. There need be various public transport forms and care sharing service. Suburb cars should park on rim of the city, and people should move to public transport.

A sustainable city would be full of **vegetation and food** growing in the streets, on the roofs and in all so far unused gardens. Transportation would be collective, ecological and free: bikes should be available in all cities and roads should be made for them. Public spaces should be many for people to **encounter** each other and build social, economical or artistic projects. Culture and nature should be at the core of the new cities.

Agriculture, animals

I propose to modify the directive concerning the release of genetically modified non-human organisms (**GMOs**) into the environment, in order to appropriately regulate disease vectors that might be modified using the CRISPR system and gene drives. Modifications should include: provide guidance on how the GMO directive should be understood to interact with clinical regulations; regarding member states who object to use of an approved GMO and the fact that current provisions to avoid cross-border GMO contamination do not take into account cases like gene-drive mosquitoes, the EU may have to reconsider how to navigate fundamental democratic issues in implementing field trials that may put even abstaining states at unavoidable risk; risk assessments of gene drives for disease vectors should not be performed solely by the European Food Safety Authority, but in collaboration with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control; the European Parliament

ENVIRONNEMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

should reconsider the role of the precautionary principle in the directive, and closely attend to the potential benefits, as well as the risks associated with different courses of action available.

The UE (the Court more precisely) should **integrate the “new GMOs”** (derived from the new “breeding techniques”) **in the same legal frame as the “former GMOs”** (derived from transgenesis, and so on). This frame is very good, as it imposes the risks assessment; the labelling.../ The Parliament and the Commission should not allow any patent about a native gene / A referendum should be organized to ask the European citizens if they would like to see banned agricultural GMOs.

Human genetic modification (i.e. the modification of humans) must follow certain rules - 1) For the improvement of health. 2) Not for frivolous reasons. These should be the core elements of human genetic modification. Any possible GM treatment must go through the same review process as drugs go through so that we can assess the safety and viability of each separate treatment. But as a general rule: if we have the ability to cure a disease, then we should do so... As for agricultural and animal GM: as we saw recently with Monsanto, some companies may attempt to mislead the EU Parliament and the public, which is why it is not enough that the companies carry out studies on their products, but the **EU must hire its own researchers to carry out screening on every new GM product!**

We must **fund GMO development through non-private means** as well, so we can produce non patented means of producing GMOs which can be used to start smaller GM companies. We must recognise that our current, overly restrictive laws have created market barriers for small GM start-ups which are unfair and have made the GM market one ruled by an oligopoly. We must combat such anti-competitive systems and thus I suggest that we fund, not only public research, but also give subsidies to small GM firms an interfere in attempts of their hostile takeovers. Also we must **ease the market barriers to the GM market**. These are things we must do to make the GM market a competitive market. This competition will force companies like Monsanto to become more reactive to the wishes of the public...

Make common citizens healthy, by providing quality food and options to move their body. Europe could rethink GMO position. There are ways to use GMO to provide more healthy vegetables to the masses or to **produce more insect larvae with proteins**.

Robotic milking is the only system in which the cow comes to the machine voluntarily. Moreover, a machine cancels out the possibilities of human errors related to stress and fatigue. Eventually, this will cause less stress for the cows as well. Besides this, the audience raised the question if a cow would choose the robot or its own calf. Technology will be part of agriculture in the future. Things like augmented reality (AR) might show exceptions in real-time, making it more easy for the farmers to act (it could show animals in different colours, depending of the degree of care they need, or the status of

the crops in the field). During the EYE, many people were in favour of organic farming and raised the question if all these technological advancements are really necessary. In my opinion, **technological advancements are indispensable** when going towards a world population of 8 billion people. This does not necessarily mean we have to intensify modern farms. However, growing crops or raising animals more efficiently would need technology, if we want to produce more with less resources and with a lower impact on the environment.

Innovative agricultural practices should be given prominent consideration in any policy making such as the US Farm Bill or the EU Common Agricultural Policy. **Farmers** who have already taken steps towards **digitalization and biotechnology should be supported** and those who have yet to do so should be encouraged. What is so great about the EU, is that the member states can be creative in how this look in each country. Whether that includes outreach programs with research universities, incentive programs, or even marketing campaigns, innovative agricultural practices should be shared and discussed.

A **well-developed infrastructure** is needed for any technologically-advanced agriculture practice. From ensuring the safety of the roads and bridges that autonomous tractors travel across, to guaranteeing rural communities have access to high speed broadband to power the software behind robotic milking machines, we must ensure these communities have their foundational needs met.

Farmers should be able to **make use of the targeted data that is gathered from technologies**. I firmly believe that when the collection, use and storage of this data are clear and transparent between the farmer and the provider, you get a win-win business model.

Make **farmers’ markets** great again! Buying local pays back. Subsidies and promotion of farmers’ markets and local, organic food; also plastic free markets and for food shelves for unsold food. Create **labels that indicate the distance** that products travel.

Look outside Europe for **traditional agricultural knowledge**.

It is well-known that big companies control the agricultural and farmer market. They use enormous areas for fields and hundreds of thousands of animals. They also use chemicals to speed up the growing-up process of plants and animals. We also speak about mass exploitation. As consequences, animals live in unhuman conditions and agricultural products become unhealthy. Furthermore, the production and the transport of these goods pollute a lot and there is an enormous waste of water. In addition, a lot of forests and other natural living spaces are destroyed to set up fields. Small farmers fight for surviving too because the big companies sell their products cheaply. Let's look at the solutions to these various problems. It is simple to make life quality of animals better: **stop mass farming**. There will be more place for every animal. They should live on fields in spite of giant warehouses. In addition, ecological farming is the best way to lower pollution and waste of water caused by intensive farming. **No chemicals and no big machines**

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

anymore. Furthermore, big agriculture companies should not make money with food. Everyone has a right on it. Therefore should chemicals used for the growing-up of living beings be forbidden. Their and our own health would not be in danger anymore. No major food enterprises also means less transport of food around the world, so less pollution. That way, we **support local and small farmers.**

The biggest problem concerning farming is the over consumption of meat which is unsustainable in many ways. According to the Worldwatch Institute, animal agriculture is responsible for 51% or more of global greenhouse-gas emissions and 10 pounds of grain are needed to produce 1 pound of meat as stated in the U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification. For example in the United States, 4 million acres of land are used to produce plants for humans to eat whereas 56 million acres of land are used to grow food for animals. Consuming the crops directly instead of using them to feed animals would decrease the amount of greenhouse-gas emissions in the atmosphere and liberate land for it to be used for other purposes. This means meat consumption should be reduced considerably. The mass production of meat also has a negative effect on pollution. Not only are their natural gases emitted in the air, in factory farms their excrements are becoming too much for the land to absorb because of its large quantity, causing irreversible damage to the soil. **Reducing meat consumption** is one solution to minimize the impact of animal farming on our environment, but **making organic farmers the main producers of meat** would ensure the decline of meat consumption. One of the reasons the overconsumption of meat is a problem is because of its mass production making it more accessible to the population. This is why we believe organic farming with higher standards would lead to a more sustainable environment and way of living. Organic farming is better for the welfare of animals, for our own health and for our environment. Technology in farms, which favours mass production, not only causes pollution but also destroys the soil which is not sustainable.

Supporting **Plant-Based Diets** for mitigating Climate Change. We are "eating up our forests". The lust for meat and dairy, and by extension the soy that feeds our livestock, is destroying one of our key carbon sinks - the rainforest - plus other biodiverse ecosystems. I want to present to you the idea of a Europe that takes the global lead on supporting plant-based diets in order to protect rainforests and consequently our climate. More precisely, I suggest that our politicians shift agricultural subsidies that right now are given to intensive livestock farms- to farmers who focus on a local fruit and/or vegetable production that meets ecological criteria and of course to farmers who want to shift to ecological plant options. This could be supported by increasing EU funding for research on ecological production of plant-rich options and by imposing stricter limits on air, soil, water pollution, animal welfare and antibiotics use. By adjusting at the same time environmental and health policies including dietary guidelines and education programs, citizens can be encouraged to consume more ecologically grown plant-rich options.

First of all, we have to **stop consuming so much. Have less children! Get the people to eat less meat!** And with less I mean 2 times a week. We really don't need to eat so much meat to stay healthy. And in these times health should be more important than just the pleasure of eating. I would not focus on technology too much here, and instead look back at how we used the earth in ancient times, when we were collaboration more with nature rather than destroying it. I don't know if our technology will solve this problem. I believe that **animals should be as important as humans.** They also need the right for a good life. Especially if they are meant to die for us. People tend to forget that we are all born on the same earth. We should not consider ourselves more important than all the other organisms on this planet just because we have such great communication skills. The egoism and greediness of humans makes me feel ashamed.

The biggest problem concerning food in our western societies is its accessibility. We, the young generation, are not used to not having anything we want to eat at any time we want it. Most of us know about the circumstances under which meat, dairy and other animal-products are made, but many of us are not really aware of it. The solution to this problem is not to ration food and therefore make us incapable to decide on what we eat or what we not eat but to **raise awareness** and to lead people back to their roots. Why should I eat meat every day? Would I be able to slaughter the animal by myself? Who are the people who do that for me? Are they happy, killing hundreds of animals, seeing them in their moment of death? The debate is an emotional one and so it should be. Just as debates about human rights, global inequality and all kinds of social issues. Animals do have a place in most of our hearts, but we make the fatal differentiation between pets and livestock. All beings are worth the same and unless you need to kill in order to survive, it's more than unethical. **Organic farming** is one of the most important things we could do to have an impact on environmental issues. We have done so much damage to our nature, it is time to give something back to our planet. You don't have to make a radical change, but you could consider **at least one vegan day a week.** I think global trading is a very important and useful achievement, but in order to save our planet I can easily do without strawberries in winter in Germany. And I think you can do.

The one true evolution for **farming** is in an ethical direction; it has to be **veganized.** As exponentially increasing numbers of people are becoming educated about the health problems caused by consuming animal body parts and excretions - the morality of treating sentient beings as a products is coming into brighter light. It is unacceptable, ethically and for the welfare of our world, to continue breeding exploiting billions of living beings every year under the circumstances that a plant based vegan diet (as stated by the association of nutritionists) is adequate for all stages of human life. This transition is one which will entail a complete revolution in our understanding of life and industrial responsibilities.

Current food production and animal agriculture is indeed not within the boundaries of our planet. In fact, it is destroying

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

thousands of years old rainforests in South America (e.g. soy farming - 70% of that is fed directly to livestock), covers at least 45% of the earth's land and is harmful (especially red meat) not only to us but especially to the animals since they are the voiceless victims. The use of fresh water in animal agriculture is enormous - while 1 in 10 people on this planet still lack access to safe drinking water. It is not necessary to take the long way around and with that also kill a sentient being when we can directly consume nutrition from plants.

Animal agriculture needs to stop. It is so important for keeping the planet, the animals, the biodiversity and us alive.

Animal farming must be put to an end. It is an ethical and ecological imperative. Animal agriculture is responsible for at least 15% of GHG emissions, including methane and nitrous oxide which are much more destructive than CO2. It takes thousands of litres of waters to obtain 1kg of meat. It takes 5 to 15 calories of cereals to obtain 1 calorie of animal product while 800million people are suffering from hunger in impoverished countries. Animal faeces and drugs used during the process are heavily polluting soils and oceans. Fishing is emptying oceans and destroying ecosystems. Rain forests are being severed to plant crops in order to feed livestock (or to produce palm oil!). Massive use of antibiotics on livestock is a health threat due to resistant bacteria development. See ? I haven't even talked about the way we decide these sentient innocent beings (still children when they're killed) can be used and exploited for our mere gustatory pleasure. It's nonetheless the core of the problem. This has to stop, there are so many alternatives. We must have farmers to make **the transition to organic permaculture**, cultivating all sorts of vegetables using the symbiosis they can achieve altogether to keep them from insects. This would be ecologically sustainable and harm-free.

The question is not about precise technology OR organic farming, but how to combine it in a smart way to profit from their both advantages. A huge problem is the high consumption of meat by the European citizens, which pollutes our environment. In my opinion **higher standards on the animal welfare**, e.g. outdoor areas for all animals, could be one solution. Meat would be more expensive and consumption would decline.

Another problem is the structure of our countryside. Enormous monocultures offer no habitats for wild nature. In my view a strict quota system for extensive agriculture is not the right answer from politicians. We should have more structure elements like **hedge for a higher biodiversity**. It would also protect our ground from erosion. Altogether we need a different attitude on nature from farmers and a **stronger cooperation with local conservationists**. This would guarantee a sustainable agriculture.

I am calling for the **full implementation on EU Action Plan Against Wildlife Trafficking** by the European Commission and the Member States.

Confiscation of wildlife from the illegal trade.

In order to tackle **wildlife traffic**, the EU should **reinforce their laws** about those proceedings: If people are scared off, they won't dare to break the law.

Disrupt and dismantle **wildlife cybercrime networks**.

We urge the EU to introduce **legislation**, which **bans** all external, and intra-EU commercial **trade in ivory** (imports, exports and re-exports).

For the EU to retain its position as an effective global player in the fight against wildlife trafficking, I am calling for a **review of Directive on the protection of the environment through criminal law** (2008/99/EC) and for strengthening and harmonising criminal sanctions applicable to wildlife trafficking throughout EU Member States.

Stop the import of materials coming from animals! Like ivory for example, right now ivory is being imported in Europe with the claim of being 'vintage' or 'retro', while research shows that the objects in question are actually being made from fresh ivory! These lies need to be stopped. Also, we should make clear to the people that products such as tiger balm have no 'magical' powers. These kind of beliefs are not from this time anymore. We should start protecting the nature reserves better. **Train more rangers** who keep an eye out for poachers, I would love a job like that. The biggest threat for nature right now is one of her own children: the human kind. So make the world conscious about what's happening to the rest of natures children! And stop materialism!

Protection of wildlife requires education and awareness, as basic as that. Consumerism, wealth-oriented standards and lifestyles are big societal drivers that drive animal species to the edge of extinction. We must stop thinking, for instance, that a dead bear or a dead lion are a trophy worth admiring, or a trophy for which we deserve admiration. Shifting cultural paradigms in Europe and in the World for societies that stand for life protection.

I believe the European Union should introduce **more bans upon hunting** and a ban on hunting as a whole to protect our wildlife. Not just banning the hunting itself but banning the thing that encourage hunters to hunt these precious animals. The things that encourages them to do it is the knowledge of making a lot of money from it. So, I also propose **to ban all clothing that are made from an animal** e.g. furs, skins etc. This will take money from the hunters therefore giving them a lot less motive to keep hunting these animals.

One thing we can do is to **forbid keeping wild animals as pets**, which also means banning circus from using wild animals. If government find someone is keeping pet tiger he will be confiscated and put in the shelter.

I believe that hunting trophies have no place in modern conservation, and disagree with the contention that trophies can play a positive role in conservation efforts. Instead, I encourage the development of ground-breaking initiatives to rescue, **rehabilitate and release wildlife into a safe and secure habitat**. For instance, IFAW is partnering with

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

the Zimbabwe Elephant Nursery to rescue, rehabilitate and release orphaned elephants into a forest reserve, which used to be a hunting concession. We are leasing this land and have transformed it into a safe home for these elephants.

Zoos are not the solution. The solutions are **natural parks or protected areas for the endanger species.**

Europe is one of the most powerful regions in the world, so that it could and should fight wildlife crimes and protect biodiversity. In order to complete this mission, the European Union and the member states have to reveal more and more adverts and articles dealing with this issue, whether in magazines, in the streets, on websites, or documentaries on TV. That way, both adults and teenagers could be aware of reality and realise the importance of wildlife and the impact of humankind on it. However children too should feel involved as soon as possible, meaning that a part of their education has to be dedicated to what's truly happening to Nature and to endangered species. All it takes to protect wildlife and biodiversity is education and awareness. Moreover, actions such as donations to environmentalist associations, for example WWF or The Nature Conservancy, need to be promoted. And remember that every action counts ! Nowadays Europe has already taken place in this fight and suggested solutions but it doesn't mean that we're coming to an end, there's still so much more to do! Indeed natural reserves can be found in almost every country, but yet not have stopped poachers from committing crimes to wildlife. That's why European organisations should create more of these **reserves** and train better and more people to an adapted protection of threatened animals. Furthermore, forbidding criminals from hunting is a priority such as **prohibiting circus and zoos from owning and training wild animals.** The men's pleasure to discover giraffes, to own ivory necklaces or to applause a tiger jumping through a burning circle is purely selfish. No one has the right to decide the life of another living being, it is as simple as that.

The same attitude from trophy hunting, animals are seen as commodities and not living things. We need to **expand the safari trade so that viewing these animals in their natural habitat is more accessible to the west and in turn more profitable to Africa.** A prime example is African farmers instead of killing wild animals that trespass on their land and endanger their lives and livelihood will now (because of trophy hunting) reserve a plot of their land where they can protect these animals from poachers. This is just an example of how the solution would work as in this case its only prolonging the death until someone pays more for the whole head of the rhino than just the horn. But if we make it more profitable for the farmer to protect the animals in their own environment it will be more beneficial for all parties involved.

Waste, pollution

Saving natural resources by making companies design their **electronic devices and household gadgets in a modular way.** This way if something is broken only the special module needs to be changed. Things get easy to repair and we'll save a lot of natural resources and CO2 from the making.

3D printers in households and businesses offer a way to **provide products without** the need for transportation, packaging, or excess waste. It also has potential for plastic recycling!

To reduce the consumption of the non-recyclable coffee and tea cups: providing coffee into reusable cups; While having the reusable cup, there are also coffee machines that are having the **option "without the cup".**

Re-invention of the "milk system" to cover both milk and water distribution and collection in **reusable glass bottles** (targeting regions in Europe that may have less safe tap water); introducing a Europe-wide glass bottle deposit system.

Getting rid of waste. No plastic packaging anymore; products are filled in **containers / bottles etc. that can be picked up and returned** in many places in the city; comfort of shopping is remained.

Give a **free menstrual cup** (duration 15 years) to every menstruating person. Replacing period waste (for example tampons). Provide a safe hygiene product.

I recommend that we install in every city a system that already exists in some countries like Sweden: at every store, people can bring their **plastic bottles back**, they get money for it, and then the stores recycle the bottles. This system is great to motivate people to recycle more. Moreover, food stores are too big, and a lot of products are being wasted. Having more stores, not as big as they are today, and in the city so that they are closer to where people live could be a solution.

I strongly believe that the way to protect our oceans at this point, is not to try and pollute them less, but to gradually diminish our plastic consumption. For example, recycling is indeed helpful so that the used plastic products do not end up in the oceans but wouldn't it be better and more radical if we did not use plastic products where it is not necessary? If plastic consumption reduction begun from each individual's home, then it would make a great difference at a global level. The European Union has already showed great interest in trying to protect our planet, but something more concrete could be done, like a more strict and uniform way of applying "rules", like the **ban of plastic bags** in all EU countries, the **ban of plastic cups and straws** and a more **uniform recycling policy** in all countries that focuses also on citizen awareness raising about how they should recycle correctly. Last but not least, I believe that a broader and more transparent information regarding how and what ends up in the oceans and seas would significantly help people to adopt a plastic free way of life.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

A lot of countries just **forbid some plastic products**. For example plastic bags and microplastics in cosmetics. We need to have this prohibitions also in Europe. Most of all the packaging and single used plastics need to be forbidden or levied a tax on it.

Complete **ban of fruit and vegetable plastic bags in supermarkets** and a Europe-wide deposit-system based on that of the German system; **plastic-free corner** in European supermarkets. The aim is to display the variety of already existing plastic free products to the public, in order to increase precaution regarding plastic products and spread the message by displaying alternative and more sustainable ones.

Plastic is too cheap! That's why everybody is using it. Alternatives are much more expensive. **Plastics need a tax** on it and need to be more expensive.

Impose **plastic taxes** or providing sustainability subsidies for companies and industry.

Plastic tax: Plastic products are charged with a special tax.

Establish a reward system: set a tax on single-use plastic and create a sustainability certificate.

To establish a reward system: set a **tax on single use plastic** and create a sustainability certificate system for businesses (restaurants, cafes) who do not use these plastics - getting this certificate will give the firms tax reductions. And change consumption habits by giving reductions to customers who promote sustainable firms on social media.

How to reduce the amount of waste? Convert normal supermarkets and other stores gradually into zero waste businesses by introducing an **environmental tax for businesses** who do not start and commit themselves to the change.

Trash separation: Encourage packaging companies to **colour-code different packaging materials** with a universal system. The idea is that if everything is color-coded it is easier for the consumers to separate the waste correctly. Despite a lot of efforts for waste separations a lot of people are still unsure what goes where.

Equip **beaches with trash bins and recycle bins**.

More **informative stickers** on both recyclable and non-recyclable products about how recycling really works and how people should properly dispose of their waste.

Sustainability network for restaurants and cafés in which certification at a high level of sustainable practice would be rewarded with economic incentives for both the company and staff.

Convert normal supermarkets and other stores gradually into **zero waste businesses**.

Implementing **EU-wide "waste-free days"** at all levels of compulsory education in which students and teachers work together to actively pay attention to the waste they produce

and find suitable and sustainable replacements; students would then be able to transfer newly attained know-how to their parents and families back at home, showing that a more conscious lifestyle is well within the realm of possibility.

Creating an **anti-waste campaign**.

The EU work with prominent figures such as artists, actors, musicians, and social media influencers in order to produce **YouTube videos** informing European citizens of EU initiatives as well as providing information on the role of community engagement and resources to lead more sustainable lives individually.

The **toilet transportation of trash**. We can all have pipes in our houses just like toilets that divide into plastic, glass etc. individually. Then you would press a button which would suck it via vacuum, just like in airplane toilets!

Microbes find ways to survive in the most extreme environments. We should find more ways to harness their potential! i.e. Waste water treatment, trash treatment.

It would be great if we could send big ships to **fish plastic out of the oceans**. Furthermore we should forbid a lot of plastic we use for packages.

Use experiment methods to encourage more people to **prevent people from dumping waste** which could end up in our oceans. For example, there should be a measure taken to reduce the amount of plastic used because much of the plastic we do use ends up in the ocean and affects marine life.

Legislation against pollutants must be stricter. There must be more severe taxes for the emission of pollutants, and not only for some people, but for everyone. Also, I really think certain levels of emissions should be forbidden with really **high fines**.

Water, oceans

The European Parliament should ensure that **those who pollute our water, pay** for it. And that those who profit from using our water, pay for it. These charges will encourage better use of water and reduce pollution. And we can then spend the money collected to fund solutions: supporting innovative scientists, installing wetlands, and fully implementing the EU's Right2Water citizen campaign, and many others.

Cleaning up the rivers through a transnational operation making the **most polluting companies manage it and pay for it**. Final aim: restoring flora and fauna, restoring the ecosystem. Europe should **deny** companies and factories to **throw toxic chemicals in rivers and seas**. Also, EU should deny the dumping of oil in the seas by large ships.

Urban Water Taps. Water company producer provides water taps in the public space. Benefits for them, reduce transportation and production cost + CSR and public benefits: accessibility, cheaper, health, waste reduction.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

L'eau au même titre que l'air est un bien commun qui ne devrait pas être laissé aux "bons soins des marchés", mais **géré de manière transparente** dans l'intérêt de tous et non de quelques uns.

L'eau est un bien précieux nécessaire à la vie, elle doit être préservée et chaque humain doit pouvoir disposer d'un **accès sécurisé et gratuit pour les 100 premiers m³**.

Indeed the access to a drinkable water has been recognized by the UN in 2010 as a human right so water must be considered as a common good and not as a merchandise: it's a necessity for humanity's survival. In order to solve this problem, we must create a regulation on a European scale which must be written in the national rights of member states of the European Union according to their convenience. This requires that public authorities must **forbid to entrust the maintenance and the exploitation of the running water network to private service providers**. This first regulation will involve an inclusive and progressive pricing system without risking to propose to customers an abusive price. Indeed the first water cubic meters are necessary for human needs (defined by each member state according to the climate) and mustn't be invoiced. Moreover a private service provider could impact the difference on the following cubic meter and too much water is wasted such as in France (1 out of 5 litres of drinkable water is lost in our channellings so that's approximately 430 000 Olympic swimming pool each year). We must entrust the responsibility to a public service provider such as citizens.

Following the steps that have been taken for energy saving in building across Europe, European Union should also take measures about **water saving in private and public buildings and in industry. Renovation of plumping systems** should be funded and every building or industry should have a water management plan.

Water should be free and accessible for everyone within Europe (and outside also though), it is a first need element, as air. In today's world, air is free and it's only because you can't catch it and we all agree to say it would be a nonsense to pay for the air. I think it's a nonsense to pay for water or even restrict it to homes. The **only entities that should pay for it and have limits are industries**.

I think that in order to protect the water resources we have to look at the water from three points of view: quantity, quality and accessibility. From these three perspectives, we should start our discussion of **free and fair access** to this resource. Water is the blood of Planet.

Stricter **law enforcements** should be applied to violators such as **illegal fishermen**.

Exploitative fishing in the EU could be regulated from the consumer's standpoint. If there were an **EU-wide (traffic-light) label for fish and other sea-products** in place, that is easy to read, consumer's would be prone to make better (sustainable) decisions when purchasing aquatic produce. The consumer wants to buy sustainable products, but the current

labelling schemes are either too confusing, not applicable across the EU or may not take all the important variables into account. A label supported by the European Parliament that is applicable for all EU countries, for produce from European seas as well as imported products, would make sustainable lifestyle choices much easier for EU citizens.

Protecting **biodiversity** is complex, which demands not only scientists of every stripe - including ecologists, biologists, sociologists, economists, and more -, it also requires **collaboration with diverse voices** from local society.

The only way of ensuring a sustainable marine life is by **STOP fishing altogether**. There are many ocean dead zones due to lack of oxygen and over fishing. By 2048 we could face empty oceans due to over-fishing and other threats caused by humans such as climate change and pollution. Fish are sentient beings. They can feel pain, too.

Europe (or member states but it would be better if Europe does it because some member states may refuse) could invest in law enforcement who patrol the waters using boats/ships to monitor and ensure that all **fisherman/fisherwoman are obeying the rules** and if they do not they will be punished accordingly.

European efforts to stop ocean **overfishing should be centred on regional aspects**. Europe cannot have a unique policy directing the Mediterranean Sea, the Black Sea and the North Sea and the Baltic Sea as each location has specific challenges and environments.

The creation of quotas to avoid over-fishing, even though a noble idea to develop sustainable fisheries, has lead to another problem: the jettison of dead or dying fishes. Thus, quotas policies should be revised and marginalised quotas should be put in place. Fishery could be legal within a **defined spectrum** ranging from Legal Fishery, Fishery Limit (Legal to reach, illegal to continue once reached), and Illegal Fishery.

Incentive has been proven to be a great way to incite policies to be respected, transforming the feeling toward policies from a burden to a relief. **Economic incentive for private companies** should although not be a priority, indeed these could be of great cost to Europe and impact negatively on ocean protection perspective. Official European seal of approval on companies promoting sustainable ocean, in the forms of already existing initiatives like the 'seafood watch app', could be of benefit for Europe in two ways. First, it would be of interest to companies as this seal of approval could promote them to the wider public. The companies would be renowned as being good for the environment and benefit from free advertisement from the European Union. Second, this same wider public would have way easier access to the information on the "greener" solution available to them. Indeed, now it is not the clearest system to know which fish is sustainable and which comes from industries responsible for the pillage of the ocean. It could also have a double effect in interesting European citizen to the protection of the ocean and spread the message for its protection.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Climate action and education

The EU has ambitious CO2 targets for 2050, a full 80% decrease at minimum or even 95% at max. While the goals are ambitious, they are distant still, and the Finnish winters are growing ever shorter, warmer and less snowy. 2050 might be too late to protect our winters, and it will certainly be so if we go at it alone. The 28 Member States look to the EU for a stronger negotiating position and strength on the global arena, and as such the EU must ensure that we're not alone in our ambitions for a snowy future. The EU should take an active role in ensuring the **other states follow their treaty obligations under the Paris Accords** and any further details settled. The least disruptive and non-coercive methods are negotiations and cooperation at an international scale. The climate summits are a good start and a great example of what this cooperation should look like and what it can achieve, but the clue is in the name: it's a summit. Not an independent organisation combating climate change internationally around the clock but a once a year meeting that has historically been both rushed and as such, relatively unproductive. Imagine the parliament only convening once a year. Nothing would ever get done in politics! Thus, I believe it's reasonable to **create a new permanent structure** for international cooperation with the goal to negotiate, monitor and share best practises etc. **on climate change**. It is quite frankly ridiculous that we created PESCO and saw the practicality of a coordinating force such as NATO for defence, but never thought that a similar structure might be needed for combating climate change. We are not even currently at war and we realise the need for such institutions and structures, but when we're actively trying to combat climate change, no one thinks to emulate them.

The EU should give environmental matters more priority. It is essential that EU politics starts standing up for an effective climate policy and **against all those lobbies blocking it**. Environmental activities deserve a place in the hemicycle, at the EYE and in every day politics.

There should be **more strict policies**, which request large-sized enterprises to apply new policies and provide time and support to the small and medium-sized business. Nothing will happen without a strong strategy, and we need the **media** for that. If Sustainability is not one of the most exciting words in today's society, a word that we use daily as we talk about sport, food, and gossip, it will be challenging to take the lead on **climate action**.

To intensify EU citizens' implication in environmental issues, EU could include **Green Points** as a requirement to get Erasmus scholarships or other types of grants. Green points acquisition system needs to be equally accessible by anyone. Proper recycling or car sharing are some examples to get points.

Green economy concept: Integrated sustainable plan (local policies); **Common wealth economy** concept (incentives for companies); Green investment local fund (from **green taxes** run by local); **Environmental footprint app**.

Reward of free public transportation **for environmental friendly actions** taken such as home recycling, buying local food, composting and food sharing.

Happy tree day! **For every child born in a city a tree is planted**. Better climate in the city; Compensate the ecological footprint of the new inhabitant; Better climate in the city; City gets greener and younger.

Young people should place at the top of the agenda the importance of having a sustainable life. Not only by helping others, but by changing their way of living. Every day we consume all type of products and services and many of them are not being produced in a sustainable way. By this I mean that human rights are being violated in the production process. Our challenge is to stop consuming those product and **start consuming sustainable products!**

Eco-education: Ecological education starting at a young age. Introducing eco-kindergartens and a new mandatory subject at school (sustainability) half-theoretical, half-practical.

Education plays a key role in this manner, teach about recycling in our schools, about wildlife preservation, about sustainable economy and cultivate a green mentality in the future minds. European governments must come together, sit down and begin the implementation of a common project.

EU should take the lead on climate change. The EU should invest more money in education from primary school level to PhD level in every country. **Education** throughout every stage is what helps the change to happen, educate future generations.

I urge Europe to include **outdoor learning programs** into the primary school curriculum.

Agriculture in the classroom. Integrate agriculture in the public education curriculum for elementary schools. Creation of school gardens, cooking with self-planted local food in the school. Promote healthy nutrition.

DIY Classes in School. Start a new subject in school: "How to...?" providing students with practical sustainability skills and knowledge to accomplish simple tasks as repairing a bike or producing plastic-free soaps.

The best solution of protecting our planet is to raise people's awareness of this problem. We have to start doing that through **education**. Moreover, the European Union has to establish a clear policy concerning the protection of the environment. All the **enterprises** or factories that do not respect our planet have to be **penalised**.

As a lot of waste and especially plastic ends up in the water, I believe **educate people** on the issue is very important but there are also some other small things we can do. Personally, I upcycle, I recycle, I rarely consume meat, I use a bike or public transport and I am using fabric bags for shopping. BUT there is something that I cannot change! The situation in the super markets. As I am not able to often go to an open market, I am going to the supermarkets where I see cucumbers having

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

plastic around them. Do we really need this? Nature has a way to protect it! Bananas packed in plastic as well. But why? we can just put a sticker on them. I would really like to see EU taking some **action on how companies are using** materials such as **plastic**.

Reduce industry pollution with **taxes** and plans for greener energies and **fostering local economy**.

We should **decrease the taxation of green products**, that is fairly evident.

The EU should create **incentives for the development of innovation** (be it a technology, business model,...) that allow for a system in which we are limited in our environmental impact but no major behaviour change of businesses, industry and the individual is required. A good start was made with the EU Circular Economy Package in 2015. A new reusing and recycling market, shift towards more service orientated business, this are all good ideas. However, especially environmental laws fail to be successfully implemented.

Education about the subject also needs improvement since European citizens have no idea at all of what kind of action is expected of them, and academia needs to raise the number of implementation of green technology experts, and also **a few more climate change scientists**. Maybe it would be a good idea too to encourage specialized formation actions for all kinds of scientists, engineers, politicians, and so on... and to direct **media** for news that really encourage action and orient people, instead of the sensationalist ones with titles like "13 reasons why we are ruining earth".

Instead of capping emissions here and forbidding pesticides there as it happens a lot in the agriculture industry, there needs to be **more education** for affected people, in this example **farmers, how to deal with these new regulations and how to use them for their benefits**. If we think of the "less developed" countries within the EU, wouldn't knowledge and education be the key to mitigating climate change issues? Europe needs to first develop a true AWARENESS for how urgent a change in our system and behaviour is and how much we contribute on a daily basis - often unconsciously- to climate change.

Start **campaigns** informing people of the catastrophic effects of **pollution**.

The EU, as a role model also for developing countries, needs to position itself in the climate change debate and if this position involves **climate action**, main stakeholders of EU countries need to recognize the urge to act and **see an economic chance** in more resource efficient, more environmental friendly and future generation orientated market, technologies and policies and this is the minimum the EU should do!

The EU should create conditions that **increase local value** addition in the countries and stop the exploitation of the continents resources on which our wealth is partly based.

We propose an integrated vision of the territorial, environmental and archaeological resources, in which the different elements characterizing the historical-cultural identity of the places are contextually enhanced (art, environmental heritage, memory, history, cults, wine and food peculiarities, etc.). **The value and potential of cultural heritage must be considered as a resource for sustainable development and for the life quality of rural and intermediate regions**. For these reasons, the **landscape** can be considered as an ideal and privileged planning site for research on the cultural identity of a society with different history, religion, art, foods, etc. The "Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society" considers landscapes as fully part of the cultural heritage, and, as such, must be transmit to future generations. The involvement of the communities in the process of identifying cultural values takes place through the recognition of heritage as a resource for sustainable development. The knowledge of cultural heritage increases awareness, public spirit, sense of belonging and entrenchment, making possible a "return to the territory".

Cyber-security

E-platforms as safe spaces for debate (participative democracy): teach media competence at school; research and awareness on effects of social media on mental health and personal development.

Prevent the existence of Echo chambers on social platforms: there shouldn't be working Algorithms targeting specific groups of people.

Similar to the Declaration of Human Rights the **Declaration of Online Rights** can become a guideline for a safer and more peaceful internet throughout the world. The EU encourages the development of such a declaration.

Virtual life organized by a social contract, creating rights and rules: European citizenship possibility to preserve our data and prosecute transnational crime.

Digital Identity verification. Registration with **online passport** (only on account per person). Not possible to create fake accounts. Use if an easy language.

Traceable Identity. A system built openly on top of the existing Internet. Digitalized real identity for each person (for public services) with multiple separate internet identities (for private services). Traceable real to internet, but vice versa requires a warrant.

The possibility to download and **delete your stored data** in regular intervals: our data won't be available for sale and will be in our hands.

Data protection and privacy in line with the **GDPR** should be implemented especially with regard to **social media websites**. Sensitive information like addresses, phone numbers and other identifying information should not be shared without the explicit consent of the person.

Social media platforms to highlight when **photos** of people have been **digitally manipulated**.

A company should have to **report to an independent agency** what they are doing with people's data.

European Agency to control and protect our digital/online privacy.

Align the economic agenda (EU Single Market Strategy) **with the cybersecurity agenda.** Don't treat cybersecurity as a siloed issue to be addressed as a stand-alone problem. Understand that protecting the internet is both an economic and national security imperative. Align cybersecurity policies with foreign policy, security policy, defence policy (PESCO), export strategy, trade and development goals.

Map and call attention to **internet-infrastructure** dependencies and vulnerabilities across the EU. Don't treat cybersecurity as a mere technical problem; understand broader and systemic cyber risks; identify the most critical services, assets, and infrastructures for the EU to protect; develop an effective **cyber risk management strategy**; accelerate cooperation among EU countries to develop joint capabilities; established standards for IoT products (plus product liability).

Promote cybersecurity education and training: Encourage EU member states to launch cybersecurity education programs from elementary school to university; invest in cybersecurity R&D (beyond Horizon 2020); establish a common vocabulary and well-defined career paths for young people entering this field; launch a broader cybersecurity awareness campaign for the public (beyond the "EU Cybersecurity Awareness Month"); demystify the image of the stereotypical hacker, coders or programmers (a "men in hoodies" sitting in dark rooms staring at screens) and encourage women and minorities to pursue a career in cybersecurity.

Enforce **security through education.** Early education for children, EU program for schools. Secure private information on Internet and other platforms. More security cameras, especially in big cities.

Create an EU **wide firewall and anti-virus** to counteract any party that wants to do us harm using the internet. Involve engineers from all over the EU.

Ensure that every individual and all companies have the **latest computer protection software** for free to keep out intruders (or for companies at a low cost). It is also important to ensure that the protection company has no connections with hackers (e.g. Russian hackers etc.) and that the protection software is legitimate. Ensure that all important computers such as: NHS etc. are updated for free and equipped with the latest protection software.

Give up to date **advice** to individuals and companies on how to stay safe and **protect themselves from hackers**.

Ensure that if someone falls **victim** to a hacker that it is thoroughly investigated by the **European Court** and the individual/group/organisation are prosecuted in order to show a complete intolerance of this kind of behaviour. Russian interference should be investigated and individuals/organisations/parties who are found to be involved should be prosecuted and sentenced to prison time and disqualified and stripped of their public duties to show an intolerance and ensure the message is received that this will not be tolerated in Europe.

Relevant authority figures such as **police departments, judges and lawyers must be trained to recognize gender-based cyberbullying**, revenge porn and targeted gender based violence and implement measures so that it does not escalate

further. Measures could include restraining orders, loss of right to contact the victim, or a criminal record of recorded abuse. Free or low cost support should be made available to the victim. This could be in the form of free counselling in the language of the victim, assistance with changing contact information (phone numbers, temporary addresses).

Guarantee for free speech: creation of software that can **recognise fake news**.

Terrorism

We often hear ideas about fighting terrorism by **physically depriving potential terrorists** of the possibility to come in contact with radicalization or radical groups.

It can't be only the taste of violence that fascinates. I believe there's something more: a dream, a fake dream that these radical organization can offer to all the excluded people of our societies, especially after the end of ideological world of the twentieth century. To me, this doesn't appear like a radical intervention. What about **depriving them of the willing to join** similar organizations? Stop building narratives based on prevention and start building narratives based on alternatives. Do we have a real alternative? Do we have a stronger dream, a stronger hope we can offer them? The passion for politics, the passion for activism or for the defence of human rights...

There are many successful **"disengagement" organisations** and initiatives across the EU. Amongst the most successful are those using former members of criminal gangs or networks in order to build the initial alliance and start the change of behaviour with the individual wanting to leave the destructive life behind. My idea is to **build up of a pool of these former members**. I'll explain why and how. To start up a disengagement program using former members of the environments you're targeting, called "formers" is hard for two reasons: 1. You do not know who is a real and "good" former. 2. The former might not have the tools to use his/her experience to help others. In order to do these two steps effectively you need another former with experience from working with disengagement. This is in many cases very hard to find and thus the problem. My idea is therefore aimed at helping out with the initial and important phase of starting up a disengagement program using formers. I propose that the EU creates a resource pool drawing from experienced formers from the field of disengagement – these are easily available for example through the EU Radicalisation Awareness Network. To further ensure the sustainability of the pool the EU would finance these already working formers as consultants to start up new disengagement programs across Europe.

Let's not treat terrorists as special cases, but normal criminals. **No special treatment**.

You go fighting with ISIS, **no tolerance you can't come back**. We have enough work with the people inside Europe that try to make terror a way of life.

To bring potential terrorists or terror group candidates back to the right track, we can use the same psychology, or as many would call it **brain wash**, used on them by their group leaders to bring them on the path of terrorism. For example, tell them how they could actually benefit from the society if they do the right things and tell them that the modern world isn't religious, cultural, racial or gender biased & that if anyone by any chance practices bias, how the law will treat them, etc. This should be done for at least one and a half year and should be done under environments of least tension and the person shouldn't feel like being interrogated or being forcefully taught about humanity. After, they should be evaluated and left on their own. If this doesn't work and the person has made contacts with their previous groups, then he or she should be made to go through the process again. Another very important aspect would be to not practice this technique on individual candidates but on groups.

The goal of this idea is to get those that feel most excluded from society to participate meaningfully. If young people from crime affected areas feel that they have the power to shape their own future and participate meaningfully in what society has to offer, the **attraction of a life of crime** will be much less strong. This is a recruitment apprehension strategy to end the vicious circle. This should be implemented at the municipal level.

Fight poverty and exclusion. To become terrorist one need to see no hope in systems life.

Fight violence in all forms, since suffering turns into more violence.

Expand democracy: if people could "change the world", they would not get involved in terrorist attempts. Support Africa/Asia states which are sane to fight jihadists.

Improve **mental health care**. Have fun. Happy women > happy mothers > happy kids.

We must look to the Italian counter-terrorism strategy and we must apply this in other EU countries. Also, we must keep tight watch on **returning fighters**, even better: we don't let them back. EU has no place for ISIS fighters, even former ones. We must also implement a **cross national refugee/migrant database**. This should be mixed with emphasis on integration of our current migrant populations.

How to enhance European cooperation and law enforcement against **transnational criminal networks**, dealing with drugs and weapons, trafficking humans and toxic waste? So far, I have seen that the **engagement of academics in a practitioner setting** has improved strategic planning, informed the use of new analytical methods, and guided policy. EU would benefit from frequent workshops where young experts are invited to consult with practitioners. Practitioners could present problems and the young experts could use these to generate ideas for new initiatives, whether these are research related or not.

Sharing the intelligence. How is it possible that we have a better cooperation of Europeans intelligence agencies when it

comes to fiscal fraud than when it's about protecting lives?! We can't be honestly satisfied with the current way of dealing with dark networks spreading in Europe, whether it's gun traffic, prostitution, drugs or radical cells.

Network of surveillance agencies located in each Member State.

We need more hawkish measures. We need to drastically **increase our overall military spending**. Along with it, we need to greatly increase **funding for counter-terrorism, counterespionage and counterintelligence services** and clandestine organisations, with emphasis on their "cyber features".

Add a new law that everyone should bring a personal card or passport that shows the identity of the person in bigger public institutions. If people don't have something to identify themselves let them pay a fee if they want to get in. Because no terrorist wants others to know who he/she is, so they will be scared to even enter the institution or whatever building there is. I think that you shouldn't try to stop an attack, you should prevent it and save lots of innocents. That's why I think that in first place **security checks should be placed on everywhere**.

EU is fighting against terrorism in Syria but (forgetting the fact that half of the Union is not involved) it never did anything to stabilise the country. This empower terrorism in the region. Before the destitution of Bachar El Assad, the EU should try to **help in the rebuilding of Syria to avoid terrorism**.

I believe that one of the main reasons why terrorism happens is because of media's effect over the population. If the **media** was somehow **regulated** (without losing the freedom of the press) and if information was filtered, terrorists would be less encouraged, as there is less fear spread around people.

Criminality

In order to **reduce gang violence** one has to look at the context that the violence stems from. There are various push and pull factors that increase the risk of a young individual ending up in these destructive environments. The idea I will present tackles the problem of exclusion – and the feeling of it – as it is prevalent in all those who end up in anti-democratic, anti-law, types of groups. For those within these environments the state is a hostile entity and an enemy as such. The goal of this idea is to get those that feel most excluded from society to participate meaningfully. If young people from crime affected areas feel that they have the power to shape their own future and participate meaningfully in what society has to offer, the attraction of a life of crime will be much less strong. **This is a recruitment apprehension strategy to end the vicious circle**. This should be implemented at the municipal level. The strategy has several steps:

1. Meet these people where they are: this is essential, by doing this you prevent the dynamic of power where the

municipality or other actor provide help (thus shaping a need from the youth). Use passionate interests as a starting point – i.e. martial arts – build relationships and trust amongst the local community.

2. Use the trust and relationship to motivate young people from affected areas to participate in leadership programs and take on leadership roles. Enable them to find their full potential – not necessarily adapting to all the norms of society.

3. Involve these people in political processes such as youth councils. The desired outcome is that the new participants – from the most affected communities – will serve as role models providing a positive alternative to crime.

4. To make this happen the local authorities has to be willing to change their behavior as the youth are changing theirs, it's a reciprocal process.

My proposal is that the EU would finance a pilot project that goes through all these steps and go through a thorough evaluation from start. When finished and evaluated, it can be transformed in an action plan to serve as an example for local governments across Europe.

Instead of investing resources in daily newspapers, Europe should invest in **investigative journalism** [and weekly press].

How to enhance European cooperation and law enforcement against transnational criminal networks, dealing with drugs and weapons, trafficking humans and toxic waste? There is many things that could be done to help solve such problems, but it will be really hard to completely solve it. First of all we should have a **common database** in all of Europe having criminal's identity and all of that so that a criminal could not just escape to another country to be safe. Also the police should be able to arrest people in the nearest countries because as it is right now, it is not clear if a police officer can follow you if you try to escape to another country. So that means that if you run away to another country and that you are not stopped at the border and that the foreign police does not want to search for you, you are basically safe. It makes organized crime a bit easier in my opinion.

It might be needed to **rethink** some of the laws in every European countries because some of the **punishment** for certain crimes just do not make sense. We might want to make them a bit harsher to kind of scare people that would maybe take the risk with the actual punishment but wouldn't with the new harsher one. About toxic waste, hopefully the COP is gonna take care of those problems otherwise we might just have to review European legislation.

To stop human trafficking maybe we could use the "dark net" to find the biggest "seller" by **hiring really good hackers** or something as such, because it is where most of the sales are made so maybe we could just use that against trafficking.

In order to fight against cross-border crime we need a **cross-national criminal database; common laws on organised crime**; we need to form a **Common European police** force aimed at organised and cross-national crime (i.e. EuroPol); we need to **transform Frontex** into a better funded Agency

and into a more effective European border GUARD and manage it with more powers and manpower; we should create a **European anti Terrorism organisation**. In order to fight against cross-border crime we have to understand that while many criminals are "correctable", there are many who aren't. A thief can be helped to change, but a person with 20 years in an organised criminal gang probably cannot. And their punishment shouldn't be the same. We need **separate facilities, correctional help for criminals** and lock-away facilities to protect the public.

I do not believe one voice can achieve peace because one voice alone is resemblance to just shouting at a brick wall. I believe everyone should unite and voice their will and want for peace. The more voice who fight for peace the more likely it is for it to be achieved. We certainly need to reach out to those in need and help them. There also needs to be an intervention in regards to human trafficking. There needs to be a **removal of all corrupt leaders**. It is inhuman to just sit back and watch others suffer. We have a duty as fellow human beings to help our fellow man.

My proposal is about hunting down the people who make corruption possible. Who are they? They are the people who propose to corruptive people a deal or a business or even a little commission. All of them are **corruption criminals** too and not normal criminals and we have to treat them like that. To tackle corruption it is necessary to punish harder the corruption sponsors. If we establish a **harder legislation** against this people they will think twice to come up with a corruption deal.

In order to tackle corruption, several measures are required, some of them are: Firstly, it is crucial to understand the different kinds of corruption to develop smart responses. In addition, creation of pathways that give citizens suitable tools to ply and participate in their governments and identify priorities, problems followed by the finding of solutions is relay effective, along with conjugating formal and informal processes (this means working with the government as well as non-governmental groups) to change behaviour and bring in progress. Furthermore, use the power of technology to create dynamic and continuous exchanges between directly interested institutions: government, citizens, business, civil society groups, media, academia etc. Moreover, the Union could invest in institutions and policy. Sustainable improvement when it comes to services provision, is only possible if people in these institutions authorize logical rules and practices that allow changes to happen, while making the best possible practice of tested traditions and inheritance. Imported models often do not work. The **appropriate punishment** should be the aftermath of corruption.

One of the most problems that we find in a democratic country is corruption. I think that the European Union has to establish a **law against corruption** and advise their partners to fight against it. If corrupt people govern a country, it is necessary that they will have to resign. The European Union should condemn them and should penalize them. The European Union should practise a zero-tolerance towards corruption.

My proposal in regards to tackling corruption is as follows: if a leader is found to be corrupt they should be, first, given the opportunity to stand down from their position. They should be given a short amount of time to stand down. If the leader refuses to stand down then an **impeachment process** shall be put through. If the government in power are corrupt as well as the leader the European Union should step in to remove the leader from power and prosecute them for their crimes.

Expand and further build upon **cooperation** between **law enforcement agencies** dealing with **illegal drugs**.

Take control of the political narcotics agenda: Too much time is spent debating the fringe discussion on legalisation, and too little time is spent on discussing how **illegal drug abuse** can be prevented and decreased.

These days we all know that sport is spoiled by corruption and doping. Too much drugs in sport: too many "champions" doping, what solution could we find to overcome these issues in sport? We suggest to **strengthen the sanctions and drug controls**: make sure that an athlete who has once been caught will not be allowed to compete again. No matter the gravity of his act. However, there are specific cases such as the doping issue in Russia where the state forced all of the Olympians athletes to take drugs. Should we lump all of the athletes together? Or adopt a case by case politic? We know that official authorities are corrupted: money is stronger than sport values. Nevertheless, authorities are reacting for example by creating anti-corruption federations such as the FIACS, created in 2015. But is it enough to completely get rid of corruption? We do not think so, and what if even these anti-corruption authorities are in fact corrupted? Morally, autocrats with dodgy human rights records should not be allowed to organize international competitions. We feel that governments are turning a blind eye to the population situation in certain organizer countries (Brazil, China, South Africa...). But in fact it can be beneficial for the population as it enables to open up on the world. Sport is far from being clean. Authorities are too lax, with these serious issues and some changes definitely have to be made. Sport inspires numerous children and it is important to instil them fair values.

Introduction of a **global anti-corruption union** concerning all sports, which would impose harsh penalties. There is also a need to raise awareness and training of how to detect and suppress corruption in sports. That should concern all individuals.

Autocrats with dodgy human rights records should not be allowed to host the world's most prestigious **sport event**. If such individuals host those events, ideals will be tamed and sports will be transformed into a cheap spectacle.

We should establish **competitions for pure well-being and not for any monetary gain**. Furthermore, respect for the opponent should be reminded, competing with yourself is more important. It must be mentioned that through sports we can learn concentration, perseverance, self-discipline and in general all qualities that help the inner seeking.

Educate and communicate to change mindsets. **Communicate about corruption in sports** in sports clubs and high schools: campaign of communication; before: testimony of people confronted; during: case, trial, justice; after: doping: consequences on body.

Transparent Sport Organization. Creation of totally independent organization which is specialized in fighting against corruption in sport. It should consist of lawyers, police officers, civil experts. Only that mix of experience work.

Education is the key! Lessons at schools given by gym teachers, this is how you influence a new generation. Teach them about **sport ethics** and not only playing sports. Teachers are more known how to influence children.

The Idea is to totally **ban betting in sports** and also that betting companies has no more effect on advertisement or sponsoring on clubs. And, also that the sports people know what betting is.

European **exchange of national sport associations presidents.** By selecting the heads (e.g. President) of National Sports Associations that do not come from the country that the NSA originates, the corruption due to nepotism and personal relations will narrow down.

Referee control policy. The EU can create an organisation like the lottery to randomly select referees just before games. The referees would be considered as trustworthy by the organisation, so nobody can influence them.

European Youth Olympics. Sport competition to teach moral and ethics to youngest audience. A free competition, free tv rights. No goodies, no products, no commercialisation.

European Sport channel to regulate TV rights. Create a free European sport channel to broadcast all sports. To let free access to every European.

Back to sport as a passion - through education by providing scholars with sport opportunities and workshops, they will become aware of the implications of corruption and how to respond with good and fair competition - **values of sports.**

Sport fans united against corruption. EU should support the founding of an NGO that would mobilise the sport fans to pressure and hold accountable the corrupted stakeholders in sport. For example, petitioning against Qatar World Championships.

To support **children clubs in all sports.** Because childhood is the best moment to educate them.

Vote among the citizens to decide where the competitions are going to take place. Currently the IOC (or the FIFA for football) decide where the competitions take place. It should be a vote for everyone to give his opinion.

Sport from the people for the people. Democratic process of **election for championships and tournaments** in UE. To avoid corruption and speculation and leave people choose for their country.

I suggest the EU to initiate a law that will be put into effect in all 27 Member states, requiring that **land data** (who owns the land), **company information data be accessible for free.** This would help the **fight against corruption** exponentially, and the fight against populism and manipulation.

Prevention

A set of **EU Guidelines** on how to **prevent radicalization at the educational level.** Fight extremism; prevent it, before the problem occurs. Advocate at all levels of education to prevent radicalization with democratic thinking, tolerance, inclusion, positive aspects such as multiculturalism. Start in primary education and advocate for European values. Europeans countries should formulate common guidelines for local governments.

To prevent radicalization of young people, **teachers need to learn how to recognize its signs.** Every teacher should have to take part in workshops specializing on that topic and be given a helpline (for students too). Once at it, it could be expanded, eg to signs of non-terroristic suicides as well.

Educate! Develop children (but also adults) critical mind allowing them to assess by themselves the truthfulness of an information. Also, in the same way, educate to differences and acceptance of others. We have the chance to live in a world and continent composed by so many different countries, and within those countries so many different communities. Accepting is the first step to a peaceful society.

Long term prevention on online security through education.

Focus more on issues of consent in schools to reduce sexual violence and crime.

More **information about how these terrorists radicalise people** is needed to warn people of their brainwashing techniques then they will recognise it and will be able to prevent themselves getting caught up into it.

EU should **stop the impunity** of authors of hateful/radical comments online. The fact that almost everything can be said without any control and leaving a permanent mark in the net is alarming. Internet is an undeniable way of radicalisation, whether it is hate, or religion. It's a whole new world, that shouldn't be standing impunity.

Once a person or more people come up on the radar as **"terrorist suspects" bring them in for questioning and hold them** indefinitely because as previous proven the "terror suspects" almost always follow through with what they have been accused of.

People need to be included in the society and adapted to it. I propose that the European Union makes series of events and projects every year bringing people from different cultural backgrounds together and not only discussing, but uniting

them via art (music, painting, dances, performances, etc.). Art has uniting power. These projects should be introduced at schools, because the children can build valuable relationships from early age. Moreover, these projects should be done mostly in schools, where children from minorities or of migrant parents study. EU should also do campaigns promoting non-discrimination, inclusion and active participation of people from every culture.

Integration: integrate all people into our society and take extra measure to make it happen so no one feels isolated and bullied because these are the reasons which make people angry and upset and more vulnerable to radicalisation.

In order to answer the question about how to stop terrorists, we have to ask ourselves if everyone around us is **respected and treated equally?** Because people usually get the craziest ideas when they want something but they can't get it because their type of people is on a lower level than everyone else's. Everyone can become a terrorist and all terrorists have a reason to be who they are. In order to prevent them, I think equality and respect between everyone can help. Education too. But we come across these attractions every day so, in order to stop them we should scare them in some way.

The problem with radicalisation is that these people feel given up by the State and the society. There is two way to prevent it
1) Politics have to devote a part of their **political programs to these people** (suburbs, residential district, etc)
2) There must be a **European school plan** for the promotion of human's right since primary school.

In order to tackle the problem of terrorism (both ISIS and other kinds of terrorism), I propose to use the **internet to track down terrorists and hate groups** and shut them down so they cannot operate or spread their agenda therefore protecting people from their disturbing way of thinking and acts. We could send terrorists into custody by tracing their social media accounts because nowadays they have social media accounts and are practically pushing it in our faces believing their are invincible, let's show them that we aren't.

Social media is said to be accessible for everyone, no matter the age. Making the **social media more secure** to be used by everyone and being more vigilant regarding who logs in, it will truly fulfill the purpose it has been created for: socialising, making friends and meeting new people, stop being lonely and more! Thank you :)

A digital licence for every EU citizen, entailing a first course at about 10 years and refreshment courses in regular intervals. Some online services will not be available if the licence is not valid.

Verification of the news to have a **virtual check** or sign that indicates that the information is verified, contrasted, true and complete.

Something a little less realistic that I have in my mind is ruining all weapons and destroying everything that can produce dangerous items. **Weapons should only be produced for**

public institutions like police stations, armies, etc.

Robots could be used in various situation for example in the army as soldiers - they will be better, because digital electronics are more precise than human hand, but we should not allow to build militaries robots and drones which could be used against human beings.

Ensure that Europe becomes a **more secular continent.**

Accepting **freedom and security** as a unity instead of two contradicting values.

What I would suggest is to **crack down on criminals smuggling migrants** from three directions; EU should act as a guardian who removes the desirable target and uses a range of methods to prevent criminal opportunity for the offender. Remove the desirable target by bringing refugees to safety. Make the EU presence visible and clear at locations where refugees are gathered in vast volumes. Add guardianship by increasing the opportunity of safe lives for vulnerable individuals, and by improving measures of integration once they have safely arrived in a new country.

Foreign policy

In order to obtain a better international representation within a full European scale, I believe we should pursue the creation of a **Diplomatic Corpus** that would represent the European necessities and values while representing us at a bigger scale, rather than independently.

Europe should try to **speak as one in external geopolitical matters.** This voice should be the result of needs of all countries. It should not be alone, should seek allies outside Union, one who are sane and fallow human rights. Power of voice depends on power of lungs, so EU should try to expand production inside and unite new members if available. United Army is good way to not waste public funds on duplication, but we don't need to outspend USA. Conventional arm force is not everything. Cyber threat is one thing. The other is losing integrity. There is a risk of growing inequality, or peripheral regions of UE losing on integration. There is challenge in boosting economy of peripherals UE to keep unity. People will not fight for corporate overlords, but for humanity and future maybe. EU should also think of **solving global crisis without arms.** Ecological catastrophe, poverty and lack of perspective could push Africa or Asia into dictatorship and war. Europe should be smart giant, which often involves creating allies. For Europe goal is not to conquest enemy but turn it into human rights democracy. Dictators die, nations remain.

Europe should speak with one voice, but Europe should avoid a "Pax Europa" situation where Europe imposes peace through force of arms, this sort of world policing doesn't work in reality and often leads to more trouble. Europe's main international form of pressure and conduct needs to be **soft power.**

What should the European Union do from a political point of view to be stronger? My idea is to **enhance the European External Action Service** into a full European diplomatic corps, as a unique bargaining counter in the global negotiations, by the promotion of a multidisciplinary approach, at the level of the EU Military Committee, under protection of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs. This is not only about allocating more resources to the actual representations. The idea is to strengthen the EU negotiating role around the globe, for example, as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council. The European Union should promote agreements as a single diplomatic agent, and this kind of improvement proposals would be evaluated and managed by a multidisciplinary group, consisting of actual Managing Directors, EU Military Staff General Director and the Foreign Policy Instruments Service. The EU as an individual global player ratified the Paris Climate Agreement by the approval of the European Parliament on the 4th of October 2016, so this might be an example on how this workgroup should operate. Both institutions, the Parliament and this EU-Diplomatic Cabinet should be able to promote the development, approval or ratification of an agreement, by a conciliation stage and the further ratification statement. It is time for a new level of ambition. The EU is a guarantor of many Peace Accords, and the 2012 Nobel Peace Prize to the EU institutions is a proof of this. The Union must be involved into the peace agreements throughout the world, and with a single voice, which is heard more clearly than many small voices. Strengthening the role of Europe in the diplomatic sphere is essential to guarantee the peace and prosperity of Europe and the world, which in turn lay the foundations for a stronger Europe in a safer, more prosperous world.

I believe that, in these times where Russia is becoming more aggressive and the US puts doubts on our mutual defence treaties, the EU needs to finally integrate our defence policy. PESCO is a great start but I have 3 more proposals that are more acceptable than a single "EU army" but also guarantee our independence and ensure a sort of "double down" on NATO. Foreign intervention should be strictly limited to cases where our allies and friendly countries' sovereignty is being directly threatened by a foreign force or a foreign funded fifth column. 1) My main proposal is a **standardisation of European armies**. In Europe, we have a lot of military excellency, some EU countries do the best military equipment in their category, particularly when thinking for example about Germany's Leopard 2 tank (and its variants), or Beretta's 9mm pistol. Ensuring every nation uses the same kind of military equipment has a double advantage. On the one side, using only the best kind of equipment any EU country has to offer allows us to profit from the excellency present in the EU, but it also allows EU countries to work as a more coherent force in the event of an attack. How do we preserve local national industries? Every time the EU's armies need new equipment, a commission of generals would convene and chose among the prototypes offered, just like in national cases, the particularity here is that the winner would have the obligation to pass on the license to all other EU weapons manufacturers in exchange for a large payment from the EU

itself. This would allow national industries to be preserved, but would also make competition much higher, since every time a new design is accepted, the technological level is "reset" across the Union, allowing our armies to benefit from the best technology available. 2) My second proposal is much simpler, the EU should include a **mutual defence treaty** guaranteeing that an attack against any member is seen as an attack against all, but excluding participation in an offensive war, this would ensure a secondary protection if NATO fails and diminish the possibility that the EU is branded as an offensive imperialistic power. 3) My last proposal is to have a **united general staff of commanders meeting every year** to review defensive plans for any occasion.

I may sound hawkish, but I think the solution is one: **More foreign interventionism**. Europe needs to increase its military spending and greatly expand its military capabilities and be ready to act in different ways to achieve global justice, security and peace. Terrorism and rogue regimes usually appear in weakened, poverty-stricken countries. Therefore, a form of "proletarian" internationalism, where 1) Europe sends humanitarian aid to poor people in poorer countries in order to improve their lives and help these people to develop and escape their misery, is absolutely necessary and 2) Europe has the responsibility to help spread democracy and humanistic liberal principals across the globe, so it is necessary for Europe to intervene on a state's political system, get rid of corruption and try to remove authoritarian leaders, by non-violently supporting and funding democratic parties/factions/organisations in that country. However, when non-violent intervention doesn't succeed in spreading democracy and peace, and, given that the threat of aggression from rogue states and non-state actors will always be present, Europe has to be ready to enter pre-emptive wars, in order to help depose authoritarian regimes, establish democracy, liberate subjugated people and rid this world from oppression. Preventive wars can also be an option, to help disarm states that in the past had been a threat to global peace, are hostile towards Europe and the principals that it stands for, and it in the future can potentially become a threat again.

Israel military force is disproportionate against civil people of Palestine, particularly in **Gaza**. The EU should take a **strong position** towards this conflict as United States does. With the crucial difference of upholding international law and human rights. Palestine has the right of self-determination.

The EU can **avoid deal with organizations who invade other countries**, break human rights, abuse labour, and pollute planets. The EU can strengthen ties with countries who are more human-centered and peaceful.

Under IPA II, the European commission gives money to Turkey in a regular way with the stated goals of improving democracy and the rule of law. This round of aid has started in 2014, four years later Turkey is in a much worsened state with regard to these priorities (even though, in theory, 1,581.4bn EUR have been spend on Democracy and the Rule of Law). How can the EU keep its status as a serious force for democracy if we keep on financing Erdogan's path to dictatorship? We should instead show that we are not afraid of dictators by cutting this

money. As shown by Bruce Bueno de Mesquita in his book "The Dictator's Handbook", authoritarian regimes tend to fall or reform once their money supply is taken out. While, as stated by Mrs Ska Keller during the event at the EYE, I understand some of this money may go to societies that preserve democracy in Turkey, as she stated, a lot also goes towards infrastructure building and hence finances Erdogan's regime. In my mind we should: 1) **Stop the IPA II funding** and freeze Turkey's accession process until the regime shows to be turning towards democracy again. 2) **Target Erdogan's government** and allies as well as Erdogan himself **with travel bans** and financial sanctions. It is a fallacy to believe these moves would cause him to "flood us with migrants" as stated in the debate, if Erdogan did the migrants deal, it was for the money the EU promised him. As noted by Moody's, the financing needs of Turkey are large and growing, even as the checks and balances are decreasing and corruption drains the funds more than it once did. Authoritarian leaders love to bluff about the grave consequences of angering them, but rarely follow through those promises of gloom and doom. When Erdogan downed Russia's fighter jet, angry promises were quickly forgotten.

More funding for EU-Turkey cooperation.

EU should keep financing Turkey democracy. EU should **stop paying for authoritarianism.**

Visa for Turkish people / liberalisation (more movement will increase mutual understanding).

I am a young Cypriot living in the last divided capital city of Europe, Nicosia. I am inspired by the notions of peace, reconciliation and reunification. I hope one day to live peacefully in a reunited country with our Turkish-Cypriots brothers and sisters. Unfortunately, Turkey has an authoritarian regime and an imperialist policy thus preventing our dreams come true. Therefore I call the EU, its citizens and our Turkish-Cypriots fellow citizens to demand the **termination of Turkey violation of international law** taking place in my homeland since 1974. This July, 44 years of illegal occupation of the north part of the Cyprus Republic are completed. For the same reasons and because human rights shouldn't be a personal or national matter, I call all of us to demand the termination of human rights violations in Turkey and Syria. It's hypocritical, from both sides, to continue the negotiations while the international and human rights law are flagrantly violated. I think the relationship between two sides should improve. But this shouldn't be just for one side. I think this relationship between two sides can be improved by visiting Europe and Turkey and seeing each other closely. Education also can be another strong tie between Europe and Turkey as well. If Turkey's young generation could find more chance to being educated in Europe I think this would be an efficient way to **know each other more, learn about each other and improve the relationship between Europe and Turkey.**

Undoubtedly, there would be benefits for both **European and Turkish young generation if relationships between the two were closer.** To begin with, that would enhance the multiculturalism of Europe, as Turkey is a country with

great culture. In addition, if students from the EU were given the chance to visit Turkey through, for instance, Erasmus programs and vice versa, it would symbolize a battle against conservatism. Furthermore, Turkish young generation would be given a chance in better education, quality of life and equality. As far as Europe is concerned, Turkey is a member of NATO, G-20 and the EEC and has a very strong geopolitical location. Therefore, the Criteria of Copenhagen might not be fulfilled, but it is worth considering a tightening of bonds, as quality of life for the European young generation can be improved. To conclude, young people should be raised in a "climate of objectivity" and not with prejudice.

The most pressing problem we need to deal with at the moment is the **Aegean sea conflict.** There is an issue with Turkish state aggression in the area and we must do our utmost that this not become a war, but at the same time we cannot leave Greece to the metaphorical "sharks". We must also understand the Turkish point of view and accept this fact: The law of the sea is unfair to Turkey which is why Turkey refuses to sign the treaty. Under the treaty Turkey would not be entitled to the 6km of EEZ that it should get even by the clauses of the treaty itself and Turkey's fishing industry and other marine projects would greatly suffer if Turkey abided by the treaty. The treaty **MUST** be renegotiated in more fair terms. EU must condemn Turkish actions in Afrin region. **EU should pursue a "special relationship" with Turkey,** but unless the country fits the ascension criteria and manages to mend relations with member states I don't see them becoming a member any time soon.

If we talk about **Turkey** as a state, it is easy to define it. But if we talk about Turkish people it is very difficult to define them. Turkey is a huge multicultural country with so many minority groups and cultures. And not everybody gets perfectly along with each other. I just have to mention the Kurdish-Turkish conflict in some areas. It's the same about regions and geographic parts. Young people in Izmir and Istanbul will reply completely different to political questions if you ask them. In my opinion, it is very important to improve relations and don't start a second EU vs. another region conflict e.g. the Russia case. It is very important that Turkey is not just the government but also the people. And we, as European citizens and representatives have our responsibility towards them. But instead of accusing and punishing each other we should try to find a solution together. Find the dialogue, see and understand the Turkish view and certain topics e.g. the Amnesty International case (representatives went to prison, Turkish governmental representatives don't want to collaborate with them anymore). Erasmus programs are already there, but relations should be fostered by offering/supporting special exchange programs e.g. the Turkish-German Youth exchange. The Turkish point of view should be neutrally represented and understood in Europe. Turkey is still the gateway for European citizens to the Middle East. I think everyone of us should first visit such a country before judging it. On the other side, we should be careful with who we collaborate. Education in Europe should not be given to Turkish-Muslim organizations as DITIB like in Germany without proving them. **Collaboration should be limited to a certain level were Human Rights are still untouched.** We cannot allow conflicts with other democratic representatives.

Regarding Turkey, we should most certainly maintain a negotiable and somewhat **calm relationship with Turkey**. However, Turkey should not be welcomed as a member state until the leader is changed and their values change to be in accordance with the European Union's values. Turkey does not have the same values as the European Union, therefore, should not be considered to become a member state. The European Union has an obligation to protect its member states therefore not bringing Turkey into the Union until they correct their ways is the best way to do that.

I must say that I am proud to be part of the EU as a Turkish citizen. I think Turkey is an inseparable part of the EU and the EU - Turkey relationship should never be finished. This will most likely affect younger generations. It should be remembered that Turkey is a cosmopolitan country and there are many citizens (especially young people) who deserve European standards. Multiculturalism and mutual assistance will benefit both sides. Both sides should not hesitate to step on. It is **necessary to act more together**. The development of Turkey and the EU in many ways depends on the continuity of this bilateral relationship

I firmly believe that EU - Turkish relations should be improved. First of all, it's a beneficial assignment for both. In European Union will be able to integrate one more country which belongs to G20 and is one of the strongest in the world. Furthermore, EU will control the percentage of immigration that is coming in EU. On the other hand, Turkish people will be able to trade their products in a free way in the Single Market. Additionally, it's an opportunity for Turkish government to democratize the regime and respect the Human Rights. However, in the first place Turkey must fulfil the Criteria of Copenhagen and accept the pre-accession strategy. It means that **both sides should have trust in their relationship and be ready to make stable movements**.

Mutual respect and trust between Turkey and the EU.

Young people from Turkey need to travel to Europe. At the same time, European Youth need to travel to Turkey. They need to learn that these 2 worlds are not so much different. As accession seems impossible now, culture differences appears to be a real barrier, Europe should continue **building partnership**. EVS, Erasmus, Erasmus plus exchanges work well, young people have a chance to experience the reality. Since media in every country creates the image of other country the way that is useful for current politics, it's crucial to enable youth to make their own opinions. Turkish youth is craving Europe, they want to experience European life. But at the same time they want to stay in Turkey living life they know. It's important to give them European experience, to give them ideas, chance for better education, chance to speak English, chance to broaden their horizons. If Europe won't give them this chance, they will be separated from freedom ideas, from development ideas. This is current politics of conservative society and Europe should stop it. I am EVS volunteer in Turkey. I see that what young people need is not becoming EU citizens. They need support. If Europe gives them possibilities, they will feel closer to European ideas in the future. We can't change how conservative groups think. But we can support old generation of activists, group of West oriented people, and we can influence how young generation is raised. Europe is responsible of making them aware of what they can do. Otherwise they will be pacified by current government policy. People are not waiting for being EU citizen. What they want is to be closer to Europe than they are now, they want to feel accepted, they want freedom.

EU processes and roles

The **EU** must take a hard look at itself and reflect on the nature and state of the union. The Member States must begin a **clear dialogue between the heads of state**, or even at a wider, parliamentary and citizen level, of what they actually think of the EU and how to make it work for them. The only way to bring Hungary, Greece, Germany, Italy and Spain back to the EU, not as reluctant states, but as willing partners is **wide scale negotiations and possible reform**. Because after all, isn't politics all about finding the way to make the best compromise for all?

The first problem of the EU is its rulers; there is not an effective government of the EU. The young people don't know how the EU works, the first thing is to teach in the schools and high schools how important is EU in our lives. The **EU** should go to a **real political unification** (same parties, same lists, same interests and policies) with an effective government as in the rest of the countries with real power. Also we should go for a **military unification**, with only one big army which don't led the member states to go alone to a conflict avoiding the decisions of the EU Parliament.

From the creation of the European Union, an "ever-closer" Union of states and citizens is an ambition worth fighting for. To begin with, added value is a value addable to this created by actions of each Member State separately. **The European legislation is correctly executed** and application of scale economy takes place, so that money will be used as critically as to offer to citizens better services. Furthermore, decisions can be comparatively assessed, thus commitment would be required and **decisions would be based on evidence**.

Governments must **stop stalling EU progress** and implement policies without delay. Mechanisms must be put in place to encourage this, or punish governments if necessary. These mechanisms must be in the citizens' control; Member states positions in institutions like the Council must be communicated clearly to the public.

So in my opinion the EU needs to be more transparent and need to address voters directly, the lack of an European public sphere - EU needs to take a step in the social direction away from the economics and needs to focus **agendas with social importance**; Spread understanding for the population and bring states together; The EU needs to address directly and be more present in the everyday life's of the European population!

All young politicians should organise themselves in a **committee that only deals with the future of the European Union** and the young citizens. Show us that you care!

EU local communities: to solve problems, create a sort of **platform to connect rural people to the EU**. The Committee of the Regions is already in place... but maybe restructure this institution.

I think we should promote stronger EU ties, creating a **"federation" with the countries more involved**, in the Eurozone, and keeping the others in EU but outside, with different perspectives. In any case, federate or not, we have to keep high social and green standards, even if it means lower "growth" in the short term (but much stronger in the long one).

We need a more democratic Europe. **The European Parliament has to get more power** as it is the only democratically elected European institution.

The European parliament doesn't have so many rights compared with the national parliaments. The **European parliament should have initiative** as the **same level** as the European Commission.

Creating a special agency, namely **European Transparency Agency**, to address the corruption all around the UE. At first, each State should share with others its best practices to tackle the issue on their inside; then, the Agency should elaborate proposals to be implemented to reach common standard.

Un quota de représentativité de la jeunesse. L'objectif est de mettre en place un quota jeune de moins de 30 ans au sein de l'hémicycle européen. Chaque parti devra respecter ce quota. Quoi de mieux qu'un jeune pour représenter les jeunes ?

By agreeing with the **Brexit**, many students might lose the chance to study in the UK due to the fact that the tuition fees will go up and the only way to get into the country will be by VISA. From my point of view, a **better look into this matter should be taken** because many opportunities will be lost and other countries that have close relationships with Great Britain will suffer (e.g.: Canada, Australia, New Zealand) because what strikes the UK will strike them too. Such thing might happen to European countries too, because from the early stages of the EU, Great Britain has played an important and major role.

In the face of **Brexit**, the EU's approval rates are the highest since 35 years. The EU should see this as an **opportunity to raise awareness of its significance**, increase its democratic legitimacy and become more relevant to all citizens of Europe.

Scotland should remain a part of the EU as per the 2014 referendum and 2016 vote where all Scotland region voted to remain in the EU.

Make sure that the **UK realises the importance of being part of EU** and that the things will not be better outside the EU than inside.

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

I wish the EU saw the opportunity in luring **young educated British** people who want to escape Brexit Britain, perhaps by offering them **permanent residence in the EU?**

It's important to make sure to **keep the young British generations in touch with the rest of Europe**, so that we can have friendly neighbourhood relations and exchange ideas as well as goods. Continuing or increasing **exchange programmes** is very necessary! Hopefully this might also **keep the door open** for the British to return to the family once the dust has settled on Brexit, and they are ready to get involved again in the EU as team-players. If free movement for young people or even an option to get European passports are possible, we should go for them!

English people are our friends. We fight so many wars together, sometimes even on the same side. So far negotiations seem fine, priority is divorce bill, Irish situation and citizens situation. In future negotiations it should be made clear that European capital stock exchange can't remain in London, and must be somewhere inside the EU. **Young people should not suffer for the sin of their fathers. So all existing programs should remain available.** Also, Academics should find new workplace inside EU. Generally, there need to be a lot of love going on. 48% of voters said EU, we can't screw them, since UK politicians already did.

Elections

ONE uniform electoral system for all members of the European Union.

Give the European Parliament legislative power and enable **transnational lists of candidates!**

Impossibility to vote for politicians of other EU Member States. **Foresee transnational lists.**

The European Parliament should organise a **real European TV debate with the Spitzenkandidaten**, which then should be broadcasted in the national channels of the Member States as well as in online streaming portals with interpretation into all official languages.

We are about to elect the future European Parliament, the legislative institution of the EU but why is the executive power not elected? It is as much important as the parliament (if not more). I want to **elect the head state of the Union.**

Right to vote without nationality issue. If you're an EU citizen living in another country, you should have a say in communal and regional elections.

The vast majority of young people does not attend the ballots due to inconvenience, voting is a time-consuming procedure (multiple steps to take beforehand). Furthermore, the youth, and all the citizens in general, tend to undermine politics. Politicians have the bad reputation of making empty promises, thus the public has given up on the system a long time ago.

One of the possible solutions to the "turn-out gap" is **Online Voting Process**. By establishing this, everyone could have the chance to vote wherever they are, in whichever situation. Technology is our ally, not our enemy.

Ease of voting - we need a **secure digital voting system** across the EU and we must protect it from hacking. This will make voting very easy.

I hope that my encouragement for establishing **online voting for European Parliament elections** will be considered seriously! (#Estonia#thistimelamvoting) Why? Easier access to voting increases interest to vote and learn about politics. Proved by research study. How? Learn from Estonia. #eResidency

The high abstention rate at the election often represents the voters' growing disillusionment with politics. Discredited ideologies, unfulfilled promises and policies that habitually fail to meet the needs of the youth. **Aspiring political candidates should align their messages and policies to address the growing needs of the youth** to stimulate their interest in politics. Massing up at voting centres often discourages participation in voting. **E-voting** should therefore, be prioritized to make voting easily accessible.

In my opinion, we can only increase voter turnout by **highlighting the important issues** the European Union faces today and how the different parties would solve them. As they do in the national elections. Another way would be to enable European Citizens to vote via **E-voting tools**.

Online voting process and compulsory voting.

One of the possible solutions for the "turn-out gap" is **compulsory Voting**. This has been established in numerous countries and it has proven that: because the voter turnout increases, the public's will is being expressed, thus legal certainty is ensured. Many may say that mandatory voting is an infringement of our liberties, but in fact voting is a right that becomes an obligation.

The European Parliament should urge the Member States to **allow for simple access to postal voting** as in particular young people live abroad for a limited period of time which can disproportionately increase the logistical (travel home to vote) and administrative burden (register as a national abroad) to participate in an election.

To reduce the turnout gap, make the **voting system more accessible** to anyone eligible to vote. This facilitates the voting process overall and helps to increase voter turnout.

Many young people do not vote because it's hard to know who to vote for. **Creating an easy way** for people to **understand how the process works**, and what the different parties stand for will increase the amount of voters.

E-Democracy at school. Teach how to vote online, which ways exist to participate and what the dangers are, and make it mandatory for all schools. Provide tools and funding for all schools, especially in poor regions.

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

In order to motivate young people to vote, we should ensure that **more information** about the elections and the European Parliament as a whole is put forward.

Taste Europe - to **educate and involve teenagers already before the age of voting** so that when they can vote they understand the process and want to participate in the process.

Creating an easy way for people to understand how the process works, and what the different parties stand for will increase the amount of voters.

In my opinion low youth turnouts are due to a lack of knowledge what Europe is at core. I do not want to generalise but I think that I can speak for a fair share of my generation when I say: "We love Europe and couldn't live without it." The problem is not that we are not aware what Europe is doing for us. I would rather say that **we do not see the actual work that stands behind our privileges**. We might be the generation Easyjet, we grew up with a single currency and we are used to pass borders without having to prove our identity. I think that we need to be given the feeling that all this is not self-explanatory. Many parents might not talk about it. So I would love **if school had taught me how difficult the European Unification process was/is**.

The first problem which need to be solved is the small interest of especially young people in politics, even national, and especially in the EU. Particularly because the EU is kind of a Blackbox where no citizens, especially those who have no clue about politics, can comprehend what is going on and which decisions are made by whom. So in my opinion the EU needs to **be more transparent** and need to address voters directly, otherwise people will not vote because they have no real idea how the EU even works. At the same time, this is difficult without a European public sphere. Different languages, different cultures even different religions make the EU to this beautiful multicultural space, but it is also hard to joint all 27 states together and to spread a feeling of uniting.

There is a need to **publicise more EU and what it does, especially the voting part**. Most of the people do not know they have to vote for EU, how, when, for what, how it works, hardly many people know that. It's important to get better at communication.

A lot of young people don't even realise that they could vote for the EP. And if they do, it is usually considered a useless or unimportant election, as many do not know the actual importance and functions of the EP. For a lot of people the EU is something that seems even further out of their reach and such than their national government, which they already consider to be doing little to connect with them. Furthermore, the EU elections don't tend to get the media fuss national ones do, which isn't helping either. So a **high profile information campaign** informing about the EP and the EP elections might be very helpful. A campaign to give information about MEPs and how to reach them, to show that our MEPs listen to us, take us seriously, and aren't that far out of reach. Just posting short introduction videos for them might help already. The

more you include the younger folks into your decisions, the more you listen to them and interact with them and ask their opinion, the more likely will they probably be to care about the EP and want to support their members of choice. Make it feel like they and their voices really matter, you know.

I believe that the best way to attract young people to vote is to **create a vibrant, lively and energetic campaign**, which appeals to the younger generation, and discard the old, boring and mundane campaign techniques. This way you will attract their attention and they will listen to the information provided and be more likely to vote.

To make young people vote, we should **underline how important the youth vote is** and make young people feel needed, as if their vote will be the deciding vote. Highlight the youth's need make them feel important. Our youth feel overlooked and as if their voices are not heard. So, if there is an emphasis upon the fact that their voices are important along with a modern vibrancy to election campaigns, the youth will come forward.

Young people turnout greatly for election when the **candidate they want to vote for is young**, friendly and when they have confidence in him or her. Also when they are motivated, encouraged and promised a better life and good jobs. We can close the gap when young people are educated and make them understand that every single votes counts. When they do not vote, it may affect a candidate who has great vision for young people. The young should be given the **opportunity to know each candidate well**. They should also be educated on how to vote and where to vote. They shouldn't been stressed out when going to vote.

Finance a **European media** that transmits a clear, simple and attractive message to the whole Europe.

The European Parliament should **provide political election programmes of the different groups** to make them politically distinguishable and allow creating **tools like a EUROMAT** (an engine based on the *Wahl-o-mat* concept that is fed with the parties' or groups' positions on a variety of themes. The users tell the engine whether they agree or do not agree with the respective thesis and the EUROMAT can tell the users with which party or group they have how much of an overlap).

To **promote voting**: use **Social media**, go from a **local** reality to a bigger one, European institutions should **meet students**, use **events** (like EYE), **concerts**, make **conferences** in order to explain and remind constantly why it's so important to have "European feeling".

To **promote voting** among the individuals: **Facebook events** > sending invitation – snow ball effect – "I VOTED AND YOU SHOULD VOTE TOO" (I voted and I want you to vote too); use **Influencers** (different backgrounds, they must be convinced); Sending compilation, short videos, short testimonials (3-4 second videos); for countries where Facebook in not very popular use Instagram.

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

To **promote voting** in the villages and towns: organise **social events** in each neighbourhood (sponsored by EP with the help of volunteers); create online advertisements (via Instagram, Facebook etc.); **involve schools and universities**, with colourful flags, music, presentation of candidates, debates; create brochures with recycled paper; use advertisements such as posters around the city; use stands, information, food, gadgets; and work with youth organisations.

To **encourage young people to go to vote**: choose famous people in for each region who stand for Europe; develop Mobile Apps, blog, chats, events, more funds for dialog, better communication; Newspapers & Blogs (+Video); #EUYouTube, YouTube Channel - easier to watch video than to read a newspaper; cartoons of EU; organize events to make people feel EU is there and close; mandatory courses about EU in schools; international influencers and "common" people can make videos about what EU means to them and spread info €competition to win interrail tickets; Interactive MEPs through Social Media; survey to analyse the problems (YouTube, Instagram).

Possible solution: introducing a **lower age-restriction for voting** (16 years), especially in municipality elections, in combination with more **political education** in schools starting at an early age. Youth often feel discouraged to take part in politics because they are not old enough to vote. If politics are taught in schools at the time when youth are allowed to vote, it might encourage more engagement and participation. Encouraging youth to vote at a lower age will also help target a broader audience of voters and help them bring their engagement into their adult lives, thus helping to close the "turnout gap".

How could we get especially young people more interested in the EU? Everybody present at the EYE should commit to spreading **the message about the importance of voting** (and the fact that you vote!) using all social media platforms and all other media available.

In my point of view, the only reason why there is a turnout gap between young and old is just that in our not so democratic system of governance it takes too long for citizens to be convinced that their vote can change anything. Democracy isn't in crisis, our political under-representative system is. The way to make citizens and especially young citizens vote, is to make their vote matter. This could happen only by **Direct Democracy**, a form of which is the **European Citizens Initiative** - it should be however binding, not not-binding as it is now.

To make Europe more attractive to the youth- Let youth govern it! At least a share. I have to admit that low turnouts are also related to the candidates we can elect. We are used to the same old faces who will likely obtain their 6th mandate in Brussels. I think that every candidate should question himself if he is really adding value by staying in Brussels for his 20th year in row. We need some fresh air. Most of us spent the past 10 years of their youth growing up with new forms of media and another information culture. We read less long

newspapers, our attention span is shorter than ever before and our relationships are much more informal. If politics adapted to that by giving some of us the **opportunity to participate (not just by voting)** it would help a lot.

My idea for increasing voter turnout in general - and especially young voters - would be to give it a bit of an **event context**. While the voting itself obviously has to remain serious and formal, we could create communal events around the votes: town hall meetings with free food and after-party to get information about the various issues and parties, voting day BBQ parties run by volunteers to celebrate participation, voting trips that include getting a free EU flag t-shirt, competition for best voting days event ideas in advance to get more people involved in both coming up with helpful event ideas and actually running them as well.

Another pressing problem is the following: **access to electoral information** - in National Elections in some countries it is hard to get information on the policies of candidates or their parties. In EU elections, it is hard to find the European Parliament party of candidates. There should be **more platforms for debates**. Not just tv debates but also online interviews and debates. Platforms where we can easily identify the national and European parties of each candidate and what are the policies of each. The backgrounds of each candidate should also be available. Elections are essentially elaborate job interviews so we should be able to review who are our best candidates...

The major issue with young people not showing up to vote is that they don't know how to, where to go, ... A way to improve this issue would be through **ad hoc social media campaigns** through Facebook advertising, Twitter, and Instagram stories adverts redirecting to a website showing parties manifestos, voting polls - even short videos showing how the Parliament, the Commission, and the European institutions work. Knowing what they are voting for, who they are voting for, what impact their vote is going to have, what they need to go to vote (documents, ID?) and where to vote, will probably improve the turn out.

In my point of view, the problem with the younger people not voting or voting less is because Europe is something that feels far and unknown. All the **European countries could put together a campaign**, for TV and social media (Twitter, Facebook and even Instagram because it's the most popular one) and explain with a simple but catchy video, what exactly is the European Union and all the things it does for the young people and that maybe are unknown to them. But most importantly, make sure that the importance of voting and of the Union, in general, is shown and understood, for a stronger and brighter future together.

Evaluate the viability of **algorithmic campaigning tools to reach out to millions of young people** simultaneously in an accessible and personalised manner.

There is not enough **media discussion** in Member states on European elections, so there is little exposure and unless people are proactive citizens they hardly can understand where to vote,

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

how and why (that said, my first vote was casted in the last EU election but I would not have voted if it hadn't been for my mom - no idea what I was doing, I had just turned 18!). Since there is little media coverage, and it is the youth turnout that it is targeted, then use those medias that that social group uses EVERY DAY. Between one Instagram story and another, they get a reminder that there is an election coming up with an easily accessible link to further information.

Young people are not going to vote. **Involve young people in the implementation process.**

I suggest that **public deliberation and holding the government publicly account are important elements of legitimacy processes** and should be part of the scrutiny and monitoring processes national parliaments are already supposed to manifest as part of their mandates. If European governments and their ministers were held accountable on manners such as efficiency, transparency and openness to consultation with the electorate about their practices and the public discourse on EU legitimacy was not exhausted to voter turnout percentages. The real challenge "is not the access to the EU information, but rather the processing **its ever increasing amount**, and it is this information that national parliaments should help their citizens **access and understand**. Citizens have to be able to understand the reasons behind decisions taken otherwise they will have no basis on which to judge if they agree with them or not. If we understand delegation's renewal to be based on citizens satisfaction with the decisions they have to live with, is it a lot to ask for them to understand why their delegates agreed to certain decisions in the first place, having their electorate's best supposedly in mind

I want to challenge the perception that national parliaments as more legitimate, in the mainstream sense of voter turnout, in comparison to the European Parliament. Such an understanding is of pivotal importance: if EP and national parliaments acceptance is more or less on the same levels, then cui bono from the perception that national parliaments enjoy greater acceptance, i.e. legitimacy. **National parliaments are not bringing more legitimacy to the EU project** (since they have no more than the EU already enjoys) **but they are actually, manufacturing legitimacy for themselves**. Europeans currently are missing the proverbial forest for the tree: it is of no importance if their views are represented on the EU level, if their views-or at least a majority of them- is de facto not taken into account by their national parliaments.

Political engagement

Create interactive/attractive/well designed **online public service tools** where everyone can comment/discuss topics, which are important for them.

Europe does have all the ingredients to become a champion, but we miss the political recipe for it. Therefore, I propose a new recipe ... a **Citizens' Convention**. It is imperative to go

beyond the status quo and create a body that develops a new structure to empower citizens ... and defend the European general interest because at the moment ... those channels are too weak. For example, you as MEPs, you are much more powerful than we are. But even if you support our ideas, you won't be able to do much ... because unlike the Commission, you cannot initiate laws. Only a citizens' convention could credibly argue for more powers to be granted to the Parliament and formulate true pan-European interest. Politicians, civil society organizations as well as randomly picked citizens would be represented – not forgetting of course a fair share of young people. The final text of the Convention would be submitted to a referendum at the same time as the European elections in 2024. Last year, we at JEF, proved – with the European Youth Convention – that it is possible to agree on a constitution with 35 nationalities - now we need to hold a convention at a much bigger scale in a transnational process to write a new constitution.

Create **assemblies** where young people regularly can discuss issues they are concerned about (having a purpose to participate, topics they are interested in).

Citizens' assemblies like in Ireland where they had a citizens' assembly before the historic vote last week where it became legal. It's where citizens come together like a jury, but bigger, to discuss, deliberate and decide on important issues.

The **EU should help** us organize the **largest EU meeting of Activists in Europe in 2019**, which we would like to host in **Romania**.

A more local example of bringing politics closer to people is a method called **participatory budgeting**—people making decisions about how money is spent. It's about opening up public budgets (city or municipality budgets) and letting people suggest ideas and vote on where this money should go and how should be used.

Digital democracy and online engagement can play a big role too in going beyond traditional consultation and engagement. It is a brilliant opportunity to get more people involved. Digital democracy means using tools to engage online. For example, there is online platforms you could use for people to send in ideas, suggestions on changes they'd like to see, respond to consultations and make connections with each other.

Monthly online voting on an advertised website on what topic should be discussed at the European Parliament. People could suggest ideas and watch debate online/tv.

Invite more youth representatives and ordinary **European citizens to participate in day-to-day activities at the European institutions**, instead of rare big-budget media events.

Your City - your online (e-)choice. Part of **budget free for people to vote what they want to do** in all cities of EU and all regions. (Already existing somewhere but not really everywhere).

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

Digital Citizenship programme to help young people develop digital and citizenship skills.

I find that often people aren't invested because they feel like it doesn't make any difference (to vote, to be informed...). It would be great for Europe to **use the digital tools to revolutionize democracy** and make the people feel more concerned. We should, **for each European decision, ask the EU citizens to vote like MEPs** on the internet. The results should at least be shown to all members of the parliament on a big screen for every vote, but they could also count officially for a certain amount of the total votes, so the parliament would really consider the vox populi and the citizens would have the feeling to participate actively.

We should give the possibility for people to **propose new ideas/projects/laws** through systems like an **"EU kickstarter"**. Citizens can vote for each idea, and if one of them reaches x votes it's automatically discussed at the parliament.

Opening up governments—more transparency, and also increase the opportunities for people to participate in decision-making beyond just voting in elections. I am pleased that the recent Irish referendum on abortion has been mentioned lots and praised as an example of where people can have real say on decision-making (including the citizens assembly to take the temperature check too) but want to go further beyond this, and suggest we have a way of getting people involved in the implementation process, ensuring citizen input all the way through.

We should have an **advisory body** to ensure as many voices as possible are heard in the decision making process. Accountability could be strengthened by having more online, with some form of penalty (forced to stand down by public petition online perhaps) acting as an incentive.

Reform the European Citizens Initiative by changing it to **European Citizens Decision** (making it a decision making instrument).

Need to involve more citizens in the decision-making level. **Reforming the EP's petition system**, mainstreaming, online platform etc.

To increase the input of the population the EU needs to take a step in the **social direction** away from the economics and needs to focus **agendas with social importance**. Spread understanding for the population and bring states together which fear a similar or the same problems. Trying to be a place of encounter and understanding because in my opinion the EU is for most of the people untouchable and not present most of the time.

The last two years of dialogue between Brussels and Polish Law and Justice's Department shown a problem regarding the limits of interference in local political discussion. **Let allow the European society to say what it thinks** about that, by sharing **anonymous survey via internet** or any other mean of communication to ask the society where the limit should be established, to respect European political integrity and local

political decisions at the same time and help to avoid some problems in controversial new laws.

The European Union institutions should **provide "micro-grants"** to encourage small-scale, local initiatives promoting **EU awareness** with accessible, fun methods.

I think it would be great to create a **flyer or a website** that has **all the information** in it you could need **to get politically engaged**. The flyer should be **send one time a year to all citizens** of the European Union.

The EU provides a **platform where all European news is freely accessible** and **translated** to at least English, German and French.

Provide financial assistance to European grassroots campaigns that **leverage innovative social media campaign tactics** in order to support their **fight for European values**, while also learn from their experience. As well as for European civic youth activities that leverage social media technology for positive social change.

Lowering the voting age. Creating what we call a **more participatory democracy**. This is one where people are involved in decision making and given a real meaningful opportunity to shape the world around them. A more participatory democracy goes hand in hand with representative democracy, it's there to support, supplement and make democracy actually function as it should. More opportunities for people to participate in decision making than just elections and voting.

We should consider **lowering the voting age to 16**, to foster political participation among especially influential generations. Consciousness of political processes begins with access to political rights.

Lower age to 16 for all types of election.

Directly **engage with young people on social media** and be more open about politics.

Yearly European Political Week: discussions about challenges that the EU is facing, e.g. meetings with MEP, Parliament simulations, local debates.

Our political system has stopped evolving, in a world which requires agility more than ever. **Politicians** have lost their values to become everybody's darling, but they **need to become role models again**, so that people like I am start believing they are really going to change something.

The European Parliament has already put many things in place to enhance sharing economy: an exchange platform for entrepreneurs, Erasmus Program for young entrepreneur, Social Challenges.

What we ask for is a direct access to parliamentarians: a real program **allowing social entrepreneurs and parliamentarians to exchange, discuss, share views** in order to decide together the world we want to live in, to embrace innovation and to achieve our ecological goals (reducing food

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

waste by half by 2030 for example). To do so, we propose to finally get a unified status for social entrepreneurs: with a unified status comes legitimacy; to have a referent, by sector (energy, health, water, waste..), attached to the parliament who will share valuable information with entrepreneurs (legal, state of affairs...) and will be able to pass on position papers and propositions of amelioration; and to have bi-annual meetings putting around the table social entrepreneurs and parliamentarians on a given theme: from which a roadmap with clear objectives will be written.

Youth involvement

Teenagers for cities. **Workshops in cities where people are not engaged.** For 12-18 years old kids. Learn about local politics and the EU politics. Start with 6 countries, then expand.

To increase awareness of the existing opportunities for young people: raise awareness about competitions on the EU; EU volunteers and officials to come to their old education institutions and member States; EU ambassadors; creating documents and content, best practices... Target audience: kinder garden, High School, Universities.

Participatory budget on a local level so that young people can vote on how money is spent.

Create **small projects** at schools **about how to improve youth role in EU**, where winner of an idea gets to present his/her idea at the European Parliament.

It's amazing what young people can do, if they have the opportunity and a little support. **Give** them a little bit of **money** from the government for the start and some support from national agencies. I am sure young people got great ideas, but sometimes it fails implementing them. The most important things are: it has to be fun (!) and has to be THEIR project, THEIR ownership.

Improve ways how young people can create their own projects without complicated reports. Maybe there could be a possibility that for projects coordinated by National Agencies there are no reports (for projects under 2000 EUR) and young people are those who read, evaluate reports (for projects under 4000 EUR).

Actively support existing political youth groups in the European member states that already try to make a difference in their local communities.

I think that EU should watch all best active people and try to teach them how they can "manage" their friends with same interests. EU is like a cable that should connect not only young people but everyone who wants to **take part in building better Europe** and better world.

Hi EYE! I propose to organize some **periodic National Youth Events**, according to the EYE model, in all EU members. These

events could increase young people's interest about politics and EU values. So, many countries, like Italy, could fight growing disaffection about these problems.

National EYE Events should be organised across member states, to both get in touch with local MEPs and to decentralise the EU.

EYE in your city - an event, not just for young people, organised in each city to involve the local people and make them feel a part of the EU. The EU would be brought to places beyond Brussels and Strasbourg.

European Youth Events in all EU-Member States (**Mini-EYEs**). Events on the model of EYE in Strasbourg in all EU-Member States organized by EP (and representations of EP in Member States)

Young people should have a say - increase involvement of young people in development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of youth employment policies. Establish partnership opportunities in which representatives of youth organisations and trade unions would have a greater say in decision-making processes.

Reach out to the rural youth, where MEPs are interacting, inspiring young people in villages, cities. It can also be online (Q&A sessions etc).

Open access to decision-making for all young Europeans.

Make structural dialogue binding: raise awareness among the EU politicians and motivate them to take young people more seriously, build incentives where young people and politicians can interact.

To reach a broader audience, we need MEPs and their teams to **adapt their communication to their younger target**, in order to better reach young Europeans who are not yet interested in the European Union. To do so, all MEPs – and not just the younger ones – should **communicate in more youth-friendly and fun ways**, and on (even) more informal Social Media (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram of course, but why not Snapchat etc). To support MEPs and their teams, the European Parliament could organize specific trainings for them, involving expert Communication Advisors ... and young people too to check the results!

For **NGOs and young non-profit organisations**, it is almost impossible to get **funding for environmental projects from the EU**. The requirements are too complicated and take way too much time – most of the funding you can only get when you have at least 2 partners from other countries or when you work with institutes, universities or companies. That must be **much easier** and even possible for 'smaller organisations' and NGO's.

Facebook live sessions on a regular basis with young people. For instance, once a month with an exact day for instance every 15 of the month, so people can interact and know the exact dates when it will happen. #Meetmyrepresentatives. Official initiative from the European Parliament for all MEPs.

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

Be more open-minded about youth culture and spend more time learning how to use memes, GIFs and emojis properly.

Engage youth with more video live-streams on Facebook, Instagram and Snapchat.

L'idée est de **créer des postes de coordonnateurs/animateurs réseaux** qui opèrent dans les établissements scolaires souhaitant s'engager sur une thématique précise (Valeurs de l'Europe, Développement Durable, Éducation....). Ces coordinateurs/animateurs de réseaux animent des temps avec des jeunes et des personnels dans les établissements scolaires d'un réseau et organisent des rencontres/assises. Exemple : un groupe d'élève veut développer un projet autour du développement durable dans un établissement. Appuyer par un professeur, ils se demandent si dans l'Union Européenne d'autres établissements travaillent sur cette thématique. Ils décident de s'adresser au coordinateur/animateur "Développement Durable" qui va les mettre en lien avec le réseau. Cet établissement scolaire pourra nouer des relations avec les autres et pourra faire des échanges, travailler ensemble. Le réseau organisera des Assises Européennes du Développement Durable (tous les 4 ans) et, comme aux Eyes, les lycéens partagent leurs projets, proposent des solutions/des idées... Ces réseaux auront pour objectif de : - Partager des informations/compétences - Favoriser les échanges sur une thématique entre établissements scolaires européens - Développer des relations de coopération - Permettre aux jeunes générations d'avoir une réflexion sur une thématique européenne - Développer un sentiment d'appartenance à l'UE - Recueillir des idées nouvelles - Favoriser l'engagement des jeunes - ... Le Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation en France possède des réseaux divers et variés à destination des jeunes de l'enseignement agricole. Ces réseaux permettent de faire remonter les envies/les propositions des jeunes au Ministère afin de co-construire des projets.

Financing a **European media that transmits a clear, simple and attractive message** to the whole Europe. Sometimes youth are not enrolled due to the complexity of the message.

Pour que les jeunes s'intéressent à l'Europe faites parler ceux qui y travaillent! Montrer les projets et les avancer. L'Europe est assimilée à l'image de fonctionnaires et de gens en réunion qui n'arrivent pas à se mettre d'accord. **Montrer l'échange entre les générations et des projets qui intéressent :** Gallileo par exemple, combien connaissent ce projet de GPS européen? Comment peut-on travailler pour l'Europe? Votre site ne donne pas envie de s'y frotter, il faut montrer une Europe qui respire et non pas une image poussiéreuse.

EYE is great but it's time to **take it further**. Many municipalities, schools and organisations have some kind of a permanent youth parliament or board, with the explicit purpose of representing the youth in decision-making body. The actual powers of these youth representatives range from the right to speak as a representative of the youth, the power to present their own proposals to the right to vote. I don't suggest we create a parallel decision making body to the

European Parliament, but an **advisory body** with the rights to observe and speak at Parliament meetings and its various committees, could provide the EP with some insights from the next generation, and the youth a clear institution to refer to in all instances.

Good idea to **question** Mark Zuckerberg. Why isn't it possible that our generation can do the same with the **president of the European Parliament?** The final event in the Hemicycle was a first step. But it should be normal that he replies to our questions, defends and informs us (the next European generation) about what he and his Parliament is doing.

The European Union by no means should encourage young people to take matters into their own hands due to the fact that they could engage in illegal means. Instead, we should **encourage them to participate in social and democratic life** and let them know that their voices are heard and important because the biggest problem is that many feel their voices are not heard or/and not important.

Decrease the voting age, give them money, more time and less expectations. Stop telling young people what is "right" or "wrong", they will find out by themselves.

The EP to set a **cooperation with influencers and bloggers** informing about news concerning (Youth-) policy of European Union.

Direct dialogue with MEPs: MEPs being questioned by school classes throughout Europe. EP selects schools, approaches schools throughout Europe and organizes direct dialogue.

All MEPs, with the support of the European Parliament providing the right methods/material and of their own team, should all chair a small **simulation of the European Parliament with young people** once a year in their home country.

Civic education

The EU needs a **better explanation** of its work and this should especially come **from informal education!** The EU should fund these projects actively.

To me, the most essential thing to do is to ensure all schools provide complete, thorough and unbiased **political education**. If more was done to make sure young people were informed and engaged from an early age, far more would vote in all elections.

There needs to be spread more awareness of the importance of the EU and politics in general in people who are not as privileged in experience, language skills and education as most of EYE participants are. **Political education** needs to be enforced in schools and communities, partially funded by the EU.

We need **MORE education** in schools, which provides a real explanation of the functioning of the EU and the role of the

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

different institutions, arguments for voting other than: you have to. Explain why; so that the answers finally come from the places of knowledge ... Show us that the EU is worthwhile.

In my country Romania, since Communism fell in 1989, the youths were 88% far from getting involved or having an opinion vis-à-vis the rulers or future leaders of the country. The elderly or the past 40+ people always voted. Well, since the last elections people have been dissatisfied with some legislative changes. Young people, but all young people, have been mobilized by certain movements to go out and fight against those who have been involved in these changes. But, I do not think it's okay what's going on. Why do they say this: Because most of them do not know why they're out in the street, or they're out because that's how the neighbour goes out. I believe that for the upcoming elections, in order to achieve a healthy and civic society in a sustainable way, we need to educate. Perhaps in other countries children are taught little about what it means to vote and many other parliamentary details, as when they grow up to know what they are facing. But often the information learned at kindergarten or primary school is just up to date with those when the child becomes adult. And that's because of the century of speed and global digitization. I propose that young people who have already obtained the right to vote should benefit free of charge from the state of which they are part of a **short but intensive learning process about: what are the political parties in their country, details about them, who are the people who want to represent them.** What concrete proposals and possibilities for implementation can take after going out of government, and so on. Like when a young man decides to vote to be prepared and involved in these processes. This eliminates the appearance that only the elderly go to vote. Well they say they are more experienced and I say I know that I have lived, etc.

The **European Union should focus more on education.** To make young people participate in political events or projects organised by the EU, the youth first needs to understand why we have a Union, why we started to cooperate with our neighbours. This could be done by **adapting national course curricula.** Then, the youth can be further educated on more specific political topics such as voluntary work (European Solidarity Corps) and initiatives that could make the young people participate socially and democratically. Let them know how they can contribute to European integration and let their voice be heard.

Implementing EU politics class at schools (the role of European Parliament, European Commission etc.) so that everyone understands the role of European Union.

Organise **education classes in politics** in schools.

Program coordinated by young leaders that will, briefly speaking, focus on both **educating** those who lack knowledge about EU and hence either don't vote at all or pick random surnames from the list, and promoting European-level civic society (especially involvement in upcoming elections) in mass media.

My key proposal is that we should **ensure high-quality**

civic education being taught in schools/colleges and non-formal places across the EU. Organisations, institutions and establishments that serve and work with young people (i.e. first-time voters) who want to receive resources and financial support from the EU, should have to commit to ensuring that they will engage and encourage these people into civic participation. Beneficiaries of EU resources should have to show how they are going to uphold this commitment.

One of the possible solutions to the "turn-out gap" is: **Accession of Civic Education in Schools:** from an early age, children must acquire a basic understanding of the significance of politics and voting. Since kids are the future of Europe, their minds must be properly cultivated, so that they can develop critical thinking and opinionated personalities.

Implementing **EU politics class at schools** (the role of European Parliament, European Commission etc.) so that everyone understands the role of European Union.

Introducing **mandatory and comprehensive classes on EU subjects** at school (since the very early phase). Educating young people and creating a common European sense.

European-civic education. Close that gap by giving good education, well-educated teachers should teach kids from 12 to 18 about Europe, rules, politics and last but not least, importance of a strong Union.

Start from a young age: **European education** from kindergarten and primary school; English as foreign language; More exchanges.

To encourage Member States to put a **stronger focus on the EU in their national curricula:** bottom-Up approach - Initiative should start from Member States and then go up to the European Institutions. Top-down approach - the EU to promote initiatives and then further go down to Member States.

EU in the school curricula: Incentives for Member States to implement EU in the School curricula; adopt Directives which request MS to teach EU in kindergartens; mandatory seminars for ERASMUS+ students to inform about programs on EU level.

Interactive online video courses on EU citizenship targeted at middle and high school students. After watching a video, students take quizzes on the content. After a year: certificates and prizes.

There is an obvious lack of interest from the youth, even for national elections. That comes from school, citizenship is no longer something that matter, that is concrete, and students don't even realise how the system they belong to works... **We have to teach youth about how EU works, who governs us, and why.** I'm 18 and all the knowledge I have, I got it on my own, not at school. Nobody taught me how to vote, how to read and compare programs. Nobody told me how I can get represented by a deputy. Nobody told me how our democracy concretely works. But I heard Eurosceptic spread their ideas. I heard people saying that EU is a disaster. Even at school, no one approves these speech, but no one gives us another point of view neither, in favour of the EU, because of neutrality it has to

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

keep. I don't think that is democracy, or education. The place given to politics is so small if you don't choose to study it in particular. If we want to make a stronger EU we have to give a "critical apparatus" to understand it.

I propose to **increase the number of projects in schools and local communities about our common history and heritage**. Knowing where we come from makes us understand who we are, what do we have in common as Europeans and where do we want to go. In a few words: let's build a common identity!

A huge problem is that the European citizens expect too much of the European Union, with just 1% of their national income it is quite impossible to stabilize a whole country or make a full turn in better directions. It should be **made clear how much states spent in the EU and how much we (!!!) get out of it**, in my opinion, there is a big misunderstanding and I guess most of the Europeans have no idea about that! So, they are not voting or taking part in the EU-Movement because they are not enough educated about the **EU** and its backgrounds. The EU needs to **address directly and be more present in the everyday life's** of the European population!

A European exhibition! Every 2 years an exhibition in the country of the elected President (ex Tusk from Poland) about the EU. And in the other countries an exhibition about the typical culture and politics of that country. So we can bring not only Europe but also countries closer to people.

In order to promote a European feeling: European **trips**, funding more projects, European **events** and workshops, online **platform** dedicated to youth, **meet the EU-Representatives**, more **lessons** about EU, **information meeting**, students council to launch European **projects**.

One of the challenges we must face on this EYE2018 is how to make Europe stronger again. My proposal goes on this way: the **establishment of an EU-wide public holiday on 9 May, the Europe Day**. This does not immediately change the life of people, but I believe it would have a very positive impact in developing a European identity and achieving this goal. I am aware that the establishment of such a holiday is not a direct competence of the European Parliament or even the European institutions. In the last 5 years, at least 6 similar petitions have been addressed to the Committee on Petitions, which have not been accepted as valid for this reason. However, I do believe that much can be done from here. Maybe this is not about competences, but about political agreements. What would you think about the European Parliament and the Commission presenting an agreement proposal to the Member States to take the necessary measures to make Europe Day a common holiday? Sometimes symbolic details, like a flag, hymn or commemoration day are the most important things for creating a sense of belonging that, at last, will strengthen us.

Let's celebrate a united Europe massively on Europe Day as from 2020! We, the youth in Europe should organize **mass events on "Europe Day"** (9th May) in all 28 capitals, starting in 2020, to celebrate peace and freedom for 75 years, with the support of the EU and its 28 member countries. This will help to tackle

Euroscepticism and (increased) nationalism, and it will also help to give us, the youth a bigger platform to speak out. And let's make Europe Day a free public holiday! All EU member countries have their own "National Day", like Bastille Day in France, but the EU is not celebrating their successes on Europe Day, including the 75 years of peaceful coexistence in the EU in 2020, by "Unity in Diversity".

Taste of Europe: Feel Europe - people send packages of things that are important to them and other people in their country to someone else in another member state; when the recipient receives it, he opens the package and then there is a video connection (skype) with the sender and the sender explains the importance of each object. People from different member states would get to know each other better.

European Cuisine Day - cooking events in public spaces in cities once a month; with reaching out to different communities in the city with the goal to make people aware that there are other nationalities in their city. It would bring people together once a month around national food of different communities

My proposal is the **improvement of the knowledge of Classic Culture**. If people study Classical Literature, they will discover that actual problems like populism have been already analysed by our ancestors. We have to recover and renew classical values, keeping attention to not exploit their messages.

The **Parlamentarium**, which already organizes interactive simulations of the European Parliament in Strasbourg and Brussels, should further **develop its offer** and support towards youth associations, the youth and social sector etc.

The European Parliament should provide and promote a free, official **"European Parliament Simulation Kit"** for all interested organizations, in all 24 official EU languages.

The EU institutions should create an **online Database of "fun", playful learning opportunities** on the European Union, and open it for all interested schools, NGOs, universities, or young people themselves across Europe.

To make people interested into EU affairs and elections: combine practical knowledge with **interesting and funny activities** for young people, for example: conferences, camps, festivals, volunteer opportunities. Make the EU our thing! Nation vs EU: mandatory visits of MEPs to youth organisations; communicate via social media -> break out of your bubble!

To strengthen European solidarity: **EU summer camps**. Kids from all over Europe; cultural exchange; against prejudices; part of the curriculum.

In order to improve the knowledge about the Institutions of the European Union among young Europeans: **European train set up by EP**, travelling throughout Europe. Several stops in each EU Member State. Special programme set up including a) workshops about the European Union, b) simulation games; c) information about the countries it has been travelled through; d) fun activities, games e) possibility to ride along on the train to another EU country.

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

Youth ambassadors (e.g. participants of the EYE) travelling to schools in another EU Member State and talk about Europe (how the Institutions work?, why it is important to vote?, Youth policy of the European Union etc.? EP selects ambassadors, approaches schools throughout Europe and organizes exchange.

We need a **common space, a common world, institutions in which we can meet physically with one another**. This is the type of encounter that enables a stronger, more profound understanding of the reality of the Other. Events such as the EYE2018 that literally open doors of institutions as important as the European Parliament, create precisely this type of encounter and reinforce the sense of belonging young Europeans can and should have. Enabling the youth to become active citizens, counters disenchantment.

Every capital in the EU member states should have a **museum dedicated to the EU** and projects like **EYE should be extended**.

Hang out with EU. Students should connect via Skype/Google Hangout with other schools from different countries. They learn about tradition, language and more. After one year the country changes to another one.

The most pressing problems from my point of view is the following: the lack of knowledge and understanding of the EU, and of political structures in general - this problem is caused by two things: lack of interest (which is hard to affect) and lack of education and easily available knowledge. I think EU has recently been doing a good job at spreading knowledge about its structures with videos etc. But EU should try to **make such informative videos even more interesting**, maybe even fund **cartoons for smaller children** to teach about the EU. Then spread knowledge **on as many platforms as possible**. From Facebook to twitter to tumblr to reddit to myspace to google, etc. Ease of access to electoral information - in National Elections in some countries it is hard to get information on the policies of candidates or their parties. In EU elections it is hard to find the Euro parliament party of candidates. There should be more platforms for debates. Not just the tv debates but also online interviews and debates. Platforms where we can easily see the national and euro party of each candidate and what are the policies of each. The backgrounds of each candidate should also be available. Elections are essentially an elaborate job interviews so we could be able to review who are our best candidates...

Euromedia: One European source of facts, not news. Only gives information that is confirmed without any interpretations or opinions. The truth may be boring, but it is the truth.

Create an online platform containing information about the EU with an interactive live stream of the debates and speeches of the parliament + access to summary and information about political news.

Lack of knowledge and interest in European issues by citizens - creating an **European TV channel** available in all the member states; raising awareness on common issues relevant for many countries.

We should **set up a European TV Channel and media platforms**. Launching a European TV channel, transmitting news and cultural content relevant to the countries within the European Union. The focus would be on content relevant to the relations between countries instead of individual nations. In this way, a comprehensible media source would provide EU citizens with European news and cultural content. Moreover, the channel would provide comprehensible explanations and outlines on EU policies such as the GDPR, the newly implemented roaming laws etc. This would include the already implemented laws and policies to increase citizens' understanding of EU laws, but more importantly, updates about new policy making and discussions within EU policy makers. Spreading to other media, The Channel would be supported by a website, with news and information, updated 24/7. Furthermore, updates and news report will be shared through social media such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and Snapchat, to increase Youth involvement. Why create a European TV channel? To create a cross-cultural and European awareness of matters concerning EU relations and EU collaboration. To increase the average citizens' understanding of international events and their importance for societies, both nationally and crossing borders. To increase EU citizens' understanding of EU policy making, to increase participation in the European debate, to enhance growth of the European cultural feeling – creating unity and strength across borders, realising the importance of cultural diversity. Outline of specific content areas for the TV channel & website– to be further developed: 1. International News – to create global awareness 2. EU relation news – to create European Awareness 3. Relevant National news – to create awareness about important national news across EU countries.

Rights and anti-discrimination

We should be defending other people when their rights are trampled and we should mention it to the authorities. If we see someone being harassed nor bullied on the street, in public transport, at work, or even at school, we should support them and help people whose voice is rarely heard to share their point of view.

Another important factor is the **contribution of leaders** to the uphold of human rights. We must urge our government, lawmakers and community leaders to **make public commitments regarding human rights**, sign related reports, pass laws in favour and protection human rights, and ban those that are against them.

Integrate intercultural social classes in education. Not to learn about your own culture but to see the other perspectives of other countries, cultures, believes... To break with typical stereotypes and categorizing in our way of thinking.

Lack of **knowledge about Islam and Muslims**. There should be education about Islam, people should be able to ask Muslims what Islam is all about. Increasing knowledge about Islam and Muslims.

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

I propose to **raise awareness in young generations on gender issues**, men's privileges, women's empowerment and sexual harassment.

I propose having a **representation of all genders in the decision-making processes** of the EU.

The **minorities** in the European Union should have **representation** because they contribute, live and suffer the policies that are being implemented by the Parliament. So, they should have a say in things that concern them because they are also Europeans.

When a terroristic attack happens where I live (Belgium) our security level goes to 4 and then there are police and army everywhere. My proposal is to **create a platform where you can make activities with all races** so people can come together and share their cultures.

Social networks must present **mandatory "Code of Conduct"** on online abuse against women, online bullying, discrimination and hate speech to new members before they can create a new account. The "Code of Conduct" can be presented in the form of text or video next to the Terms & Conditions, and Privacy Policy. Explicit user approval to the Social networks' "Code of Conduct" must be required for the user to submit the new account.

Social network platforms must raise awareness on the feed timeline of registered members by **sharing communications** on online abuse against women, online bullying, discrimination and hate speech. **Call on social networks** to take action against online abuse against women, online bullying, discrimination and hate speech perpetuated by members of their communities.

Call on the **European parliament to impose measures on social networks to counter online abuse against women, online bullying, discrimination and hate speech.**

Acknowledgement from all member states that online abuse against women and girls is a growing problem that needs to be addressed. **Support services for anyone facing online abuse.**

Companies will be responsible for the info they store. If a comment gets a certain amount of reports it would not get shown and the company would need to give a response in 24h.

What says Free Speech better than debate? **The EU should create a platform for even the harshest of debates**, so we can find our common ground, and nobody will be left out and ignored.

Freedom of speech-button (FOS): 1) Statuses and comments on social media are screened on hate speech ; 2) If hate is in the message it will not be published ; 3) next to the likes you can press FOS to report content missed before.µ

Digital Rights Framework: governance for Social Media and online community. Including consequences for the breaking

of the social contract. For instance, time lapsed tweets for first offenders to discourage instant gratification of hate.

Digital Reinsertion: anyone reported and found guilty, through an evaluation mechanism, of hate speech would have access to the internet only for contents that deconstruct their action and would do an exam about it.

Affirmation of the Rule of Law in the regulation and policing of online contents: in order to ensure the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms the regulators should require those in **control of online censorship** to provide a right to appeal their decisions.

Online court for prompt resolution of online disputes. An online body with expertise in the field of Social Media as well as in the protection of the freedom of speech would be the best way of dealing with disputes due to online content.

Creation of a general „Internet-Law / Ethics“.

Online Passport: existing passport to be upgraded to be used as a verification of identity to prevent fake profiles and track hate speech.

European Server System: European digital infrastructure with free access to the internet everywhere, EU data protection standards and the right to be forgotten, fundamental rights Charter.

Simple unified system to report all hate speech on all websites.

Internet as a common good: everyone should have access to Internet and everyone should equally finance Internet. It should not be provided by private companies, making profits.

Similar to the **Declaration of Human Rights** the Declaration of Online Rights can become a guideline for a safer and more peaceful internet throughout the world. The encourages the development of such a declaration.

European Charter on Fundamental Rights Online creating an EU moderator setting basic regulation regarding hate speech for Member States: setting European Standard on free speech, taking into account national differences; finding online harassers to allow prosecution.

Introduce an **annex** to the **Universal Human Rights Declaration** to refresh it with **digital sphere** context.

All websites to have a **unified code of ethics.**

More should be done to make **hate-speech a punishable crime.** It is no longer enough just to set a society standard. It must become a punishable crime.

Citizen Council of the European Regulation of the Internet: composed of non-elected European citizens, who are representative of the European population, bringing in different points of view on freedom of speech from different European countries.

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

European searching engine: free access for everybody (but no obligation), **controlled and protected by European authorities**, independent from America.

Most important internet companies should be owned by the government and focus on happiness of people, not profit.

There are things we can do in our daily life to urge, **recognize and encourage the compliance of human rights**. Those things are connected to workplace, on the sports field, at school, in street and everywhere. Firstly, we should be informed and inform others also, about why human rights matter. For instance, we could read and share the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or promote stories on social media concerning people that we know and have stood up for their rights. In online and daily conversations, we should challenge harmful stereotypes, fight against prejudice and defend tolerance, also talk to children about human rights and point out positive and various role models.

I will express in my language, one language that our MEP can't use in our European Parliament. La Unió Europea s'està enfonsant com a sistema. Tenim el problema dels refugiats, el Brexit, el canvi climàtic, els bancs i, d'entre d'altres, la violència policial que la població de Catalunya va patir el passat 1 d'octubre com a resposta de la determinació de la gent a votar en el Referèndum convocat pel govern de Catalunya. Tenim una UE que no respecta les llengües minoritàries de les regions que la conformen. Com voleu que un català es senti representat si els eurodiputats no es poden expressar en català? La UE necessita respectar als ciutadans que la conformen només així el projecte europeu es podrà salvar. Solució? **Apliqueu els Drets Humans** que dieu defensar, estigueu al costat dels més febles i no dels mercats, serviu als vostres conciutadans, només així els ciutadans tornarem a creure en aquest projecte.

I believe Europeans can stand for Human Rights only through education. We need to be honest about the fact that "information campaigns" are rarely effective. The most important and sustainable way to **promote human rights is through formal and non-formal education**. I am personally committed to human rights education through non-formal learning - that is, in my opinion, largely more impacting than formal education.

The EU has the task to **establish the conditions how we want to meet in open society** and not to separate the genders with the expression of the burqa.

We could establish a **European Conference on Islam for general integration** like in Germany. It would negotiate about Integration and about the question how we want to live together in Europe. But it's very important not only to include the conservative Muslims (like in Germany).

Establishment of a European conference of Islam with young people from all over Europe talking about issues of religion and discrimination (and not integration, because most European Muslims are far beyond that and they are part of Europe and not strangers).

The **EU law** should integrate a section about the situation and state that the **burqa and the burkini should be banned**.

The EP should **distinguish between freedom of choice and religious imposition** and ban burka and burkini.

The EP should **set a definition for what religious freedom allows** and ban both burka and burkini.

Muslim women must have a say in their freedom to wear what they choose.

Banning the **burqa** would be like banning the cross. The burqa is a religious piece of clothing, and **banning it would not be fair**. We need to be welcoming of all religions and therefore we cannot ban the **burkini** neither.

The European Union considers cultural and religious difference as a positive element, if not as the central characteristic of a European identity. Rules that stigmatise or exclude religious minorities are contrasting the motto of "united in diversity"; the EU should rather aim to **reduce discrimination** to get in line with its motto. This is even more the case, as veiling bans in individual member states will have effects on affected Muslim women being EU citizens to actively make use their freedom of movement and settlement across member states. The European Parliament should therefore decide to **condemn veiling bans**, call on Member states to stop these bans to reduce discrimination and re-evaluate the necessity and proportionality of the ban cases so far, and instruct the European Commission to examine the effects of veiling bans on the right of free movement of EU citizens.

Ban the burqa and burkini is not secular therefore should not be implemented as a law. Banning the burqa and burkini (which are said to be traditional religious garments) is like banning the cross or another religious garment or jewellery. It is not secular nor is it right. **We must be a continent that stays secular, open, united and welcoming for all cultures**.

The Burqa is in my opinion a symbol of oppression and a symbol of the Salafist Islam. Do not forget that before the Islamic revolution in Iran nobody wore Burqas and not even Hijabs while it still was a Islamic country. On the other hand, the liberal inside of me says that people should be able to wear what they want. **Banning the burkini is idiotic in my opinion**. Some European women wear bathing suits/wet suits while swimming and it's almost the same.

In my opinion, the **common project of all Europeans is freedom**, which means choosing your own religion but also choosing your own clothes, and Muslim women do not have a choice when being raised in Islam. Stop imposition. Respect choice above all.

Banning burqa and burkini might lead to discrimination. If women feel more secure and free wearing it, then let them do it. We need to respect everyone and not forbid people to wear what they want.

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

As long as we are discussing the clothes of women, not of all gender, it is the wrong question and something wrong in society and Europe.

It's not about a dress code, it's about freedom. Globalisation and Social Medias have always taken the images of different girls in the eastern countries. Oriental women, especially in the globalised era, are seeing how different are life conditions for them: then, a simple protest against burkini is sometimes the synonymous of an objection against the misogynous rules they have to follow in their daily lives. So, if **people** are really open-minded as they prattle on socials, they **must let girls choose on their own**. Their bodies, their rules: it's up to them to decide about their own dress code.

If they choose to wear a **burqa**, they should be **allowed** to do so. If they want to wear a burkini then they can wear it. If they are forced to wear it, then it is not OK. This is not a religious freedom issue; it is an issue of personal freedoms. **No state should be able to tell me what to wear on my free time**. But! If you work for the state or a company and they do not allow it at customer service related jobs, then you should follow the dress codes at work.

You do not give more freedom to people by banning something. What is wrong in not showing your body? Should we also ban scarves and hoods/hats because people can cover their mouth and nose, keeping only the eyes visible? If this is a major security issue you ban every single piece of clothing than can cover the face, otherwise you leave people alone with how they choose to dress, even when they go swimming.

It's up to the people themselves to decide what they want to wear. The state should not interfere. It is totally illogical to allow and even pressure women to put bikini and have the bikini body and want to ban the burkini. Although, it should be something that should be debated in schools and public spaces for all women to choose consciously for themselves what to wear.

This debate is a waste of time, as the question should not even be asked. Europe is based on freedom of conscience and expression. Banning whatever the burqa or any other covering thing is totally against human rights. This debate has no place as the roots of this issue is just based on intolerance. So, the solution is to **raise awareness to people against the hatred and misconception about Muslim women and fight intolerance**. They create a Muslim problem and legislate around it, thus violating fundamental rights.

We should start openly criticizing religions. We should apply reason and the scientific method to analyse and then (if done properly and honestly) reject religious myths. We should be able to openly criticize religions in the same way as we can criticize astrology, homeopathy, political arguments, or any other claims. Religions cannot be granted a special status, especially because they encourage billions of people to break human rights.

Intolerance comes from a lack of assimilation. Once you meet people listen to their experiences and the values behind their

beliefs you see them as human. Every Muslim woman I've met who wears a hijab or a burqa does so, yes for religious reasons but also to reflect their feminist values. But indeed before I met these women, before I left my little world I couldn't know this to be true. Our governments highlight the extremes of Islam but rarely the extremes of nationalism and conservatism. **By banning the burqa you are banning religious expression**; which would then be needed to parallel across all religious expression. All major religions have some concept of modesty, Christianity, Judaism are no different. The concept of modesty is indeed questionable, unconsciously pushing the aims of the patriarchy creating a sense of 'us and them'. The reason it is a highlighted constantly across the Muslim faith is the fear of 'the other' a fear peddled by neo-liberal European governments who don't see their lack of diversity, their foreign interventionism and economic prioritization as a possible root cause for extremism and hatred when individuals are so often left behind who don't fit the bill of white, straight and male. We live in a world where identity politics is labelled as pettiness rather than us trying to see the importance of recognizing the individual and how we are different through an intersectional approach.

There is no need for the state to get involved in telling its citizens how to dress. We may draw some limits to this, though, including requiring people by law not to go fully naked in public. As we can see in Austria, an attempt to regulate face-coverings can very easily back-fire and overwhelm police with lots of work, where they have to decide on a case-by-case basis whether a scarf wrapped around the face in cold whether is crossing the line or not. This shows what a practical disaster this unnecessary over-regulation brings. It would be fully sufficient - and indeed much more sensible - **to require people to not wear any face-covering clothes in particular circumstances** (airports, public offices, during police controls, etc.). To suppress any religious clothing because of its religious or cultural association is to destroy the neutrality of the secular state - but we need the secular state! If the state starts taking sides in interreligious and intercultural disagreements on taste and fashion, it undermines its own authority.

I understand the concerns many people have regarding the wearing of burqa, especially in public spaces. A balance must be struck between civic values and liberty, and cultural or religious diversity and identity - because sometimes they conflict. If such striking such balance in the case of the burqa means prohibiting its wear in public, I think that it is fine, even though some people will feel their interests threatened by it. In such case, though, we must make sure that women do not stop going out because the burqa is prohibited. That would mean an unacceptable price to pay for banning the burqa. As for the burkini, I don't think there is a problem with it. It does not hide a woman's face, and it is meant to allow women who hold certain religious beliefs to be able to enjoy the beach or the swimming pool. There isn't really a security issue related to it, so while there is some solid ground for the prohibition of the burqa, I find that it would be arbitrary (something quite like harassment) to do the same with the burkini. Of course, this is just the way I see things and I am open to see different opinions.

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

Attempts to ban burkini on the beaches are disgrace to humankind. Some places may require dress code, but it should be functional. Like "You can't cover face on stadiums, administration offices, and need to show face to police officers if asked. Or "No niyah in schools" however people could wear face covers as cold protection, breathing masks, health problems, or fashion choice if security does not require unmask. On the beaches or other recreational areas you may wear monks frock, Darth Vader costume, burkini, victoria secret linen creation, water sports outfit and medieval armour and who cares? Some employment position may require unmask, like police officers need to make contact, face is part of communication tool. But you may wear burka in 911 hotline. Generally if you want to be a seductive western culture you should **integrate incomers, by work, by social activity, by way of life and entertainment.** Muslim girls on the beaches is how you assimilate human mass. Muslim women may be easier to convince, since Europe may offer more personal freedom than Middle East monarchies.

Religion should not be treated in special way for good and bad. Similar acts should be by law treated in similar way. You can't be cruel to animal from selfish reason, you can't be cruel to animal from religion reason. You can't hurt child as act of madness, and can't hurt child from tradition reason. Even cutting foreskin is barbaric. When boys become men they could cut off whatever they want. **This should be left for country national ideas,** since Euro ban or enforcement would create backlash. Sometimes EP need to let citizens make mistakes, making everyone happy with the club is hard.

It is just about being reasonable. If we do live in a society which have every time on tv codified women wearing almost nothing and we see that as normal, we should not point out the clothing which comes from other parts of the world that are not the occidental ones. **We need to be tolerant, to understand that we are not the rescuers of every people** who are coming from a different world, which is not bounded by European limits. And of course, have a look to our habits, which are not fighting essentially for women liberation in many senses.

Freedom of speech is the freedom to speak whatever. If anything, **the definition should be reformed** to allow hate speech so we can at least see every argument and the people on either side.

There were some terroristic attacks in last few years on the EU territory. Some people became scared and fought against European integrity. Some of them are using really hard words on social medias such as Facebook or YouTube that are calling to use force against people from outside Europe, because of their skin colour or religion. Migration problem cannot make European citizens feel better humans. So, on every **social media there should be a control, made by some moderators** or even the police to **reduce hate level** there. The punishment could be (for example) cutting the Internet connection for some time.

There should most definitely be a **hate-speech ban to protect vulnerable people.** Many people who have endured hate-

speech are afraid to go outside; they feel unwelcome and think their voices are falling in deaf ears. By allowing hate-speech to go on, we are marginalising the minorities and making it easier for terror groups to infiltrate them. Ban hate-speech and hate behaviour will help reduce the risk of the minority groups feeling isolated, bullied and unheard; will give a strong message of intolerance of hate-speech and behaviour; will make our stance against radicalisation stronger and our ability to integrate the community easier. There is a fine line between free speech and hate-speech. Let us make that line clear, ban hate-speech, and truly make our democracy an equal one.

Not all kind of speech should be allowed - on a quite contradicting way - to protect the liberal democracy. This is a dilemma, by protecting the liberal democracy we love; we end up eroding it in the process. Personally, **I would allow hate speech but illegalize speech that incites violence and direct verbal assaults,** because as much as we have free speech we also have the right not to be harassed.

There should be efforts to **define hate speech more accurately.** We should look at whether something is offensive or not. When looking at free and hate speech, we need to take everything into account, like if it is purposeful, does it truly hurt anyone... We have examples outside of the EU of how not defining it closely enough will cause problems, and as for this, this is not a subject at which we could just say that we should do something or not, it requires a case by case approach. Which requires new laws to make it all possible, but also a far more detailed approach than banning or not banning.

We need to **criminalize hate speech!!** People have the right to feel secure and hate speech, which may include swearing, obscenities, threats, slanders, blackmailing and discrimination, is infringing on our right to free expression and, in the long-term, on our right to freedom! Verbal "assaulting" is just as damaging and evil as physical assaulting, and can be used to silence us and marginalize us with the goal of limiting our liberties! Some might dismiss the criminalization of hate speech as an infringement on the right to free speech. But all rights come with its limitations; you are not supposed to use your rights to infringe another person's rights.

Hate speech: there should be a **ban in virtual and real space.** As for the other content - Fake news: legal but support fact check. Spam bots: delete the posts. Conspiracy theories: e.g campaign to fight anti vaccine movement, or other, should be more rational and stick to material world and reality. We should not let ideology rule us. Allow scientific discussion as long as data is here.

Who will we let define hate speech? In this day and age there is a lot of hate speech, but there is also a lot of people practising their 'right to be offended'. We should **stop demonising people who use hate speech.** We are not better if we label them as villains and we are certainly not helping anyone by shaming them. Do you even know why people start using hate speech, what the psychology behind it is? It would help to have more focus groups with (cyber)bullies, hate speech proponents, to better understand their drives and motives. Because, how do you battle a thing you don't truly(!) understand?

EU DEMOCRACY AND PARTICIPATION

Fake news are everyone's problem. It's not just about the journalists who don't verify information. It's about us who don't like paying for our news any more. Less money, less staff, less time. It about our lack of critical thinking and media literacy. Do you click on big, fat, scandalous headlines (click-baits)? Why? Do you share an article about how drinking water cures breast cancer, or do you verify it beforehand? Do you even have the will to do so? And how do we outlaw bots? Not completely, but let's say the ones Devumi uses to 'accelerate your social media growth'? There's a lot of revenue money in it, in the influencers. Twitter isn't doing much to battle them, can EU enforce their law on a corporation from USA? The best solution I see is in education. Perhaps we need to implement media and scientific literacy into schools. For sure, we **need to implement a lot more critical thinking, starting with primary schools.** To teach our young to keep a critical eye on what they see and read. To understand how Facebook algorithm works (and changes) and be less susceptible to the likes of Cambridge Analytica. To understand the importance of escaping your 'filter bubble' and noticing where our confirmation bias starts. To show alternatives to mindlessly scrolling news feed.

The **internet** is a public room. There should be the **same laws as in reality.** Just because there is a laptop between the hate speeches and the consumer doesn't make insults better or legal. Everyone has an identity, even on the internet; it's not and never was, anonymous. Otherwise the internet will turn out to be a legalized place to do illegal things. And, that's not the future I'm a dreaming of. Give everyone one identity and let the people grow up, so that they take over responsibility for their actions and thoughts.

The freedom of expression should not be banned, if the EU does this, it will lose its face in front of all pro-European citizens! Besides, it is against the human rights! The EU **needs more effective rules against fake news and bots,** because information like this is working against the ideas and the EU itself, most of all people who are desperate are following EU-sceptics because of their "Fake News" about EU, hiding information. Insults should not be controlled or banned, as long as people are not harmed.