

# MAPPING ROOTS

## A Manual for building a European Civic Service at regional and local level

*Result 5 (R5) — Erasmus+ KA2 Project "Along the Road of the YouSCE"*

Partnership: France · Poland · Spain · Portugal · Romania

March 2026

Produced by the Collectif pour un Service Civique Européen (CSCE)



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

## How to use this manual

This manual is a living strategy skeleton. It is designed to grow with the project — some sections are fully written based on existing research and pilot experience; others are clearly marked for completion as the project generates more data. It has two audiences:

- Coordinating organisations (Poland, Spain, Portugal, Romania) — the primary beneficiaries of this KA2 project — who are building local ecosystems of civic service missions in their communities. Parts 3, 4 and 5 are written for you.
- Decision-makers and policy advocates — who need to understand the European landscape, the evidence base, and the concrete model to consider adopting or adapting it. Parts 1, 2 and 6 are written for you.

<b>Part 1</b>	Context & rationale — What civic service is, why national schemes are the backbone, how the SCE model works
<b>Part 2</b>	Existing national schemes — Deep profiles of France, Italy and Germany as reference models
<b>Part 3</b>	Country profiles — The consortium countries and other European examples
<b>Part 4</b>	Building the ecosystem — The practical guide for coordinating organisations
<b>Part 5</b>	Youth perspective — Who volunteers, what they gain, what pilots have shown
<b>Part 6</b>	Towards a policy framework — ROI, recommendations, the replicable model

**IMPORTANT** — On naming: The word 'volunteering' is not neutral across European legal systems. In several countries, a legal status of 'volunteer' explicitly prohibits payment or stipends. Before naming your programme, check national labour law. Terms like 'community service', 'social service of the youth', 'community engagement scheme', or 'structured civic engagement' may be more appropriate depending on your country — and may unlock access to public funding that 'volunteering' would not.

## Part 1 — Context & rationale

### 1.1 What is the European Civic Service?

The European Civic Service (SCE — Service Civique Européen) is a structured long-term engagement scheme for young people built on two phases:

- Phase 1 (national): minimum 6 months of service in the young person's own country, within a mixed cohort of 50% local youth and 50% European volunteers, funded primarily by national or local sources (public authorities, NGOs, municipalities, foundations).
- Phase 2 (European): 6 months or more of mobility in another European country, funded through the European Solidarity Corps (ESC) or, where available, national civic service programmes.

The ESC is therefore not the backbone of the SCE — it is the instrument for the mobility phase. The backbone is the national or sub-national civic engagement scheme that makes Phase 1 possible. Where such a scheme does not exist (like in Poland, Spain, Portugal, Romania), building it — even at pilot scale — is the central challenge this project addresses.

Key distinction: The ESC provides the legal framework and co-funding for transnational mobility. But without a strong local Phase 1 — rooted in national funding, local organisations, and structured support — there is no meaningful European experience to offer. This manual is primarily about building Phase 1.

### 1.2 Why national schemes are the backbone

Countries with mature civic service programmes — France (Service Civique, ~150,000 youth/year), Germany (FSJ/BFD, ~97,000 youth/year), Italy (Servizio Civile Universale, ~50,000 youth/year) — share a common architecture:

- A national legal framework that defines the volunteer's status, rights and obligations.
- A state-funded stipend covering basic living costs — distinct from employment, avoiding labour law conflicts.
- An accredited coordinating structure that manages the quality of the experience.
- A network of hosting organisations offering structured missions.
- Formal training, mentoring and civic education integrated into the service.

In these countries, the ESC acts as a complementary layer — offering the European mobility dimension to young people who have already completed or are completing their national service. The ESC does not replace the national scheme; it extends it.

In countries without national schemes, pilots must be run under EU project funding (such as this KA2). But this is explicitly a transitional model. The goal is to demonstrate proof-of-concept at local level, generate evidence, and use that evidence to advocate for national policy adoption.

### 1.3 The civic service and youth employment: a strategic investment

Researches from others projects — involving countries as France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Poland, Cyprus and Eastern countries — documents clearly the link between structured civic engagement and youth employability. Key findings:

<b>NEET rate EU average (2024)</b>	11.0% of youth aged 15–29 (Education and training monitor 2025)
<b>Countries above average</b>	Romania, Italy, Spain — structural inequalities in labour market access
<b>Germany NEET rate (2023)</b>	7.5% — well below EU average, strongly linked to structured volunteering culture
<b>France youth unemployment (2024)</b>	18.8% for 15–24 year olds; 12.8% NEET rate — Service Civique as key policy response
<b>Service Civique impact (France)</b>	Skill development, social inclusion, civic participation — 97% in positive transition within 3 months of completion
<b>Germany volunteering rate</b>	43.6% of residents 14+ participate in voluntary activities (German Volunteering Survey 2019)

Civic service programmes are not cost-only investments. Studies consistently show social returns of €1.50–€4.00 per €1 invested in France, and £2.42 per £1 in the UK National Citizen Service. Returns come from: improved employability (lower unemployment benefit costs, higher tax revenues), stronger NGO and public sector capacity, reduced social isolation, and higher civic participation.

On naming — labour law watch: In France, the distinction between 'bénévolat' (unpaid, unstructured) and 'volontariat' (legally regulated, time-limited, compensated) is enshrined in law. In Spain, 'voluntariado' regulated under Law 45/2015 has specific rules on compensation. In Romania and Poland, calling participants 'volunteers' while paying them a stipend may require specific legal authorisations. Each country must identify the right legal term and framework before designing its national programme. The name matters — it determines what financial mechanisms apply.

### 1.4 The SCE in numbers (end of 2025)

<b>Youth deployed (2021–2025)</b>	1,500+ in 43 cohorts across 15 countries
<b>Youth with fewer opportunities (JAMO)</b>	54.6% of all participants — exceeding the 50% minimum target
<b>Feel like a European citizen (end of programme)</b>	94%
<b>Would recommend the experience</b>	92%
<b>Developed significant competencies</b>	85%
<b>Gained autonomy and initiative</b>	87%
<b>In positive transition within 3 months</b>	97% (2022 cohort)
<b>Pilot countries in this project</b>	Poland (Gdynia), Spain (Madrid, Malaga), Portugal (Cascais), Romania (Bucharest)

## Part 2 — Existing national schemes: The reference models

France, Italy and Germany provide the three most developed national civic service models in Europe. Understanding them is essential: they are both evidence of what works and the source of the methodology used in this project. Each profile covers: historical context, how it was built, legal framework, how it operates today, and key numbers.

### FR FRANCE — Service Civique

#### Historical context & how it was built

The French civic service was not created by government decree — it was built from below. Unis-Cité was founded in 1994 by three students from ESSEC Business School, inspired by AmeriCorps and City Year in the United States, who believed that young people should have a structured opportunity to serve their community in a diverse team. Working without any legal status for volunteers and without public funding for the first decade, they proved the model worked.

#### Key milestones:

- 1994: Unis-Cité launches in Île-de-France — the first group for civic service in France.
- 2005: After the suburban social crisis, President Chirac announces a voluntary civic service for 50,000 young people. The 'Service Civil Volontaire' is created — directly modelled on Unis-Cité.
- 2007: Unis-Cité successfully campaigns for inclusion of universal civic service in presidential candidates' platforms.
- 2010: Law 2010-2041 of 10 March 2010 — the Service Civique is born. 6,000 places in year one; 1,500 managed by Unis-Cité.
- 2023: Unis-Cité manages 10,000+ volunteers/year in its collective model; national programme hosts ~150,000 youth/year.
- 2020–present: The SCE (European Civic Service) is piloted, combining Service Civique and ESC under the tandem model.

The critical lesson from France: advocacy and proof-of-concept came first; national policy followed. The law was written after 16 years of NGO experimentation.

#### Legal framework

<b>Law</b>	Law 2010-2041 of 10 March 2010; article L.120-1 of the National Service Code
<b>Definition</b>	Voluntary engagement of general interest; not employment, not internship
<b>Eligibility</b>	16–25 (up to 30 for people with disabilities)
<b>Duration</b>	6–12 months, minimum 24h/week

<b>Status</b>	Specific legal status — not subject to the Labour Code
<b>Governing body</b>	Agence du Service Civique (public interest grouping under Ministry of National Education and Youth)
<b>Accreditation</b>	Hosting organisations must be accredited; cannot replace paid employees

## How it works

The Service Civique operates through accredited hosting organisations (associations, public bodies, municipalities) which define missions of general interest. Volunteers are recruited without selection criteria — motivation is the only requirement. They receive civic and professional training, are mentored by a designated tutor, and participate in collective citizenship education sessions.

The Unis-Cité model adds a collective dimension: teams of ~20 volunteers from diverse backgrounds (urban/rural, educated/uneducated, different origins) serve together on the same mission. This social mix is non-negotiable and is a key quality indicator.

## Financial structure

Cost item	Paid by	Amount
<b>Monthly stipend</b>	State (80%)	€496.94/month
<b>Complementary support</b>	Host organisation (20%)	€113.02/month
<b>Social contributions</b>	State	~€250/month
<b>Mentoring support</b>	State (via Agence)	€100/month to hosting org
<b>Civic training</b>	State (via Agence)	€100 per mission
<b>Total cost per volunteer (8 months)</b>	~80% State, ~20% host org	~€6,800–€8,000

## Key numbers

<b>Annual participants (national programme)</b>	~150,000 young people/year
<b>Unis-Cité managed</b>	10,000+/year in collective model
<b>Cities covered (Unis-Cité)</b>	120+ cities in metropolitan France + La Réunion
<b>Youth unemployment rate (2024)</b>	18.8% for 15–24 year olds
<b>NEET rate (2024)</b>	12.8% — above EU average; Service Civique as key policy response
<b>SCE promotions (2025)</b>	7 promotions, 100 youth — Dunkerque, Caen, St-Étienne, Carcassonne, Angers

## DE GERMANY — FSJ / BFD (Freiwilligendienste)

### Historical context & how it was built

Germany's civic service emerged from church-based charitable work for young women in the 1950s. Unlike France, Germany's model grew from religious and civil society organisations, not from a student advocacy movement. The path to today's system:

- 1954: First 'Freiwilliges Soziales Jahr' (FSJ — Voluntary Social Year) launched by Catholic and Protestant women's organisations.
- 1964: Law 'Gesetz zur Förderung des Freiwilligen Sozialen Jahres' establishes a legal framework for the FSJ. From the start, the educational dimension is emphasised.
- 1968: First men participate in the FSJ — the programme opens beyond its original female demographic.
- 1993: 'Freiwilliges Ökologisches Jahr' (FÖJ — Voluntary Ecological Year) introduced, with its own legal basis.
- 2002: FSJ and FÖJ unified under one law — 'Gesetz zur Förderung von Jugendfreiwilligendiensten' (JFDG).
- 2011: Introduction of the 'Bundesfreiwilligendienst' (BFD — Federal Volunteer Service) — open to all ages (no upper age limit), replacing civilian alternative service after military service was suspended.
- 2022: 97,459 participants in regulated voluntary services (including national and international, including ESC).

Germany's distinctive feature: hosting organisations pay the majority of costs. This creates strong institutional ownership but also financial barriers for smaller organisations. The State supports pedagogical coordination (€200/volunteer/month to coordination agencies), not the full stipend.

### Legal framework

<b>Main laws</b>	JFDG (Jugendfreiwilligendienste Act) for FSJ/FÖJ; separate law for BFD
<b>Eligibility</b>	FSJ: 16–26 (sometimes 27/28); BFD: all ages (no upper limit for civilian service)
<b>Duration</b>	6–18 months (average 10 months); from September to August typically
<b>Hours</b>	Up to 39h/week; since 2019, part-time possible (minimum 20h/week)
<b>Status</b>	Not employment; volunteer status with specific legal protections
<b>Governance</b>	18 coordination agencies ('Zentralstellen') accredited by Federal Family Ministry (BaFzA); plus state-level authorities
<b>Mandatory training</b>	25 pedagogical days per year (5 seminars of 5 days); political education included

## How it works

Germany operates through a triangle: coordination agency — hosting organisation — volunteer. The coordination agency holds the contract with the volunteer and is responsible for pedagogical support. Hosting organisations (hospitals, schools, environmental organisations, social care centres) provide the placement and pay most of the costs. The Federal Ministry of Family (BMFSFJ) and BaFzA provide oversight and partial funding.

Mentors ('Anleiter') within hosting organisations receive training from coordination agencies. Quality assurance is managed centrally through the Zentralstellen network. Each volunteer has at least one designated mentor and participates in regular training seminars away from their placement site.

## Financial structure

Cost item	Who pays	Amount
<b>Pocket money</b>	Hosting organisation	Max €426/month
<b>Food/housing (if provided)</b>	Hosting organisation	Variable
<b>Social insurance</b>	Hosting organisation (mainly)	~€160/month
<b>Pedagogical coordination</b>	State (BaFzA) to coordination agency	€200/volunteer/month (+€100 for JAMO)
<b>Political education seminar</b>	State (BaFzA)	One-off travel reimbursement
<b>Total cost per volunteer/month</b>	~70% hosting org, ~30% state	~€920/month

## Key numbers

<b>Annual participants</b>	~97,000+ in regulated voluntary services
<b>FWD DRS network alone</b>	1,570 volunteers in 2022; 1,000+ partner institutions
<b>NEET rate (2023)</b>	7.5% — well below EU average of 11%
<b>Youth volunteering rate</b>	43.6% of residents 14+ participate in voluntary activities
<b>Regional disparities</b>	NEET: 12.1% in Berlin vs 5.3% in Bavaria — civic service as a targeted response
<b>Without vocational qualification</b>	19.1% of 20–34 year olds — key target group for civic service

## IT ITALY — Servizio Civile Universale

### Historical context & how it was built

Italy's civic service has its deepest roots in conscientious objection to military service. Unlike France (advocacy-led) or Germany (church-led), Italy's model emerged from a rights-based struggle against compulsory military service.

- 1972: Law on 'Conscientious Objection' — alternative to military service created. Initially 8 months longer than military service, discouraging uptake.
- 1989: Constitutional Court equalises duration of civilian and military service — applications surge from 16,000 (1990) to 70,000 (1998).
- 1998: National Civic Service Council created; programme moved from Ministry of Defence to Presidency of Council of Ministers — a critical step removing conflict of interest.
- 2000: Law suspending mandatory military service (effective 2005) — civic service becomes voluntary.
- 2001: Law 64 — the modern National Civic Service is born. Opens to youth 18–28 for social, cultural and international missions.
- 2015: Constitutional Court rules Italian citizenship requirement unconstitutional — programme opens to EU citizens and legal residents.
- 2017: Legislative Decree 40/2017 — Service Civile Universale (SCU) created. Programme becomes universal, open to all regardless of background. First international mobility component introduced (up to 3 months abroad).
- 2021: 49,984 volunteers; 64,686 places available; 112,008 applicants — 1.7 applications per place.

### Legal framework

<b>Main law</b>	Legislative Decree 40/2017 — 'Institution and discipline of the universal civic service'
<b>Eligibility</b>	18–28 years old; EU citizens or legal residents in Italy
<b>Duration</b>	8–12 months; minimum 25 hours/week (1,145 hours total for 12 months)
<b>International component</b>	Up to 3 months abroad (EU countries)
<b>Status</b>	Specific civic service status — not employment; competence recognition pathway exists
<b>Governance</b>	Department of Youth Policy and Universal Civic Service (Presidency of Council of Ministers)
<b>Accreditation</b>	Organisations register in national SCU Register; project-by-project accreditation
<b>Competence recognition</b>	Formal 'Individual Competence Dossier' pathway; counted as equivalent to public service for civil service recruitment

## How it works

Organisations submit project proposals annually in response to public calls. Once approved, they recruit volunteers from a national pool. Volunteers receive general training (programme values and principles) and specific training (mission-related). A designated OLP (Operatore Locale di Progetto) within each hosting organisation provides mentoring and monthly check-ins.

The programme is managed nationally but implemented locally — projects span every Italian region. The distribution of missions reflects Italian social priorities: 47.2% in social assistance, 31.9% in education/culture/environment/tourism, 13.2% in cultural heritage, 4.9% in environmental heritage.

## Financial structure

<b>Monthly stipend</b>	~€440/month (flexible; 20-day leave for 12 months)
<b>Social security &amp; pension</b>	Recognised and contributed — convertible for future retirement
<b>Public recognition</b>	Counted as public service equivalent in civil service recruitment; formal competence certification
<b>State investment (2021)</b>	56,205+ places funded; objective: 40,000 volunteers as PNRR milestone (achieved)
<b>Cost per volunteer (estimated)</b>	~€750–€900/month total (stipend + social + coordination)

## Key numbers

<b>Total volunteers (2001–2021)</b>	523,404 youth
<b>Annual participants (2021)</b>	49,984 — of which 49,367 in Italy, 617 abroad
<b>Applications vs places (2022)</b>	112,008 applications for 64,686 places — 1.7:1 ratio
<b>Hosting organisations (2021)</b>	45,582 registered operators; 51,628 project sites
<b>Youth unemployment (Italy)</b>	~20% for under 25 — one of EU's highest; SCU as structural response
<b>NEET rate (Italy)</b>	Among highest in EU — particularly pronounced gender gap (20%+ for young women)

## Part 3 — Country profiles

### 3.1 The consortium countries

The following profiles cover the four 'target' countries of this project — where the SCE does not yet exist as a national programme and where the project is building pilot ecosystems.

#### PL POLAND

<b>National programme</b>	Korpus Solidarności (2018–2030) — long-term volunteering development framework, not a civic service per se
<b>Legal basis</b>	Volunteer Act (ustawa o działalności pożytku publicznego i wolontariacie) 2003; Solidarity Corps strategy
<b>Governing body</b>	NIW — National Freedom Institute (Centre for Civil Society Development)
<b>Stipend</b>	No national stipend system; ESC pocket money ~€250/month
<b>ESC National Agency</b>	FRSE — Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji
<b>SCE pilot — Gdynia</b>	Center of Mobility — 8 local youth (Nov 2024–Apr 2025), completed
<b>SCE pilot — Warsaw (S1 2026)</b>	Regional Center of Volunteering — 3 youth
<b>SCE pilot — Lublin (S1 2026)</b>	LOS — 20 youth
<b>Key challenge</b>	No legal stipend; explaining an unknown concept; limited public awareness of structured civic engagement
<b>Key strength</b>	Active civil society; regional volunteering centres as natural coordinators; Solidarity Corps provides institutional framework

The Gdynia pilot (Center of Mobility) provides the first detailed evidence base for Poland. Key findings from the impact report:

- **Recruitment:** Multi-channel (ngo.pl, social media, Open'er Festival, peer-to-peer) — effective but requiring significant coordination effort from a 2-person team.
- **Hosting organisations:** Required extensive individual outreach to explain the pilot concept — this is not a known model in Poland. Trust-building was time-intensive.
- **Barriers:** No existing legal framework for stipends; limited team capacity; logistical complexity (3 volunteers with disabilities requiring adapted international mobility).
- **Key lesson:** At least one coordinator and one youth worker are the minimum viable team. Institutional endorsement from a national-level organisation significantly improves recruitment.
- **Inclusion:** 3 of 8 volunteers were people with disabilities (JAMO profile); targeted outreach and adapted support were essential.

## ES SPAIN

<b>National programme</b>	No dedicated national civic service; regional models + ESC
<b>Legal basis</b>	Law 45/2015 on Volunteering; Youth Strategy 2022–2030 (EJ2030)
<b>Governing body</b>	Ministry of Social Rights; INJUVE (Instituto de la Juventud)
<b>Stipend</b>	No national stipend; ESC pocket money for mobility phase
<b>ESC National Agency</b>	INJUVE also manages the national ESC programme
<b>SCE pilot — Madrid</b>	Coordinadora Infantil y Juvenil de Tiempo Libre de Vallecas — 10 youth (Oct 2024–Apr 2025)
<b>SCE pilot — Malaga</b>	Arrabal Aid — 10 youth (S2 2025, continuing)
<b>Key challenge</b>	Highly decentralised; 100% JAMO profile in Madrid pilot (socioeconomic difficulties) — all 10 participants had fewer opportunities
<b>Key strength</b>	Existing network of social associations (Coordinadora manages 17 member organisations); municipalities active

The Madrid pilot (Coordinadora Vallecas) is exceptional for its inclusion profile: all 10 participants faced socioeconomic difficulties. The model operated as a fully external network: volunteers were placed into 8 partner associations across Vallecas:

- Fundación Amoverse — social inclusion and labour integration
- Asociación Chispa — children and families at risk through leisure activities
- Asociación Barró — socio-educational space for vulnerable people (active since 1994)
- Asociación Citycentro — educational leisure for children and adolescents
- Asociación Lakalle — social transformation, professional training
- Asociación Krecer — non-profit open to children, youth and families (since 1990, Vallecas)
- Asociación Primera Prevención — socio-educational intervention, women's support
- Asociación El Fanal — personal and social development for families at risk of exclusion

Weekly training sessions covered: volunteering competencies, communication and conflict resolution, digital skills (photography, video), creativity, social media, and European mobility. The Christmas community volunteering recognition event — involving all 17 Coordinadora member associations — was a powerful moment of collective visibility for the participants.

## PT PORTUGAL

<b>National programme</b>	Programa de Voluntariado Jovem (IPDJ) — short-term; no long-term national civic service
<b>Legal basis</b>	Volunteer Framework Law; IPDJ management
<b>Governing body</b>	IPDJ — Instituto Português do Desporto e Juventude
<b>Stipend</b>	Expense reimbursement only for most programmes; no structured national stipend
<b>ESC National Agency</b>	PT National Agency (Erasmus+ Youth and Sport)
<b>SCE pilot — Cascais</b>	Plantar Uma Árvore — 6–8 youth (Oct 2024–Mar 2025, in rolling cohorts)
<b>Key challenge</b>	Volunteers were university students with academic schedules; transportation to forest sites (limited vehicles); rolling recruitment needed
<b>Key strength</b>	Plantar Uma Árvore has 34,000+ volunteer history; municipality of Cascais active; corporate partner network is exceptional

The Cascais pilot operated differently from Poland and Spain: Plantar Uma Árvore is itself the hosting organisation AND the coordinating structure. Volunteers were embedded in the organisation's environmental mission network, leading groups from 40+ partner organisations — corporations, schools, universities, community groups:

- Corporate partners included: EDP (energy), GSK (pharma), Mastercard, DHL, Airbus, Kyndryl, Veolia, LG Electronics.
- Community and public partners: Junta de Freguesia de Santo António, two international schools, Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- Volunteers developed: group leadership in the field, biodiversity education, video production, ecological monitoring (Asian Wasp, amphibian populations, fern species).
- Total plants planted during the pilot period: 1,000+ across conservation and restoration sites.

Key testimonials: Alyson Oliveira: "Six months in the Sintra-Cascais Natural Park was one of the most transformative experiences of my life. I grew personally and professionally, gained sensitivity, discipline, and a new relationship with nature."

## RO ROMANIA

<b>National programme</b>	No national civic service; National Youth Strategy 2024–2027 includes youth volunteering objective
<b>Legal basis</b>	Law 78/2014 on volunteering — allows reimbursement of food, transport, activity costs; no stipend
<b>Governing body</b>	Ministry of Family, Youth and Equal Opportunities; ProVobis (National Resource Centre for Volunteering)
<b>Stipend</b>	No stipend in law; target for national programme ~€450/month (based on minimum wage ~€500/month)
<b>ESC National Agency</b>	ANPCDEFP
<b>SCE pilot — Bucharest</b>	FNT — Fundatia Nationala pentru Tineret — 10 youth (completed March 2025)
<b>Cultural context</b>	Historical negative connotation of 'volunteering' — associated with Communist-era forced unpaid labour
<b>Key strength</b>	FNT experienced ESC partner; ProVobis national NGO network; growing youth volunteering culture (43% of young Romanians now participate)

### 3.2 Other European examples

Beyond the consortium, several European countries have developed interesting civic service models that illustrate different approaches to the challenge of building local ecosystems without a mature national framework.

## MT MALTA — Youth Voluntary Service (YVS)

<b>Programme</b>	Youth Voluntary Service (YVS) — managed by Malta Council for Voluntary Sector (MCVS)
<b>Founded</b>	2015 (first funded programme); international volunteering component added 2022
<b>Age range</b>	16–30 (young people with disabilities: 13–30)
<b>Duration</b>	Local: 2–6 months (up to 12 for JAMO); International: 1–12 months
<b>Stipend</b>	€3.50/hour pocket money; hosting orgs receive €100/month admin + €50/volunteer
<b>Sectors</b>	Animal welfare, arts, culture, disability, education, environment, health, humanitarian, social, sports, youth
<b>ESC integration</b>	MCVS holds ESC Quality Label (Support 2022; Leader and Host 2023) — connecting local and European programmes

<b>Inclusion programme</b>	Youth Engage — specific programme for young people with fewer opportunities (disability, social difficulties), partnered with national disability and social protection agencies
<b>Key feature</b>	J.O.Y.S. programme (Journey of Youth Self-Development) — monthly workshops on self-awareness, mental health, intercultural dialogue, combined with mentoring

## GR GREECE — Emerging civic service concept

Greece has no national civic service programme, but Ecogenia — a non-profit created in 2021 — has piloted the concept through three small-scale environmental projects (2022–2023). Key findings from their pilots:

- 25 participants across 3 pilots; 6,501 community service hours; 598 direct beneficiaries; 1,018 people reached.
- All participants successfully transitioned to employment or higher education after the programme.
- Proposed national model: 18–30 year olds; 6–12 months; full-time; €700–800/month stipend; sectors including eco-tourism, climate preparedness, cultural heritage, civic education.
- Key challenge: 'service' in Greek is associated with mandatory military service — reframing as a positive voluntary experience is essential.
- Proposed governance: National agency modelled on the French Agence du Service Civique, under Employment or Youth Secretariat.

## LV EE LATVIA & ESTONIA — Nordic-Baltic approaches

Estonia's YouthWiki profile and ESTYES research (2022–2023) show a country with strong civic infrastructure but no national long-term volunteering scheme:

- Population: 1.37M; 201,000 young people aged 15–29. ESC sends ~100 young people annually — very small scale.
- Main challenge: minority integration — Russian-speaking communities (307,000) have limited interaction with Estonian-speaking society; civic service could be a powerful integration tool.
- Economic context: 2023 recession, tight state budget — introduction of a national programme not imminent, but the ESC In-Country mechanism is being tested.
- Proposed model (ESTYES): voluntary; 3–12 months; full-time; stipend aligned with minimum wage (€654 non-taxable); strong inclusion objective.

Latvia is currently developing ESC participation through Ropazi Municipality (10 youth placed in S1 2026), indicating municipal-level appetite for structured youth civic engagement — a potential entry point for a civic service pilot similar to the approach used in Cascais (Portugal) and Vallecás (Spain).

## Part 4 — Building the network

---

This part is written for coordinating organisations. It is the operational heart of this manual.

During this KA2 project, coordinating organisations are the primary beneficiaries. They do not yet have a national civic service to plug into. Their role is to build the local ecosystem that will make a civic service possible — and to document that process so it can be used as evidence for policy change.

### 4.1 Understanding your role as a coordinating organisation

A coordinating organisation in this project does two things simultaneously:

- Internally: it accompanies a small group of local youth through a structured long-term engagement experience — with training, mentoring, weekly collective sessions, and competency development.
- Externally: it identifies, contacts, qualifies and onboards local associations, NGOs and public organisations that can offer structured missions to volunteers. These are your hosting organisations.

The hosting organisations are not just mission providers. They become partners in the ecosystem. In exchange for receiving a motivated, trained young volunteer who contributes real capacity to their work, they commit to: defining a structured mission, designating a mentor, providing skills training (hard and soft), participating in the coordinating organisation's feedback and coordination cycle.

Coordinadora Vallecas (Spain) placed 10 volunteers across 8 partner associations. Plantar Uma Árvore (Portugal) embedded 6–8 volunteers in a network of 40+ corporate, NGO and public partners. Center of Mobility (Poland) built relationships with hosting organisations across Gdynia before a single volunteer was recruited. The ecosystem comes first.

### 4.2 Building your mission network: step by step

#### Step 1 — Map your local associative landscape

Before approaching any organisation, map who exists in your territory: associations, social enterprises, public institutions, schools, municipalities, cultural centres, sports clubs. Consider:

- What social challenges are most acute in your community? (social exclusion, environment, education, elderly care, cultural access?)
- Which organisations already have some experience with volunteers — even short-term?
- Which organisations have capacity to offer mentoring (a dedicated staff member who can follow a volunteer weekly)?
- Which organisations could provide technical skills training (digital, environmental, social work, languages)?

## Step 2 — Make first contact and explain the model

This takes longer than expected. In all three pilot countries (Poland, Spain, Portugal), coordinators reported that explaining a concept that does not legally exist in their country required trust-building conversations over weeks, not days. Key messages for your first contact:

- "We are not asking you to manage a volunteer on your own. We are the coordinating structure — we handle recruitment, collective training, mentoring and administrative support. You provide the mission and a contact person."
- "A volunteer with us will commit 10 hours minimum per week to your organisation. They receive training from us on volunteering competencies. You train them in your specific area of work."
- "At the end of the project, your organisation will have contributed to building a civic service model that we plan to present to public authorities as a policy proposal."

## Step 3 — Qualify the mission

Use the mission profile template (see Annex B) to define the mission with the hosting organisation. Key criteria:

- The mission must be of general interest — it serves the community, not the organisation's commercial interests.
- The volunteer must not replace a paid employee (fundamental principle of civic service — protects labour market).
- The volunteer must learn something — hard skills (specific to the sector) and soft skills (teamwork, initiative, communication).
- The mission must be meaningful for 6 months — not just marginal support but a real contribution.

## Step 4 — Sign a partnership agreement

Formalise the relationship between your coordinating organisation and the hosting organisation. The agreement should cover: mission description, volunteer's schedule, mentor designation, confidentiality, reporting obligations, and the coordinating organisation's role in collective training days.

## Step 5 — Recruit your volunteers

Recruitment is the moment your network becomes visible. Key lessons from the pilots:

- Multiple channels work better than one: social media, university and school visits, community centres, peer-to-peer, local NGO portals.
- In-person events are more effective than online for reaching JAMO youth — the Open'er Festival approach (Poland), the school/university visits (Portugal), the Coordinadora network events (Spain) all generated higher quality leads than online-only campaigns.
- Be specific in what you offer: not 'a volunteering opportunity' but 'a 6-month commitment with real responsibilities, training, mentoring, a certificate, and the possibility of European mobility afterwards.'
- Timing matters: start recruitment 3–4 months before the programme start date. The Gdynia pilot opened recruitment in June 2024 for a November 2024 start.

## Step 6 — Run the collective programme

This is where coordinating organisations add their specific value beyond hosting organisations. The collective programme consists of:

- Induction week: introduction to civic service values, team building, mission orientation, competency self-assessment baseline.
- Weekly collective day: all volunteers gather regardless of their hosting organisation. This is the heart of the model — it creates cohesion, shared learning, and the mixed-team dynamic that distinguishes civic service from ordinary volunteering.
- Monthly competency sessions: structured workshops on specific skills (communication, digital, civic participation, conflict resolution, project management). Coordinadora's programme covered photography, video production, social media, conflict resolution, European opportunities.
- Mid-term evaluation: individual and group assessment; adjustment of missions if needed; individual coaching.
- International exchange: all three pilots held a joint transnational meeting (Italy-Portugal-Spain, April 2025) — described by participants as the most impactful moment of the entire programme.
- Final presentation and certification: volunteers present their experience to local stakeholders (associations, municipalities, schools). This is both a recognition moment and a dissemination opportunity.

### 4.3 The national business plan template

For countries considering moving from pilot to national programme, the following template provides a structured thinking framework. Each country's coordinating organisation should adapt it to their national context.

Before filling in this template, consult a national legal expert on: (1) what legal status can be given to participants without triggering labour law; (2) what the term 'volunteering' means in your jurisdiction and whether it prevents compensation; (3) what existing laws (if any) allow stipends or expense reimbursements for civic engagement activities.

Component	Questions to answer	Our country's answer
<b>A. Vision</b>	What social need does this programme address? Who are the target participants? Is it voluntary or could it become universal?	
<b>B. Legal status</b>	What will participants be called? (not 'volunteer' if that creates legal barriers). What law covers their status? Can they receive a stipend legally?	
<b>C. Stipend &amp; support</b>	What monthly amount is realistic? (benchmark: minimum wage or student allowance). What about housing? Food? Transport?	
<b>D. Governance</b>	Who will be the national coordinating body? Government agency, NGO federation, or hybrid? How will quality be assured?	
<b>E. Hosting organisations</b>	What sectors will be prioritised? What accreditation criteria will apply? How will missions be published?	
<b>F. Training</b>	How many training days? General (civic values) + specific (mission-related)? Who delivers it?	

Component	Questions to answer	Our country's answer
<b>G. Funding (Year 1)</b>	Public funding (ministry, municipality, EU)? Private co-funding (foundations, corporate)? Cost per volunteer?	
<b>H. Funding (Years 2–5)</b>	Path to state institutionalisation? What proportion of cost should State carry vs hosting orgs?	
<b>I. Scale</b>	How many volunteers in Year 1 (pilot)? Year 3 (scale)? Year 5 (ambition)?	
<b>J. Name</b>	What name works in your language and legal framework? (Avoid terms that trigger labour law restrictions)	
<b>K. Political allies</b>	Which ministry? Which MEPs? Which civil society champions? Which municipalities can be early adopters?	
<b>L. Evidence needed</b>	What data will convince your decision-makers? What does your pilot generate that feeds this argument?	

Labour law caution across consortium countries — Poland: the Volunteer Act 2003 allows unpaid volunteering; stipends require a separate legal basis. Spain: Law 45/2015 on Volunteering defines volunteers as uncompensated; paid civic engagement requires a different legal instrument. Portugal: volunteer framework law focuses on expense reimbursement, not stipends. Romania: Law 78/2014 allows reimbursement of food, transport and activity costs only. In all four countries, a new legal instrument or ministerial decree is needed to create a stipended civic service. This is a long-term policy goal — pilots under EU project funding are the bridge.

## 4.4 Recognising and certifying competencies

A civic service experience that leaves no formal trace is less powerful than one that generates a recognised certificate. Options available now, without waiting for national policy:

- Youthpass: the EU's non-formal learning certificate, free and immediately available through the Erasmus+ portal. Can document competencies developed during ESC-funded activities.
- Local authority endorsement letter: a letter from the municipality confirming the volunteer's mission and hours — valuable for CVs.
- Hosting organisation certificate: a formal letter from each hosting organisation describing the missions and skills developed.
- Competency portfolio: a self-documented record of skills developed, structured by the coordinating organisation during the weekly collective sessions. Coordinadora Vallecas' monthly evaluation system is an excellent model.
- Youthpass + national framework: if your country has a National Qualifications Framework (NQF), explore whether civic service competencies can be mapped onto existing qualifications levels.

## Part 5 — The youth perspective

### 5.1 Who are the volunteers?

<b>Gender (2025 SCE data)</b>	Women 67% — Men 33%
<b>Age distribution</b>	16–18: 28.2%   18–20: 25.8%   21–24: 37.1%   25–30: 8.9%
<b>Study level</b>	No diploma: 21%   High school: 50.8%   Higher education: 28.2%
<b>JAMO participants</b>	54.6% of all SCE participants — above the 50% minimum target
<b>Madrid pilot (Spain)</b>	100% JAMO — all 10 participants faced socioeconomic difficulties; vocational training or high school level
<b>Gdynia pilot (Poland)</b>	4 of 8 (50%) with 3 with disability profiles; diverse educational and geographical backgrounds
<b>Cascais pilot (Portugal)</b>	6 of 8 university students; 1 with economic difficulties; majority from environmental or related fields

### 5.2 What motivates volunteers?

<b>Personal development</b>	43.7%
<b>Discover a new culture</b>	31.2%
<b>Acquire new languages</b>	29.5%
<b>Citizenship engagement</b>	17.3%
<b>Professional experience</b>	14.1%

At entry, volunteers' main concerns: self-confidence, language abilities, meeting project expectations, and logistical challenges. This profile — motivated but anxious — underlines why structured induction, peer support and mentoring from the first week are non-negotiable.

### 5.3 What do volunteers gain?

<b>Intercultural openness</b>	91%
<b>Autonomy</b>	87%
<b>Teamwork</b>	84%
<b>Adaptability</b>	82%
<b>Communication</b>	78%
<b>Linguistic competences</b>	72%
<b>Project management</b>	65%

Language progression: from 74% at beginner level at entry → 12% at beginner at exit. Intermediate speakers: 35% → 48%. Advanced: 15% → 27%. Particularly significant given that most SCE volunteers are first-time language learners at entry.

## 5.4 Voices from the pilots

**POLAND** — Gdynia Daria Lysenko: "I discovered that my skills have real value and a true impact." Klaudia Bojk: "This project helped me define my career path and even led to my current job in a kindergarten!" Rozalia Jankowska: "I overcame my stage fright with public speaking and improved my skills in graphic design and presentations." Katarzyna Klemenska: "Learning about others' life stories helped me open up to new perspectives." Halina Kocurek: "I loved the learning process through travel — especially our trip to Romania — and the great group energy."

**PORTUGAL** — Cascais Tomás Ribeiro (Geography student): "This project completely exceeded my expectations. Environmental volunteering in forest management has been my greatest source of motivation. I believe all young people should do the same — change only happens when we roll up our sleeves and work together." Margarida Ramos: "In addition to being an environment of knowledge and work, it is an environment of friendship, mutual respect, and enormous empathy. Everyone was willing to help and teach. Being part of a project that contributes to the good of nature fills the heart." Alyson Oliveira: "Six months in the Sintra-Cascais Natural Park was one of the most transformative experiences of my life. I grew personally and professionally, gained sensitivity, discipline, and a new relationship with nature." Afonso Noronha, Sara Gato, Érica Correia — all completed their missions and are exploring further European mobility.

## 5.5 Communication strategy

<b>Young people (general)</b>	Short testimonial videos (Instagram, TikTok) from returned volunteers; focus on personal growth, travel, friendship, and becoming someone who 'offers' rather than 'receives'
<b>Long-term commitment candidates</b>	LinkedIn, youth centres, university career offices — emphasise skills, professional recognition, European opportunity
<b>Youth organisations</b>	Peer events, Erasmus+ fairs, sector-specific networks — partnership and co-creation framing
<b>Decision-makers</b>	Evidence briefs, this manual, ROI tables — cost-effectiveness and policy alignment framing
<b>Municipalities</b>	Local impact, community benefit, civic cohesion — connect to local youth policies and social action plans

## Part 6 — Towards a policy framework

### 6.1 What the pilots demonstrate

The four pilots (Gdynia, Madrid, Cascais, Bucharest) collectively demonstrate that:

- A civic service model can be built without a national framework — if there is a strong coordinating organisation and a willingness to do the ecosystem-building work.
- Hosting organisations, even small ones, can offer quality missions — if they receive proper support and a clear mandate.
- Young people with fewer opportunities are not a last resort — they are the primary target and they succeed when properly supported.
- The mixed-team model (local + European) works — the April 2025 transnational gathering (Italy-Portugal-Spain) was described as the single most impactful moment of the entire pilot year.
- The process generates evidence — volunteer profiles, competency data, hosting organisation feedback, mission hours — that is directly usable for policy advocacy.

### 6.2 ROI: the case per existing scheme

The following tables draw on published evaluations and the TIPJEV research to present the return on investment case for each existing national scheme. They are designed to help decision-makers in consortium countries understand what a national programme, scaled to their context, could generate.

#### France — Service Civique

Indicator	Value	Source
<b>ROI per €1 invested</b>	€1.50–€4.00	State evaluation (INJEP/Cour des Comptes)
<b>Annual participants</b>	~150,000	Agence du Service Civique 2024
<b>Youth unemployment saved</b>	Lower unemployment benefit costs + higher future tax revenues (INJEP)	—
<b>NEET rate</b>	12.8% — programme targets this cohort directly	INSEE 2024
<b>Strongest returns in</b>	Education, social inclusion, health, employment outcomes	INJEP evaluation
<b>Relevant for Romania?</b>	Yes — similar NEET challenge; FNT pilot as proof of concept	—
<b>Relevant for Poland?</b>	Yes — Solidarity Corps framework already exists; stipend mechanism is the missing piece	—

## Germany — FSJ/BFD

Indicator	Value	Source
Annual participants	97,000+ in regulated services	BaFZA 2022
NEET rate (Germany)	7.5% — well below EU average of 11%	Eurostat 2023
Volunteering rate	43.6% of all residents 14+ engage in voluntary activities	German Volunteering Survey 2019
Link to employment	Volunteering directly linked to labour market integration; soft skills + network building	SALTO; Bertelsmann
Cost per volunteer	~€920/month; hosting orgs bear majority	JFDG analysis
Relevant for Spain?	Yes — decentralised model suits Spanish regional structure; hosting org cost model could be adapted	—
Relevant for Portugal?	Yes — small-scale entry via environmental organisations (like Plantar) replicable	—

## Italy — Servizio Civile Universale

Indicator	Value	Source
Annual participants (2021)	49,984	Dept Youth Policy 2021
Applications vs places	1.7:1 — demand exceeds supply	Dept Youth Policy 2022
Long-term employment impact	Increased employment rates, particularly southern regions — reduces youth unemployment costs	PNRR evaluation
Competence recognition	Formal pathway; counted as public service equivalent in civil service recruitment	Decree 40/2017
NEET rate (Italy)	Among EU's highest — SCU as structural response	Eurostat 2023
Relevant for Romania?	Very — similar unemployment profile, similar historical context (post-communist), similar cultural proximity	—
Relevant for Spain?	Partly — the universal model (no selection criteria) and the JAMO inclusion target align strongly	—

## 6.3 Recommendations for decision-makers

<b>1 — Legal framework</b>	Develop a specific legal status for long-term structured civic engagement that is distinct from 'volunteering' in your national law — and that enables stipends. Model: France (Law 2010-2041), Italy (Decree 40/2017).
<b>2 — National coordinator</b>	Designate or support one body (public agency, NGO federation, or hybrid) as the national coordinator — accrediting hosting organisations and assuring quality. Model: Agence du Service Civique (FR), NIW (PL), ProVobis (RO).
<b>3 — Hosting org registry</b>	Create a national registry of accredited hosting organisations with transparent criteria (mission of general interest, mentoring capacity, no replacement of paid staff).
<b>4 — Stipend mechanism</b>	Provide public co-funding covering at least the basic stipend and social contributions. ESC In-Country can fund pilots; national budget must ultimately sustain it.

<b>5 — Municipal entry points</b>	Engage municipalities first — they are the most accessible decision-makers, have local youth policies, and can co-fund missions. Cascais (PT) and Vallecas/Madrid (ES) show this works.
<b>6 — Competence recognition</b>	Map civic service competencies onto national qualification frameworks. Formal recognition increases programme attractiveness and its contribution to employability — the core ROI driver.
<b>7 — Communication</b>	Do not call it 'volunteering' in public communication if that term carries negative connotations (Romania) or legal restrictions. Invest in a national name that conveys civic duty, opportunity, and compensation.
<b>8 — Use the pilots</b>	This KA2 project generates the evidence needed. Every volunteer profile, mission description, hosting organisation relationship, and impact data point is an argument for public funding. Use it.

## 6.4 The replicable model at a glance

<b>Coordinating structure</b>	1 accredited NGO per region/city; responsible for quality, training, collective programme, and ecosystem building
<b>Hosting organisations</b>	Network of local NGOs, public bodies, schools, municipalities — each with 1 defined mission and 1 designated mentor
<b>Cohort size</b>	10–24 youth (50% local + 50% European in full SCE model; national-only in pilot phase under KA2)
<b>Duration</b>	Minimum 6 months, full-time or near full-time
<b>Training</b>	Induction week + weekly collective day + monthly competency sessions + mid-term evaluation + final presentation
<b>Certification</b>	Youthpass + hosting org certificate + coordinating org competency portfolio
<b>Phase 2 (mobility)</b>	ESC-funded mobility abroad for graduates of Phase 1 — the European dimension
<b>Funding (pilot)</b>	EU project funding (KA2 or ESC); municipality co-funding; foundation grants
<b>Funding (scale)</b>	National budget (stipend + social); hosting org contribution (mentoring); ESC (mobility)
<b>Advocacy</b>	Document everything; present to municipalities first; then regional authorities; then national ministries

## 6.5 The long-term vision

The Collectif pour un Service Civique Européen has articulated three strategic orientations for the period beyond this project:

<b>1 — National convergence</b>	Regular coordination between national civic service institutions and the ESC Agency. Systematic consultancy and training missions for countries developing national programmes. Small-scale testing via ESC In-Country as the entry point.
---------------------------------	--

## 2 — Erasmus for Volunteers

On the Erasmus+ model: national funds cover Phase 1 (basic stipend, host organisation support); ESC covers Phase 2 (language courses, travel, accommodation, additional management costs). With constant EU budgets, this model could deploy tens of thousands of additional volunteers.

## 3 — Multilateral cooperation

Move from bilateral (OFAJ Franco-German, Franco-Italian) to multilateral frameworks. A France–Germany–Italy triangle is immediately feasible. Poland, Spain, Portugal and Romania would join progressively as their national models develop.

The vision: a European Civic Service that is universal in aspiration, local in implementation, national in funding, and multilateral in governance — the second pillar of European youth mobility alongside Erasmus+, backed by the 2022 unanimous Council Recommendation on volunteering.

## Annexes

### Annex A — Glossary

<b>ECS / SCE</b>	European Civic Service — the model promoted by the CSCE network: national Phase 1 + European mobility Phase 2
<b>ESC</b>	European Solidarity Corps — EU instrument for the mobility phase (Phase 2); not the backbone of the SCE model
<b>ESC In-Country</b>	ESC volunteering in the volunteer's own country — used to pilot the national phase where no national programme exists
<b>Coordinating structure</b>	An ESC-accredited NGO managing the overall volunteer experience, collective programme, and ecosystem-building
<b>Hosting organisation</b>	A local association, NGO, public body or municipality offering a defined mission to a volunteer
<b>Mission</b>	A structured 6-month activity of general interest, with a designated mentor and clear skill-development objectives
<b>Cohort / Promotion</b>	A group of volunteers starting simultaneously — typically 10–24 in the SCE model
<b>Tandem principle</b>	50% local + 50% European composition of each SCE cohort in the full model
<b>JAMO</b>	Young people with fewer opportunities — SCE targets minimum 50% JAMO per cohort
<b>OLP</b>	Operatore Locale di Progetto (Italy) — the designated mentor within a hosting organisation
<b>Youthpass</b>	EU non-formal learning certificate available for ESC activities — free, immediate, widely recognised
<b>NIW</b>	National Freedom Institute — Polish body managing the Solidarity Corps programme
<b>IPDJ</b>	Instituto Português do Desporto e Juventude — Portuguese national youth and sport institute
<b>ProVobis</b>	National Resource Centre for Volunteering in Romania
<b>FNT</b>	Fundatia Nationala pentru Tineret — Romanian partner (Bucharest)
<b>MCVS</b>	Malta Council for Voluntary Sector — manages the Youth Voluntary Service
<b>CSCE</b>	Collectif pour un Service Civique Européen — the network coordinating the SCE model across Europe
<b>TIPJEV</b>	Tremplin vers l'Insertion Professionnelle des Jeunes Engagés en Volontariat — Erasmus+ project researching civic service and employability

## Annex B — Mission profile template

<b>Hosting organisation name</b>	
<b>Organisation type</b>	e.g. environmental NGO / social inclusion centre / municipality / school
<b>Mission title</b>	
<b>Mission description</b>	What will the volunteer concretely do, with whom, for whose benefit?
<b>Hard skills the volunteer will develop</b>	e.g. biodiversity monitoring, video production, social work tools
<b>Soft skills the volunteer will develop</b>	e.g. group leadership, communication, initiative
<b>Duration</b>	e.g. 6 months from [month] to [month]
<b>Number of places</b>	
<b>Weekly hours at hosting organisation</b>	
<b>Collective programme days (with coordinating org)</b>	1 day/week (mandatory)
<b>Mentor name &amp; function</b>	
<b>Mentor training?</b>	Will the mentor receive training from the coordinating org? Yes / No
<b>Location (city, district)</b>	
<b>Transport: accessible by public transport?</b>	Yes / No / Partial
<b>Housing provided?</b>	Note: mention only if applicable; this is not a requirement of the model
<b>Language requirements</b>	
<b>Published on missions board?</b>	Yes / Pending / No

## Annex C — National business plan template

(See Part 4.3 for the full template with guiding questions — this annex provides the blank version for each country to complete independently.)

Component	Questions to answer	Our country's answer
<b>A. Vision</b>	What social need does this programme address? Who are the target participants? Is it voluntary or could it become universal?	
<b>B. Legal status</b>	What will participants be called? (not 'volunteer' if that creates legal barriers). What law covers their status? Can they receive a stipend legally?	
<b>C. Stipend &amp; support</b>	What monthly amount is realistic? (benchmark: minimum wage or student allowance). What about housing? Food? Transport?	
<b>D. Governance</b>	Who will be the national coordinating body? Government agency, NGO federation, or hybrid? How will quality be assured?	
<b>E. Hosting organisations</b>	What sectors will be prioritised? What accreditation criteria will apply? How will missions be published?	
<b>F. Training</b>	How many training days? General (civic values) + specific (mission-related)? Who delivers it?	
<b>G. Funding (Year 1)</b>	Public funding (ministry, municipality, EU)? Private co-funding (foundations, corporate)? Cost per volunteer?	
<b>H. Funding (Years 2–5)</b>	Path to state institutionalisation? What proportion of cost should State carry vs hosting orgs?	
<b>I. Scale</b>	How many volunteers in Year 1 (pilot)? Year 3 (scale)? Year 5 (ambition)?	
<b>J. Name</b>	What name works in your language and legal framework? (Avoid terms that trigger labour law restrictions)	
<b>K. Political allies</b>	Which ministry? Which MEPs? Which civil society champions? Which municipalities can be early adopters?	
<b>L. Evidence needed</b>	What data will convince your decision-makers? What does your pilot generate that feeds this argument?	

## Annex D — Volunteer feedback questionnaire

*The structured feedback tool used at mission mid-point and completion — to be finalised in coordination with the R4 research team. It can be found on a side joint document*

## Annex E — Partner contacts

<b>France / Lead</b>	CSCE — Collectif pour un Service Civique Européen — contact: <a href="https://service-civique-europeen.com">https://service-civique-europeen.com</a>
<b>Poland</b>	Center of Mobility (Gdynia) — <a href="https://cwm.org.pl">https://cwm.org.pl</a>
<b>Spain</b>	Coordinadora Infantil y Juvenil de Tiempo Libre de Vallecas (Madrid) <a href="https://coordinadora.org.es/">https://coordinadora.org.es/</a>
<b>Portugal</b>	Plantar Uma Árvore (Cascais) — <a href="https://plantarumaaarvore.pt">https://plantarumaaarvore.pt</a>
<b>Romania</b>	FNT — Fundatia Nationala pentru Tineret (Bucharest)

## Annex F — Key sources

- YouthWiki — *European Youth Wiki: national-policies.eacea.ec.europa.eu/youthwiki*
- SCE Annual Report 2025 — Collectif pour un Service Civique Européen
- KA2 Grand Tour Européen (2022) — Diffusion du Service Civique National et Européen dans toute l'Europe
- Impact reports — YouSCE pilots: Poland (Center of Mobility), Portugal (Plantar Uma Árvore), Spain (Coordinadora Vallecas)
- Law 2010-2041 of 10 March 2010 (France — Service Civique)
- Legislative Decree 40/2017 (Italy — Servizio Civile Universale)
- JFDG — Jugendfreiwilligendienst Act (Germany — FSJ/BFD)
- Law 45/2015 on Volunteering (Spain); Law 78/2014 on volunteering (Romania); Volunteer Act 2003 (Poland)
- Council of the EU Recommendation on volunteering (2022) — unanimous adoption
- Education and Training Monitor 2025 — European Commission
- Eurostat youth unemployment data 2024–2025

Mapping Roots — R5 — Erasmus+ KA2 — Along the Road of the YouSCE — March 2026

*Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them*

