



CIVIL DIALOGUE MEETING **BRUSSELS – 15 JUNE 2015**

Report

The meeting was chaired by Dragos TUDORACHE (DG HOME, Head of Unit A1: Interinstitutional relations and Citizenship) during the morning, and by Pavel TYCHTL (DG HOME, Unit A1) during the afternoon.

41 organisations were represented in this meeting, out of 55 invited (see list of participants in Annex 1).

1. Welcome, approval of agenda and of last meeting's minutes

The Civil Dialogue being hosted in an EESC premises on the eve of the “Civil Society Day”, Pierluigi BROMBO (EESC, SG, Head of Unit A2: Relations with organised civil society and forward studies) was invited to pronounce introductory words. He viewed this event as an example of the possible synergies between the European Commission and the EESC in the area of participatory citizenship.

Dragos TUDORACHE introduced himself and welcomed the Civil Dialogue members for this first meeting of 2015, which was also the first one officially held under the auspices of DG HOME since the “Europe for Citizens” move from DG COMM to DG HOME on 1 January 2015. He thanked Pierluigi BROMBO for making that meeting possible, and agreed on the fact that these two events organised back to back was an illustration of the fruitful cooperation between the European Commission and the EESC in this field.

While presenting the agenda, Dragos TUDORACHE also explained that, further to the request of some participants during the last session of the Civil Dialogue in Rome, this session had been conceived to be more lively and interactive, with two participatory sessions (a brainstorming in the morning, a world café in the afternoon) with fewer formal presentations from the European Commission.

The proposed agenda and the previous meeting report were approved with no specific comments.

2. Policy developments related to the Citizenship portfolio

2.1. Introduction

Dragos TUDORACHE excused the absence of Matthias RUETE, Director-General of DG HOME, who could not deliver his speech because of events on the French-Italian borders.

Dragos TUDORACHE underlined that DG HOME was an administration highly reactive to current events and that it had been much taken lately by the need to respond swiftly and concretely to terrorist attacks and migration tragedies that had marked Europe over the last months. He assured however that Commissioner Avramopoulos was considering “Citizenship” as an important part of his portfolio sitting in equal footing with “Migration” and “Home Affairs”. He informed the Civil Dialogue members that the Commissioner would

have the opportunity to discuss “Citizenship” with members of the European Parliament that afternoon, and that the Commissioner was pretty much willing to exchange and hearing different views, proposals and ideas, so as to build and propose actions on that basis.

Dragos TUDORACHE said he was aware of concerns raised by the move of the “Europe for Citizens” programme from DG COMM to DG HOME, but he relativized the impact of such organisational change. He repeated that DG HOME would be fully committed to the implementation of the Programme, which would be given a new momentum without seeking to force bridges between its priorities and DG HOME’s policies.

Dragos TUDORACHE insisted that in the present context, it was of utmost importance to reflect on how to reconnect with citizens and make them engage in the European democratic life. To this end, EU citizenship had to be reinforced in its legal dimension (hence the preparation of the 2016 EU citizenship report under the lead of Commissioner Jourova) as well as in its participatory dimension (through a new momentum for the “Europe for Citizens” programme).

Dragos TUDORACHE said that because of their fragmentation across the European Commission, actions within Citizenship portfolio necessitated a closer collaboration between DG HOME and other DGs (JUST, EAC, COMM, CNECT, SG, etc.) in line with the new working methods in clusters promoted by the Juncker Commission. In this respect, he saw in this meeting a valuable opportunity for the Commission to collect comments and ideas regarding the current state of the citizenship policy and its possible future developments. He said that he personally cherished such fora for dialogue, like the one he attended in Riga with the “Europe for Citizens” national contact points’ meeting in April 2015. He explained that these exchanges with civil society organisations would feed the discussions that would take place later within the Commission, between the Commissioners responsible for the various aspects of this policy, with a view to possibly increasing the citizenship policy coherence and giving the momentum it deserves.

Questions/Answers session

During the ensuing discussion with the Civil Dialogue group, the following comments were made:

- EUROPEAN ALTERNATIVES said that it was not disappointed by the Programme’s move to DG HOME in so far as EU citizens were more influenced and concerned than ever in the past by the situation outside the Union, notably in its close neighbourhood (Ukraine, Moldova, Libya, Syria, etc.). It considered this transfer as an opportunity to address issues like migration and security at EU borders, to reinforce links and cooperation with the European External Action Service (EEAS), and to open the structured dialogue towards the East and the South of EU.
- ECAS expressed its concern about the new emphasis put on immigration instead of internal EU migration (i.e. EU mobile citizens), and wanted to know what links would be built between the Programme and this new dimension which, in its view, did not fit well with the Programme. It also wanted a stronger reference to the notion of “free movement of EU citizens”.
- CEV wondered what place would be given to active citizenship issues in the DG HOME environment, besides the legal dimension of EU citizenship.
- EUROCLIO wondered how DG HOME, with its new Citizenship portfolio would cooperate with the Education portfolio.
- EUROPEAN HOUSE asked whether DG HOME was planning to give to this civil dialogue, which is fully appreciated but currently implemented at a sectorial level by

many DGs inside the European Commission, a legal basis as it is already the case for the social dialogue.

- CEMR regretted that the Civil Dialogue members never had the opportunity to hear the Commissioner since his nomination for the Citizenship portfolio, and underlined that it could be interpreted by CSOs as a sign of disinterest for citizenship issues. It considered that there was still room for improving the links between the Programme and DG HOME's policy priorities, through the definition of the Programme's priorities, but it pointed out that it would have been preferable to be involved and associated at an earlier stage of the conception of the Programme's multiannual priorities.
- The EUROPEAN YOUTH FORUM welcomed the idea of a more comprehensive citizenship portfolio, which would come across the DGs and imply different commissioners, considering that citizenship was a multifaceted concept. It wanted to know more about the process envisaged for the coming months to achieve this, and about the place that would be given to stakeholders for creating those synergies between DGs.
- EAVI felt that this Programme had been pushed through many changes these last years, its management having been transferred from DG EAC to DG COMM, then to DG HOME, under the responsibility of different commissioners. Considering the new institutional positioning of the Programme as a matter of fact, it deemed possible to build links with migration and security issues, but without forgetting that Civil Dialogue members were addressing many other important dimensions (social, economic, cultural, civic participation) of citizenship.
- ICLS recollected that during 11 years of membership in this civil dialogue, the Programme had been viewed as an education matter (under DG EAC), before being considered as a communication exercise (under DG COMM). It expressed satisfaction to see the Programme now entering a new stage of its development under DG HOME, given that citizenship had become - in its view - a security matter. In a context of youngsters' radicalisation, common efforts towards a comprehensive policy of preventing radicalisation were welcome: however, such a policy at EU level should have military, police, communicational and "civil society" dimensions. In this regard, the Civil Dialogue group could bring its expertise on citizenship issues, with recommendations that could be taken on board by EU policy-makers and then translated in concrete policy measures.
- Reminding its initial fears that DG HOME would give too much emphasis on the legal dimension of citizenship to the detriment of the participatory one, or would excessively focus the programme on migration and security issues, ECF noted with satisfaction the perspective of seeing Commissioners working in a clustery mode on citizenship issues. It insisted on the importance to build a common vision for citizenship, which would articulate its economic, social and democratic dimensions, as this was initiated under the European Year of Citizens Alliance (EYCA) in 2013. In this respect, despite its support to democratic engagement and civic participation, the "Europe for Citizens" programme and its Civil Dialogue could not be the only channel of citizens' participation. That's why ECF advocated for building overarching mechanisms of civil dialogue, beyond this sectorial dialogue, and for a coherent vision of citizenship policy at the EU level so that citizens' participation could have tangible outcomes in policy terms.

As a general reply to some overlapping remarks, Dragos TUDORACHE noticed with satisfaction that not all Civil Dialogue members did consider as a bad evolution the Programme's getting closer to DG HOME or dealing with migration/security matters. And indeed, it was not surprising for him to see a Programme like this, which aims at fostering engagement and participation of citizens in public debates, addressing one of the main concerns of EU citizens according to Eurobarometer surveys. In times marked by populist

parties fuelling fears and confusing intentionally concepts (e.g. immigration and free movement), he said that it was a necessity and a mere acceptance of reality to address migration and security issues, because these populist discourses had an influence on the way citizens participate in public life, and on how they perceive the EU.

Dragos TUDORACHE insisted on the importance to support democratic movements in EU neighbouring countries. He cited the example of Ukraine, where the EU response to the international crisis was quite unprecedented in terms of common sanctions against Russia. He also stressed the need to maintain a dialogue with civil societies of Eastern and Southern EU neighbouring countries.

Dragos TUDORACHE said that the terms “free movement” were deliberately absent from the Agenda on Migration so as to avoid possible confusion between this notion (which applies to EU mobile citizens) and the one of migration (which applies to third country nationals or irregular migrants) – a confusion already made however by the lay man as well as by some political leaders during electoral debates notably in the UK. Such mix could prove detrimental to EU achievements like Schengen, and feed debates at national levels on the opportunity to reinstate border controls between Member States, whereas solutions exist inside the framework of the "Schengen Acquis".

Concerning the expressed need of a cross fertilization between the Citizenship portfolio and other portfolios (like Education or Employment) as well as between the citizenship policy and other EU policies, Dragos TUDORACHE considered that the fragmentation within the Commission on citizenship issues was not insurmountable. He reiterated DG HOME's will to develop positive synergies on citizenship issues by mechanisms like this Civil Dialogue, and more broadly, to ensure coherence between EU policies in this area by a closer collaboration with other DGs (EAC, JUST, COMM, EMPL, etc.).

Dragos TUDORACHE said that it was necessary, for the smooth conduct of this meeting and its steering, to come with already drafted priorities. He ensured that proposed multiannual priorities were not a "fait accompli" but simply the starting point of the consultation process. He underlined that the Commission was quite open to hearing other ideas or comments and to taking on board proposals from the Civil Dialogue group, and that this discussion would occur in the afternoon during the world café. The proposed multiannual priorities would be amended accordingly, in line with the legal basis, and finalised by the Commission before being presented for approval to the Programme Committee in autumn 2015.

In response to one participant, Dragos TUDORACHE claimed however that this forum for dialogue was not designed nor appropriate to influence DG HOME's priorities themselves, and that other channels existed to this end. He took the example of the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN), a forum developed by DG HOME with civil society organisations directly involved in anti-radicalisation efforts.

Dragos TUDORACHE concluded this Questions/Answers session by saying that he knew that the last years' itinerancy of the Programme could be a source of concern for stakeholders, but that the European Commission was deeply committed to ensure that the course of the Programme would remain unchanged, with the same legal basis, budget, objectives, and human resources.

2.2. **State of play of the preparatory work for the 2016 EU Citizenship Report**

Marie-Hélène BOULANGER (DG JUST, Head of Unit C2: Union citizenship rights and free movement) presented the state of play of the preparatory work for the 2016 EU Citizenship report (see her presentation in Annex 2).

Questions/Answers session

Dragos TUDORACHE opened the floor to the Civil Dialogue members, so as to get their feedback on issues that would be worth mentioning in the next EU Citizenship Report.

ECAS wondered whether this report would contain a follow-up on the implementation of previous report's recommendations. It also wanted to know what would be the timeframe for issuing the 2016 EU Citizenship report and if a prior consultation of stakeholders about its content was envisaged.

CEMR considered that the 2016 EU Citizenship report should address the two following items: (a) the political rights of EU mobile citizens living abroad, who work and pay their taxes in an EU country, but are unable to vote for their national or regional elections; (b) the social rights of EU mobile citizens working abroad and contributing for their retirement, who don't know how portable their pension rights will be in another EU country.

EUROPEAN YOUTH FORUM considered that disparities of voting age between Member States were an issue for many young mobile voters in Europe, and that this question should also be addressed in the report.

Marie-Hélène BOULANGER replied that the 2016 EU Citizenship report would probably contain a follow-up on the implementation of the previous report's recommendations. She clarified that a consultation would take place prior to the issuing of the report, but that the timeframe for this had not been defined yet.

She ensured that the issue of political rights of EU mobile citizens would be tackled in the report. Regarding the specific question of pension rights portability, she referred to colleagues from DG EMPL.

Marie-Hélène BOULANGER acknowledged that differences of voting age among Member States made more difficult the exercise of EU citizens' rights, especially of the younger ones. But she insisted on the fact that legal voting age was in the remit of the Member States, and that, because of its limited competence, the European Commission could only encourage awareness of such difficulties by inciting EU countries to share best practices.

2.3. **How can the "Europe for Citizens" programme contribute to promoting Citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education?**

Dragos TUDORACHE explained the aim of this brainstorming, which was to consult Civil Dialogue members in an innovative way so as to get their ideas and recommendations on such a complex issue as how education could promote citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination in times of terrorist attacks and sensitive debates on migration. He added that these testimonies could also include educational activities or projects that were not funded under the programme itself.

John MACDONALD (DG COMM Unit D2: Human Resources) asked the participants to form working groups of 5 people. In line with the Paris Declaration of 17 March 2015, they had to tell how they succeeded in their past experience or present activities to teach and promote concretely and innovatively the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination. Each person inside the working group had 5 minutes to share his/her experience or story. After 25 minutes, participants were asked to hand a voting card to the most relevant testimony. The elected ones, who shared their experience in a plenary session, were the following.

In view of bridging the gap between autochthonous and communities of immigrants, ICLS told that it had organised four days away sessions involving young people from diverse backgrounds. Those youngsters aged between 19 and 30, that had never met before, were made live together in a safe environment called "civilized framework to disagree", where they could express themselves freely and beyond the frontiers of their respective communities. During these sessions, four topics were taught: values (participants had to confront each other's values); leadership; conflicts and conflict resolution; medias (and the way the media can at times distort the image of the "other"). Later on, shorter sessions were set up for 14-18 years old in Junior ICLS (Bradford, UK). During these sessions of two days, organised in a

hotel and involving 25 children from diverse religious backgrounds, the same topics were discussed. At the end of the session, the participants had to stand up and to introduce themselves to the other members of the group. These experiences showed that mutual understanding and intercultural dialogue were made possible by such framework of deliberation, and that it was possible to break the barriers and to create "Networks of Trust" despite tensions between communities.

ALDA told that it had implemented two successful projects promoting tolerance and anti-discrimination with young people from very different backgrounds and countries (notably Armenia and Azerbaijan), respectively through sport and music. The first one targeted youngsters from 18 to 30 and the second one concerned young workers. It explained that sport and music were indeed very good means to bring people together and to break the barriers between communities. It also cited other means such as cultural festivals and summer schools.

CERS explained the "Time Capsules Towards Africa" project, a non-humanitarian mission involving four classes of students from Belgium, France, Germany and Luxembourg. On 9 May, these students were invited to fill in boxes with various objects which represented their own generation (for example, for a German student, a piece of the Berlin Wall) accompanied by a small note describing that project and by a letter depicting them and their environment. Afterwards, these boxes were sent to different regions of Africa. The second part of the project consisted in asking youngsters from different regions of Africa to send their own boxes to their correspondents in Europe.

CONFRONTATIONS EUROPE told about its working group called "Europes en devenir" which aimed at understanding differences of public governance in the European Union in terms of solidarity and tolerance. In this framework, people from France, United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, Germany and Bulgaria were invited to closed meetings with no reporting, where they could speak freely on political and economic issues and try to overcome their differences. Confrontations Europe explained that this working group was set up further to a European tour carried out three years before and a cinema festival called "L'Europe autour de l'Europe" to foster identification with Europe.

CAFÉ BABEL put forward its pilot project meeting journalism and training. Firstly implemented in the Ile-de-France region before being extended at a European level, this project aimed at giving voice to young inhabitants from secluded neighbourhoods whose image is usually distorted or biased in the traditional medias. Through this project, they could go beyond stereotypes and express themselves about how they lived in a daily basis in these secluded territories. To this end, they received trainings in writing for the web and using social medias.

JEAN MONNET ASSOCIATION recalled that it was proposing training sessions and information activities on the EU, its values and Union citizenship for scholars in the Jean Monnet House (Paris). It underlined that among these activities, there were day-long conferences destined to children with less opportunities, whose goal was to raise their awareness on the practical opportunities offered by the European Union through non-formal discussions (for instance, the possibility to study and move freely inside the EU).

EAB talked about a three years project that involved "lay judges" (normal citizens acting in a voluntary basis as honorary judges) from all over Europe to elaborate a common charter on the values and principles of civic participation in the judiciary system. Two years after having drafted the charter, a European Network of Associations of Lay Judges was created in order to continue the work done, to promote that kind of civic participation in various Member States, and to further exchange their experiences and support each other during a yearly event called the "European Day of Lay Judges".

EUROPEAN YOUTH FORUM described the ACCESS project which aimed at empowering migrant and disadvantaged youth through capacity building so that they could voice the concerns of their communities, and at engaging decision-makers from European municipalities (Helsinki, Prague, Barcelona, and Marseilles) with this project. The results

were presented in Brussels in May 2015 before MEPs in order to give a European outlet to this process.

ETUCE reacted to those testimonies by highlighting the important role that teachers and teachers unions could play in the promotion of common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through dedicated curricula. It pointed out however that they were increasingly solicited for policing purposes like prevention of extremism and of radicalisation, whereas this was exceeding their teaching role.

Dragos TUDORACHE thanked the Civil Dialogue members for sharing their ideas and testimonies. Referring to recommendations of the Paris Declaration of 17 March 2015, he expressed his agreement with ETUCE on the important role played by teachers in fostering critical thinking among youngsters regarding the Medias' information flows, and proposed to send the results of this brainstorming to DG EAC.

3. "Europe for Citizens" programme

3.1. State of play of the implementation of the Programme

Luisa RODRIGUES (EACEA Unit C1: Europe for Citizens) said that 2015 would follow a more stable path than 2014, which was exceptional due to the late adoption of the Programme.

Almost 2 000 applications were received – all measures included – before the 2 March 2015 (first deadline of the year for submitting). In terms of applications, there was:

- an increase of 15% in number of applications for the strand 1 (European remembrance), compared to 2014;
- 800 applications received for the town-twinning measure, the highest number within the last 5 years;

As a result of the selection carried-out in late May/early June, around 300 projects (including operating grants) were granted and most of them were already contractualised and pre-financed, with an average success rate of around 15%. All EU countries were represented in the projects selected – either as partners (7 by project in average, for all measures except town-twinning) or beneficiaries.

Regarding the themes addressed:

- the majority of the funded project under the strand 1 (European remembrance) aimed at raising awareness of common history and values of the EU, so as to teach the present time and fight current waves of racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, islamophobia and all types of radicalisation;
- the majority of the funded projects under the strand 2 (Democratic engagement and civic participation) deal with democratic participation and social cohesion as a way to address the priority “Debate on the future of Europe”.

Luisa RODRIGUES concluded by announcing that the next deadline for submission would be 1 September 2015 for town-twinning and networks of towns measures, and that in autumn 2015 a call for the renewal of operating grants would be launched for the organisations benefiting from a framework partnership.

3.2. World Café on the programme Multiannual Priorities for 2016-2020

Before turning to John MACDONALD & Shoena DORSON-KING for this World Café, Pavel TYCHTL explained to the Civil Dialogue members the switch from annual to multiannual priorities, which would apply throughout the remaining period of the programme (2016-2020), so as to enable applicants to better plan and prepare their projects.

Pavel TYCHTL added that although these proposed priorities were intended to be permanent, there would be flexibility to modify or add further priorities, should the need arise in light of political developments. In that case, the Civil Dialogue members would of course be consulted beforehand.

On the basis of the document sent to the Civil Dialogue members, John MACDONALD opened the World Café, and explained its organisation. The proposed multiannual priorities for 2016-2020 were examined in rotating working groups of 5 people through the prism of the three following umbrella questions during three rounds of 25 minutes:

- What is particularly strong with these proposals? (round 1)
- What needs more clarity? (round 2)
- Is there something important missing from the current proposals? (round 3)

Each working group designated an "anchor person" who summarized in key words up to 3 insights about the proposed priorities.

Results of the consultation on the proposed multiannual priorities for 2016-2020

Anchor persons from the different working groups shared their comments/remarks/suggestions in a plenary session (see Raw results of the world café in Annex 3). The main teachings of this consultation are the following:

- the switch from annual to multiannual priorities was welcomed by Civil Dialogue members, and its practical benefits for applicants were underlined (better preparation, stability and sustainability);
- the clause of flexibility was also welcomed, but the conditions for resorting to this clause had to be clarified (who will decide to add a new priority, at what conditions, how, will the Civil Dialogue be consulted?);
- the Civil Dialogue members expressed globally their satisfaction to see multiannual priorities that were:
 - broad enough to be dealt with during all the remaining period of the programme;
 - anchored in the social, economic and political reality without being too temporal;
 - linking past and present preoccupations.
- on this basis, while being criticised for their lack of precision or their missing link to EU policies, the following themes were particularly praised:
 - "Understanding and debating Euroscepticism", for addressing this issue without any prejudices, with an open and dialogic mind;
 - "A more inclusive concept of participation", for including all EU legal residents in the reflection on civic participation;
 - "Solidarity in times of crisis", for its anchorage in social and economic reality.
- some priorities were hardly mentioned (lack of interest? tacit consent?):
 - "Celebrations of major historical turning points in recent European history", except the celebration of UN convention relating to the status of refugees which was well perceived;
 - "Democratic transition, accession to the EU and Europeanization", vaguely referred to when it was preconized by some members to better deal with EU neighbourhood dimension.
- the Civil Dialogue members advocated for reorienting proposed priorities towards:
 - more concrete debates related to EU policies;

- more coherence between themselves and articulation between the strands;
 - more emphasis on concrete mechanisms that could be implemented to make citizens, whatever their differences, engage in public debates.
- the Civil Dialogue members regretted that some priorities of strand 1 were not applicable for strand 2 given their contemporary resonances:
 - "Stigmatisation, hate speech and loss of citizenship under totalitarian regimes", which could be treated under other angles like "Hate speech and Internet" or "Extremism and populism in current society";
 - "European civil societies and democratic movements under totalitarian regimes", which could stress the importance of civil society organisations in today societies as an intermediary between citizens and institutions.
 - there was a clear request for adding new elements that would convey a more prospective and positive vision of citizenship:
 - a priority dealing with the future of Europe (notably in view of the next European elections);
 - an emphasis on social medias and information and communication technologies and their impact on citizens' participation.
 - even though the new emphasis on migrants and on migration issues was considered by some members as a possible enrichment of the programme's priorities, this inflexion raised concerns about:
 - the risk of eclipsing other target groups (poor or disadvantaged, hard to reach, youngsters, women, elderly people) or the core target of the Programme (EU citizens, mobile EU citizens) especially in topics like "A more inclusive concept of participation" / "Stigmatisation, hate speech..." / "Solidarity in times of crisis";
 - the risk of occulting other European issues related to civic participation (like reference to common values, fundamental rights and intercultural dialogue, or social and economic inclusion);
 - the risk of amalgamating different sensitive concepts (crisis and migration; terrorism and migration; free movement and migration, etc.), especially in topics like "A more inclusive concept of participation" and "Solidarity in times of crisis".

Pavel TYCHTL summed up the results of this consultation, and said that they would be taken into account as much as possible, in line with the legal basis. He pointed out somehow that some general remarks clearly fell out of the remit of this exercise and were akin rather to recommendations: call for better financing of the projects, stress on the role of civil society organisations in implementing the Programme, request for a priority dealing with EU neighbourhood or for partnerships with Eastern and Southern non-EU countries.

4. **AOB**

4.1 **Networking Meeting with organisations active in the field of Memory and Remembrance (Tallinn, 4-5 May 2015)**

Pavel TYCHTL provided a feedback on the Remembrance networking meeting that took place on 4-5 May 2015 (see his presentation and a thorough review of this meeting in Annex 4).

4.2. **New dissemination tools for the Programme: e-newsletter and e-mapping**

Pavel TYCHTL explained that these dissemination tools would be showcased at a more mature stage of their development.

4.3. **Items for the next meeting**

Pavel TYCHTL invited the Civil Dialogue members to suggest items for the next meeting, which would take place within 6 months.

EUROPEAN HOUSE insisted on the importance to get the minutes of this Civil Dialogue before the summer, and not six months later. It added that it was looking forward to having the results of the Civil Dialogue's consultation on the multiannual priorities.

EUCLID suggested exploring the links between the Europe for Citizens programme and other EU funding programmes like Horizon 2020 project. It also proposed to deal with capacity building in the civic participation area through development of digital and leadership skills.

EUROPEAN ALTERNATIVES suggested inviting Commission staff to discuss with the Civil Dialogue members about current tensions between fundamental rights (like freedom of movement) and security issues.

ECF requested for an overview of the new Citizenship portfolio once its main dimensions are more defined. It also wished more links between the Programme and other EU policies and said it would welcome representatives from other DGs in future Civil Dialogue meetings.

EAVI asked the Commission to send the supporting documents of the meeting far in advance to enable Civil Dialogue members to work on them.

CEV regretted that exchanges had taken place essentially between Civil Dialogue members during these participatory sessions, and wished to have a more direct dialogue with DG HOME's staff for next meetings.

After this round table, the participants were offered the possibility to give their feedback on the meeting and its participatory format through an evaluation questionnaire (see results in Annex 5).