

Successes & challenges: First year of implementation of Programme

Management of programme

- Deadlines postponed - created MORE work!
- Information about the Programme was:
 - missing
 - late / delayed
 - Not available
 - confusing
- EU vs National legislation - tension
- Programme guide - text needed to be changed in the body of the paragraphs, not in the notes
 - too many addendums
 - too hard to communicate to applicants
 - We are losing applicants because of this!
- Support
 - support for orgs
 - focus on flexibility
 - focus on national level support
 - Commission was (very) busy managing the pandemic
 - Often we have the feeling that the EC is not listening to us. It's frustrating and disappointing.
 - Communication through MS Teams often too informal - miss some important announcements
 - COM didn't seem to be well prepared for the programmes' launch in 2021
- There was a false start to the programmes because of a lack of strategy between NAs
- Accreditations - Lack of knowledge how to manage them
 - Now really need feedback (instructions from EC) how to support accredited organisations with implementation and reporting
- Budget is getting better - But many rules mean NA cannot enjoy the increase
- Operational capacity
 - check for small NGOs that have many applications
 - good practice to be learned from other NAs (check Programme Guide, Part C)
 - Organisations that have many partnerships - what is the quality and capacity?

Programme Priorities

- +++ focus on inclusion - reaching ypwfo
- New topics came
 - Digital
 - Green/Sustainability
- Inclusion & GDPR
 - How to combine 'proof/justification of individual needs' with GDPR rules? We cant ask for medical certificates or police records!
- European Year of Youth - comes when there is a lack of resource of staff

Successes

- more communication - connected more online
- sharing information
- trying to help each other with knowledge
- supportive network - regular supportive meetings - eg. ICSOM - Thanks SALTO!
- We are still around! - There are still beneficiaries!
- Contracts went out on time! - Digital e-signatures!
- Our competence - Became more flexible - adaptable - ready to cope with uncertainty and challenges
- German NA offered regular digital-consultation hours for beneficiaries. Worked very well.
- Transformed complaining into motivation and personal growth
- Online events allow more accessibility, use resources effectively and be more green!
- Young people were still mobilised under EuSC!

Final design of programme

- There was an expectation that Jobs & Traineeships would be inside new programme, and then it wasn't
 - pity it moved to another sector - that knowledge is lost now
- Reduced EuSC budget was an unexpected shock
 - Quality Label strategy vs lack of funds (ESC) was a challenge
- New project formats very much appreciated
 - especially at national/focal level
- Multiple submissions much easier to detect
- Accreditation is very welcome!
 - created space for authentic organisations
- GOT platform is good!
- Complicated rules - complicated budget (KA154)
- Project formats
 - Participation projects - still confused how this works
 - need for a toolkit to explain the different project formats
- No quality label visits - bad decision
- Lump sum funding - does it reflect the national reality?
- Pro-organisation approach
- Discover EU: welcome aboard!
- Timing of rounds
 - First round keep to beginning of Feb
 - Second round is too late for activities in summer
- Rules are too general
 - We need more rules against cheating. We don't have enough to go on right now.
 - How to apply daily rates?

SNACs

- NAs are working together more strategically now
 - challenging at times, but positive!
 - because activities were cancelled, there was time for strategic thinking
 - Where to go in the next years?
- Need an overview
 - Of each SNAC
 - Of all the SNACs together
- Need to know what's required for the individual SNACs
 - What should happen nationally?
 - What should happen internationally?

Infrastructure of NA

- New facilities
- computers - New equipment
- increasing the teams
- permanent long term contracts
- Hard to start a new job during pandemic
- Hard to train newcomers during pandemic

Emotions & feelings

- stressful
- insecure
- unsure
- frustration
- disappointment

COVID

- closed borders
- difficulty in travelling
- Events were cancelled, some very last minute
- Interest in mobility decreased a lot
- Programme became less attractive
- Organisations are busy rebuilding their work after lockdowns
- Organisations lost young people, lost funding, money redirected away from international youth projects
- What didn't go well before the pandemic went even worse during

Communication

- demands lots of patience - Has to be continuous
- explain again and again, especially to young people
- hard to do via zoom all the time - Promotion
- Have to be creative and new different/new approaches

IT Tools

- Unfinished
- lots of bugs - crashing
- complex to navigate
- No way to download the form
- Difficult to use - Simplification is only for COM not for the users
- affects beneficiaries
- affects NA staff/work too
- Not inclusive format of e-forms
- Different forms on different websites were frustrating
- Inconsistent
- GDPR is an obstacle
- no way to address it - Copy/paste phenomenon
- no concrete space for actual details - online tools and activities
- For Solidarity Corps it was adapted a bit. Other forms need it too.
- Language of forms is not easily understandable

Projects

- number of applications decreased, budget increased
- Budget position
 - Depends on the country and which activity - some budgets increased, some decreased
- Quality went down
- It was weird during Covid times, because hardly any activities were happening
- Delayed
 - orgs not applying properly because of misunderstandings with the info
 - delayed old projects happening now, fewer new applications
 - Fewer projects now
- hybrid
- Some projects happened
- online

Successes & challenges: First year of implementation of Programme

1. Management of programme

1.1. Deadlines postponed

1.1.1. created MORE work!

1.2. Information about the Programme was:

1.2.1. missing

1.2.2. late / delayed

1.2.3. Not available

1.2.4. confusing

1.3. EU vs National legislation

1.3.1. tension

1.4. Programme guide

1.4.1. text needed to be changed in the body of the paragraphs, not in the notes

1.4.1.1. too many addendums

1.4.1.2. too hard to communicate to applicants

1.4.1.3. We are losing applicants because of this!

1.5. Support

1.5.1. support for orgs

1.5.1.1. focus on flexibility

1.5.1.2. focus on national level support

1.5.2. Commission was (very) busy managing the pandemic

1.5.2.1. Often we have the feeling that the EC is not listening to us. It's frustrating and disappointing.

1.5.3. Communication through MS Teams often too informal - miss some important announcements

1.5.4. COM didn't seem to be well prepared for the programmes' launch in 2021

1.6. There was a false start to the programmes because of a lack of strategy between NAs

1.7. Accreditations

1.7.1. Lack of knowledge how to manage them

1.7.1.1. Now really need feedback (instructions from EC) how to support accredited organisations with implementation and reporting

1.8. Budget is getting better

1.8.1. But many rules mean NA cannot enjoy the increase

1.9. Operational capacity

1.9.1. check for small NGOs that have many applications

1.9.1.1. good practice to be learned from other NAs (check Programme Guide, Part C)

1.9.2. Organisations that have many partnerships - what is the quality and capacity?

2. Programme Priorities

2.1. +++ focus on inclusion

2.1.1. reaching ypwfo

2.2. New topics came

2.2.1. Digital

2.2.2. Green/Sustainability

2.3. Inclusion & GDPR

2.3.1. How to combine 'proof/justification of individual needs' with GDPR rules? We cant ask for medical certificates or police records!

2.4. European Year of Youth

2.4.1. comes when there is a lack of resource of staff

3. Successes

3.1. between colleagues

3.1.1. more communication

3.1.1.1. connected more online

3.1.2. sharing information

3.1.3. trying to help each other with knowledge

3.1.4. supportive network

3.1.4.1. regular supportive meetings

3.1.4.1.1. eg. ICSOM

3.1.4.1.1.1. Thanks SALTO!

3.2. We are still around!

3.2.1. There are still beneficiaries!

3.3. we did well

3.3.1. Contracts went out on time!

3.3.1.1. Digital e-signatures!

3.3.2. Our competence

3.3.2.1. Became more flexible

3.3.2.1.1. adaptable

3.3.2.1.1.1. ready to cope with uncertainty and challenges

3.3.3. German NA offered regular digital-consultation hours for beneficiaries. Worked very well.

3.3.4. Transformed complaining into motivation and personal growth

3.3.5. Online events allow more accessibility, use resources effectively and be more green!

3.3.6. Young people were still mobilised under EuSC!

4. Final design of programme

4.1. There was an expectation that Jobs & Traineeships would be inside new programme, and then it wasn't

4.1.1. pity it moved to another sector

4.1.1.1. that knowledge is lost now :(

4.2. Reduced EuSC budget was an unexpected shock

4.2.1. Quality Label strategy vs lack of funds (ESC) was a challenge

4.3. New project formats very much appreciated

4.3.1. especially at national/local level

4.4. Multiple submissions much easier to detect

4.5. Accreditation is very welcome!

4.5.1. created space for authentic organisations

4.6. GOT platform is good!

4.7. Complicated rules

4.7.1. complicated budget (KA154)

4.8. Project formats

4.8.1. Participation projects

4.8.1.1. stil confused how this works

4.8.2. need for a toolkit to explain the different project formats

4.9. No quality label visits

4.9.1. bad decision

4.10. Lump sum funding

4.10.1. does it reflect the national reality?

4.10.2. Pro-organisation approach

4.11. Discover EU: welcome aboard!

4.12. Timing of rounds

4.12.1. First round keep to beginning of Feb

4.12.2. Second round is too late for activities in summer

4.13. Rules are too general

4.13.1. We need more rules against cheating. We don't have enough to go on right now.

4.13.2. How to apply daily rates?

5. SNACs

5.1. NAs are working together more strategically now

5.1.1. challenging at times, but positive!

5.1.2. because activities were cancelled, there was time for strategic thinking

5.1.2.1. Where to go in the next years?

5.2. Need an overview

5.2.1. Of each SNAC

5.2.2. Of all the SNACs together

5.3. Need to know what's required for the individual SNACs

5.3.1. What should happen nationally?

5.3.2. What should happen internationally?

6. Projects

6.1. Budget position

6.1.1. number of applications decreased, budget increased

6.1.2. Depends on the country and which activity - some budgets increased, some decreased

6.2. Quality went down

6.3. It was weird during Covid times, because hardly any activities were happening

6.4. Delayed

6.5. orgs not applying properly because of misunderstandings with the info

6.6. Fewer projects now

6.6.1. delayed old projects happening now, fewer new applications

6.7. Some projects happened

6.7.1. hybrid

6.7.2. online

7. IT Tools

7.1. Unfinished

7.2. crashing

7.2.1. lots of bugs

7.3. complex to navigate

7.4. No way to download the form

7.5. Simplification is only for COM not for the users

7.5.1. Difficult to use

7.5.1.1. affects beneficiaries

7.5.1.2. affects NA staff/work too

7.6. Not inclusive format of e-forms

7.7. Inconsistent

7.7.1. Different forms on different websites were frustrating

7.8. GDPR is an obstacle

7.9. Copy/paste phenomenon

7.9.1. no way to address it

7.10. online tools and activities

7.10.1. no concrete space for actual details

7.11. Language of forms is not easily understandable

7.11.1. For Solidarity Corps it was adapted a bit. Other forms need it too.

8. Communication

8.1. Has to be continuous

8.1.1. demands lots of patience

8.1.1.1. explain again and again, especially to young people

8.2. Promotion

8.2.1. hard to do via zoom all the time

8.3. Have to be creative and new different/new approaches

9. COVID

9.1. closed borders

9.2. difficulty in travelling

9.3. Events were cancelled, some very last minute

9.4. Interest in mobility decreased a lot

9.4.1. Programme became less attractive

9.5. Organisations lost young people, lost funding, money redirected away from international youth projects

9.5.1. Organisations are busy rebuilding their work after lockdowns

9.6. What didn't go well before the pandemic went even worse during

10. Emotions & feelings

- 10.1. stressful
- 10.2. insecure
- 10.3. unsure
- 10.4. frustration
- 10.5. disappointment

11. Infrastructure of NA

- 11.1. New facilities
- 11.2. New equipment
 - 11.2.1. computers
- 11.3. New staff
 - 11.3.1. increasing the teams
 - 11.3.2. permanent long term contracts
 - 11.3.3. Hard to start a new job during pandemic
 - 11.3.4. Hard to train newcomers during pandemic