



SAHWA BP 05-2015

Background Paper

PUBLIC POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Asuman Göksel,
Middle East Technical University



Researching
Arab Mediterranean Youth:
Towards a New Social Contract
www.sahwa.eu



This project has received funding from the European Union's
Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological
development and demonstration under grant agreement no 613174

March 2015

I. Introduction

This Background Paper on “Public Policy and International Cooperation” aims to briefly draw the background on how public policy is related to youth in general and how international cooperation schemes affect youth in the Mediterranean region within the overall research objectives of the SAHWA project. Accordingly, the paper is structured in two major parts: Conceptual Framework/State of the Art; and Research Design. In the first part the conceptual framework is drawn from four different but complementary aspects. The first aspect is intended to set the perspectives on the relationship between public policy and youth depending on the literatures of public policy analysis and youth policy. Secondly, the development and priorities of the international cooperation schemes at the European level, and those in relation to the Mediterranean Partner Countries are briefly summarised, and the approach to youth within the specific policy instruments are discussed. Third aspect relates to the place of youth in the public/social/youth policy schemes at the domestic level in the five SAHWA research countries. The first part of the paper concludes with a discussion on the main trends, main links and main conclusions relevant to the research. The second part of the paper is allocated to research design in a way to set the research questions, elaborate on the research methods and reiterate the deliverables to be produced as a result of the research.

II. Conceptual Framework: The State of the Art

a. *Public Policy and Youth*

i. Public policy: Policy problem, policy process, policy actors

A *policy* might be defined as “a relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern” (Anderson, 2003: 4). From such a perspective, three characteristics of policy can be highlighted: policy focuses on a *problem*; it is a *process* and can unfold over time; and, it is done by a set of *actors*.

When *public* as an adjective is added to *policy*, the basic focus appears to be “the public and its problems” (Dewey, 1927 quoted in Parsons, 1995: xv). Public policy is dominantly concerned with the ways in which the societal problems and issues are defined and constructed, and how they are integrated into the political and policy agenda (Parsons, 1995: xv). A quick look at a variety of definitions of public policy makes “the purposive character public policies” and “the way in which they are expected to be related to (societal) problems” visible (Hill and Hupe: 2002: 4). Such an approach underlines the importance of defining the *societal problems* to develop public policies.

The second aspect of public policy is that it is a continuous and cyclical *process*. Considering the policy process as being created “by the interaction of decisions, policy networks, organizations, actors and events”, Minogue (1983) argues that the interaction of society and economy should be considered as the broad environment within which the public policy process is located, in the effort to understand the political consequences of this interaction. In the relatively modern policy studies, the focus of the analysis of policy is more “on the stages through which issues pass, and attempts are made to assess the influence of different factors on the development of the issue” (Hill, 1997). Although there is also awareness among the scholars of the policy studies to avoid using a strict and deterministic way of studying policies in stages; as a general consent, the policy process is a very large and complex phenomenon, which needs to be divided in some way for the sake of simplifying this

complexity and make it amenable both to theoretical and empirical analysis. The literature on policy analysis concentrates on four main stages of public policy process: agenda setting, policy formulation, policy implementation and policy evaluation (Yıldız and Sobacı, 2013: 24). To the extent that public policy is cyclical and continuous, analysis and evaluation of policy is of critical importance in order to feed the loops and cycles of the public policy process.

Going one step further, studying public policy intends to understand “how, why and to what effect governments pursue particular courses of action and inaction” (Heidenheimer et. al., 1990: 3). Public policy does not only involve “what governments do, why they do it, and what difference it makes”, but also “whatever governments choose not to do”, and accordingly studying public policy refers to “description and explanation of causes and consequences of government activity” (Dye, 1995). In such an approach, the major *actor* who owns the policy is defined as the government or in more general terms, “the state and its organisations” (Hill, 1997).

Although, vertically government acts as the policy-maker at the top with hierarchical authority, historically speaking, it is possible to depict a horizontal dimension where many participants get engaged in the policy process, involved in negotiation and formation of consensus (Colebatch, 2002: 24). Policy process is generally conceived as an arena where many internal and external actors from a wide spectrum interact. A variety of actors takes part in the public policy process, such as politicians, political parties, civil servants, citizens, civil society organisations, pressure groups, lobbyists and think-tanks, experts and media, in a way to compete or collaborate for influencing the policy-makers. Sabatier (1999) suggests that understanding policy process requires “knowledge of goals and perceptions of hundreds of actors throughout the country involving possibly very technical scientific and legal issues over periods of a decade or more when most of those actors are actively seeking to propagate their specific ‘spin’ on events.” It is important to state that such an interaction between multiplicity of actors for the making and implementation of public policies is often to take place within the national boundaries.

The classical understanding of public policy, where the major actor is government and major terrain is the nation state, has been challenged and further defined starting from the 1990s, when the transition from “government” to “governance” has been a major paradigm also to analyse public policies. Such a transition is argued to change the nature of the policy process. Richards and Smith (2002: 2) indicate that:

“‘Governance’ is a descriptive label that is used to highlight the changing nature of the policy process in recent decades. It sensitises us to the ever-increasing variety of terrains and actors involved in the making of public policy. Thus, it demands that we consider all the actors and locations beyond the ‘core executive’ involved in the policy-making process.”

Highly related to globalisation phenomenon, the transition from government to governance has been both supported by and increased the role of international and supranational bodies, such as the United Nations and its agencies, European Union, World Bank, OECD etc. not only in the making but also in the implementation of public policies. Economic, social and cultural components of globalisation such as worldwide economic developments, emergence of global financial markets and of transnational or global corporations, diffusion of technology, emergence of global cultural flows have challenged state autonomy and stimulated new political formations beyond the nation state (Hill, 2005: 45). Globalisation is argued to affect public and social policies by setting welfare states in competition with each other; bringing new players into the making of social policy, raising the issues with which social policy is concerned, those of redistribution, regulation and rights, to a supranational level that has both a regional and global dimension; creating a global private market in social provision; and encouraging a global movement of peoples that challenges territorial-based structures and assumptions of welfare obligation and entitlement (Deacon, 2007: 9-10). The

emerging cross-cutting/cross-border nature of the societal problems and global interdependence regarding the solutions of those problems have necessitated integration of local, regional, national, international and supranational levels of public policy making and implementation. This is to say that:

“The social policy of a country or locality is no longer wholly shaped (if it ever was) by the politics of the national government. It is increasingly shaped . . . by the implicit and explicit social policies of numerous supranational agencies ranging from global institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund through supranational bodies such as the OECD and the European Commission.” (Deacon, Hulse and Stubbs, 1997: 10 quoted in Ervik, Kildal, and Nilssen, 2009: 4)

As a result, national public policies have become increasingly affected, dependent and integrated in terms of socio-economic spheres. This is characterised by joint development and implementation of coordinated public policy programmes, with the increasing cooperation between actors such as national governments, representatives of capital and labour, non-state actors such as non-governmental organisations and international organisations, as well as a redefined role for the private sector in the public policy process. It is important to state that such cooperation for public policy has not only been limited to the conditions of official membership to the international and supranational bodies, but has also occurred within the context of different cooperation schemes such as multilateral partnerships and bilateral agreements. Consequently, the increasing involvement of the international/supranational actors in the public policy has had inevitable repercussions on the definition of the societal problems and the policy measures taken to overcome those problems.

ii. Public policy and youth: Towards a youth policy

The literature on public policy and public policy analysis defines a non-exclusive list of areas for public policy. Public policy is often defined by policy sectors and fields such as health, transport, education, environment, social policy, housing, economic policy, urban planning etc. A problem-focussed approach to public policy necessitates going beyond disciplinary boundaries. Thus, analysis of public policy is suggested to be multi-method, multi-disciplinary, problem-focused, concerned to map the contextuality of policy process, policy options and policy outcomes, and whose goal is to integrate knowledge into overarching discipline to analyse public-choices and decision making (Lasswell, 1971 quoted in Parsons, 1995: xvi).

Although youth related policy issues are often considered under the category of public and social policies, to set up the relationship between public policy and youth is always tricky. This is mainly due to the fact that although many fields of public policy in general and social policy in particular such as women, family, labour market etc. have been elaborated and classified in the literature, it is not the case for the place of youth and policies targeting young people, especially in the European perspective (Wallace and Bendit, 2009: 441). In this context, how to relate youth to the public policy analysis is an

important concern. Two inclinations to define the place of youth within the context of public policy can be depicted from the literature, especially in relation to youth policy.

The first approach is that youth is a constitutive element of general public, for the societal problems of whom no specific policies are to be developed. In this understanding, policy measures and initiatives within different arenas or sectors of public policy are considered to have effects also on young people. In such an understanding, youth policy is deduced to a combination of individual political decisions and initiatives related to youth within the context of general public policies, having an eventual impact on young people. In other words, here, youth policy is considered as “a system of complex actions, which are integrated in the other state policy areas” (Djbou, 2012: 21). The advantage of such an approach could be the idea that youth as a category is mainstreamed in all the public policy areas such as health, finance, economic development, housing, justice, foreign affairs, education and so, which would ensure that youth and youth problems are represented in all policy areas across sectors and there would be specific projects addressing youth. However, one of the disadvantages of youth mainstreaming is that societal problems particular to young people are at the risk of being subordinated to wider societal problems that could underestimate the specificities of the problems of youth per se. Another disadvantage would be resulted by any possible incoherency between different policy areas (for example the mismatch between education policy and labour market policy) that would result in contradictory effects on young people. In addition, monitoring of success of individual measures and initiatives for young people would become more difficult, that could eventually result in lack of feedback mechanisms and input for developing better public policies in the future.

A second inclination for defining the place of youth in relation to public policies suggests considering youth as a particular category of public, for which specifically directed policies should be developed. In this understanding, youth becomes a particular subject of public policy, for which policy makers and stakeholders share a comprehensive and common view of the situation and problems of young people in the society. The target group of such a policy approach is not only the general population of young people but also specific sub-groups within that general population (such as young women, offenders or ethnic minorities), which enables the analysis to extend towards such sub-categories around specific policy themes (such as young mothers, or ethnic minority unemployment) (Finland International Report, quoted in Williamson, 2002: 35-36). In this understanding, youth policy is considered as being “cross-sectorial, services of which are shared between various institutions and sectors” (Djbou, 2012: 21) in line with the shared views on youth. This represents a coordinated policy model, which concerns goal action regarding all issues of the young people’s lives, regarding their needs and interests at the same time (Djbou, 2012: 22). In such an approach, youth policy stands at the intersection of a variety of public policies, where it can also be considered as a separate domain, the analysis of which necessitates an “integrated approach”, which cross-cuts almost all areas of public policy. The potential achievement of such integration is argued to require “policy structures which both incorporate political and professional decision-making across sectors affecting young people and engage with representatives of young people who are likely to be affected by those decisions” (Williamson, 2002: 35).

Maybe the biggest advantage of an integrated approach is that different policy initiatives targeted at the solution of youth problems share a common vision of the problems and eventually intend to produce policy outcomes to complement each other in a comprehensive way. However, the necessity for coordination among policy actors and any failure in this regard has the potential to make it very difficult to enhance an integrated approach, which may eventually jeopardise the overall success of the youth policy. Panoply of actors, including the international and supranational bodies as the main proponents of an integrated youth policy, also carries the risk of definition of the policy problems at other levels than the domestic. Accordingly, creation of templates for the solutions to the defined problems may not actually prove to be the best suitable policy option vis-à-vis domestic realities, and accordingly may turn out to carry a limited problem solving capacity.

What one sees in reality in terms of the definition of the relationship between youth and public policy is a combination of those two inclinations, although there is an increasing pressure towards the latter, especially via the policy frameworks drawn by a number of international/supranational organisations. Before going into the development of international policy approaches towards youth and cooperation schemes as policy tools, it is better to summarise the approach to youth at national policy level, and identify the areas/sectors and major themes, issues and principles that define youth policy altogether.

Any policy developed for young people depends on the perception of the governments (or in more general sense of the policy makers) regarding the role of young people in society. Case studies, especially those conducted on European countries identify two main perceptions of young people either as a “problem” or as a “resource” (Denstad, 2009: 17). For example, in their comparative study, Wallace and Bendit (2009: 445) classify youth policies in European countries with such a criterion of two dominant images of young people as a basis and identify different models of youth policy (Figure 1).

Model of youth policy	Countries	Philosophies of intervention			Target groups		
		Dominant image of youth	Major aims	Major problems	Target social groups	Target age groups	Youth sector
Universalistic model	Denmark Finland (Iceland) Norway Sweden	Youth as a resource	Autonomy Independence Development Political participation	Participation of youth	Whole generation of youth	13/15 to 25 years	Minor or no youth sector
Community based model	Ireland United Kingdom	Youth as a problem	Prevention of social problems Political participation	Prolonging of youth Social exclusion Participation of youth	Disadvantaged youth	Primary school to 25 years	Minor or no youth sector
Protective model	Austria Belgium (France) Germany Liechtenstein Luxembourg Netherlands	Vulnerable youth Youth as a resource Youth as a problem	Integration Prevention of social problems Political participation	Participation of youth Social exclusion	Whole generation of youth Disadvantaged youth	0 to 25/30 years	Major youth sector
Centralised model	Greece (Italy) Portugal Spain	Youth as a problem Youth as a resource	Autonomy Independence Integration Political participation	Prolonging of youth Social exclusion	Specialised groups of youth	15 to 25/30 years	Major youth sector

Figure 1: Typology of Youth Policies (Wallace and Bendit, 2009: 445)

Denstad (2009: 17) states that traditionally speaking, governments' approach to youth and youth policy has been dominated by a problem-oriented perspective, which considers young people either as vulnerable or in danger, falling into the category that need to be protected through government policies, or as troublemakers. Accordingly, such a perception leads youth policy to target only specific segments of the youth population, with very limited or no co-ordination between different sectors (Denstad, 2009: 17). On the other hand, Denstad (2009: 17) argues that the perspective, which perceives young people as a resource in society, values young people as capable citizens, and focuses on the ways in which the government can ensure the active participation of all young people in society and empower them to realise their full potential as citizens. Such kind of an approach is associated with the integrated cross-sectoral governmental approach towards young people, in a way to keep their needs and challenges under consideration.

In a way to define what youth policy is, comprehensive comparative studies of national youth policies suggest that there are basically two dimensions of youth policy: key domains and key issues. Key policy domains that usually fall under sub-dimensions of broader public policy can be summarised as follows (Williamson, 2002; Williamson, 2008):

- education (schooling and non-formal learning/youth work);
- post-compulsory education and training;
- employment and the labour market;
- health;
- housing;
- social protection and income support;
- welfare and family;
- criminal justice;
- leisure (including sports and arts);
- national defence and military service; and,
- values and religion.

Besides policy domains, youth policy is also considered around key policy issues (Williamson, 2008), which can be considered as horizontal elements which cross-cut a variety of policy domains:

- opportunities for participation and citizenship;
- safety and protection;
- combating social exclusion and promoting inclusion;
- the provision and use of information (including new information technologies);
- mobility and internationalism;
- multiculturalism;
- equalities;
- radicalisation/reaction of segments of the youth population versus conformity;
- local versus global pressures;
- centre – periphery;
- urban – rural polarisation;
- elites and outsiders;

environmental issues; and
the role of the Diaspora.

Particularly important for the aims of this Background Paper, it is important to note a rising trend for the making of youth policies in the recent years: “evidence-based policy making” within the context of youth policies. It is conceived as “a means of gathering and sharing better evidence and understanding of young people’s living conditions, values and attitudes to share with other relevant policy fields” in order for “government strategies and policies for young people to be successful”¹. For this aim, evidence-based youth policy promotes gathering and analysis of evidence (data, indicators, statistics etc.) on young people’s life experiences; and encourages discussion among people involved in youth work, policy-makers and researchers.

b. International cooperation schemes for the young people in the Euro-Mediterranean region: Priorities and field of action

This section briefly summarises the development and priorities of the international cooperation schemes at the European level, and those in relation to the Mediterranean Partner Countries. For the three particular schemes discussed in this section, the common denominator is the involvement of and role played by the European Union. Although it is well acknowledged that many different actors such as the World Bank, United Nations agencies and bilateral cooperation agreements (especially with the USA) play a role in shaping and (financially) supporting the youth related policies and policy instruments in the Mediterranean region in general and in Arab countries in particular, the analysis in relation to the public policies and international cooperation research within the context of SAHWA project will limit its focus on those significant and sustainable international cooperation schemes initiated and/or supported by the European Union.

The international cooperation schemes targeting youth in the Arab Mediterranean countries to be elaborated in this section includes the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme, the Youth Partnership of European Union and Council of Europe and the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures.

i. Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme

Initiated in 1999, Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme has been a unique initiative of the European Union, targeting mobility, dialogue, intercultural exchange and cooperation between young people from Europe and Mediterranean regions. Since its inception, Euro-Mediterranean Youth Programme has been one of the most

¹ http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/implementation/policy_making_en.htm

comprehensive international cooperation schemes in the field of youth between the European Union and Mediterranean partner countries.

The establishment and development of the Euro-Med Youth Programme represents a synergy between two broader European policy schemes: Barcelona Process and Euro-Mediterranean Partnership on the one hand, and EU's Youth Programme(s)² on the other. Barcelona Process, as a particular stage of the EU's foreign policy towards the Mediterranean region, is based on the signature of the "Barcelona Declaration" in 1995 between the 15 EU and 12 Mediterranean partner countries³. It was considered as the start of a partnership within a broad framework of political, economic and social relations between the European Union member states and the Mediterranean partner countries. The third chapter of the Barcelona Process (Social, Cultural and Human Affairs) envisaged that dialogue between young people from all the Euro-Mediterranean partners would help in "fostering mutual understanding among the people of the region, integrating young people into social and professional life, and contributing to the process of democratisation of the civil society"⁴. For this aim, youth exchanges were considered as a tool for preparing future generations to closer co-operation between the two shores of the Mediterranean. In addition, ensuring the presence and active involvement of civil society was a central concern of the Partnership. In this regard, youth civil society organisations were considered as important agents for the construction and implementation of youth policy on the one hand, and for the development of the youth work, on the other. In order to achieve those objectives, the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership envisaged the need to ensure the development of and support to Euro-Mediterranean youth work through providing incentives for the intercultural youth projects, as well as support for the youth workers and youth leaders.

It is against this background that the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Programme was adopted in 1998. Based on the priorities of the EU Youth Programme(s), the European Union has adapted the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Programme in line with the "perceived" needs of the Mediterranean youth: the fight against racism, discrimination and xenophobia; greater and easier access to life for young people with fewer opportunities; and dialogue with other cultures. Gender equality, minority rights and protection of the environment and the cultural heritage have always been among the thematic priorities of the programme. This is to say that the European Union integrated Mediterranean youth into its already existing youth

² In its different phases, the EU programmes targeting youth have been named differently: Youth for Europe; Youth Programme (2000-2006), Youth in Action (2007-2013) and now youth is considered within the overall framework of Erasmus+ Programme (2014-2020).

³ Parties to the Barcelona Declaration in 1995 were 15 EU member states and 12 Mediterranean states, namely Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, the Palestinian Authority, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey. Libya had observer status.

⁴ <https://www.salto-youth.net/rc/euromed/saltoeuromed/euromedyouthprogramme/abouteuromedyouth/>

programmes through the signature of the Barcelona Declaration and since then it has provided cooperation schemes and funding for the youth sector.

Although the geographical composition of the Euro-Med Youth Programme has changed several times (due to the EU enlargements on the one hand and the changing involvement of the Mediterranean countries on the other⁵), and although the implementation of the stages of the Programme has been delayed for a few times due to political and financial reasons, Euro-Med Youth Programme has been one of the most sustainable international cooperation schemes in the Mediterranean youth field.

Chronology of the involvement of youth in the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership⁶

- 1992 EU support for dialogue between young people and for youth exchanges included the Mediterranean, through the EU programme Youth for Europe.
- 1996 Launch of the EU programme European Voluntary Service for the Mediterranean partners.
- 1996 A conference in Amman on “Youth Exchanges between the European Union and its Mediterranean partners” brought officials and NGO representatives together, for discussion on the objectives of a new co-operation scheme under the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership.
- 1997 The second Euro-Mediterranean Conference, held in Malta in April 1997, reiterated that a programme of activities for young people should be put forward soon.
- 1998 The first Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme (1999-2001) was adopted by the European Commission and the Euro-Mediterranean Committee.
- 2001 The second phase of the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Programme (2001-2004).
- 2005 Before launching Phase III of the Euro-Med Youth Programme, the centralised mode of the programme was reviewed and preparations were made to decentralise management of it.
- 2007 The decentralised Euro-Med Youth Programme III (2005-2008) started.
- 2009 Euro-Med Youth Programme IV (2010-2013) was approved.

⁵ Malta and Cyprus became full EU member states in 2004. Turkey has been fully integrated into the EU Youth Programmes as a result of its pre-accession status. Involvement of some Mediterranean Partner Countries in the Programme has been subject to bilateral agreements between the country in question and the EU.

⁶ Adopted and updated from “Political and Institutional Framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Work” in MOSAIC: T-Kit on Euro-Mediterranean Youth Work, Council of Europe and European Commission publication, 2010.

Since 1999, Euro-Med Youth Programme has been implemented in four stages⁷. Euro-Med Youth I (1999-2001) and Euro-Med Youth II (2001-2004) were the centralised phases of the Programme, within which the activities of the youth civil society organisations (namely youth exchanges, voluntary service and support measures) from the Mediterranean partner countries were financed directly by the European Commission. During the Phase III of Euro-Med Youth Programme (2005-2008), the programme management was transferred to the Euro-Med Youth Units, established by the national authorities of the following countries and territories: Algeria, Palestinian Authority, Jordan, Israel, Lebanon, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, and Turkey. Such a decentralisation process is argued to allow “the appropriation of the programme by the Mediterranean partner countries and a closer relation with the beneficiaries through the creation of Euro-Med Youth Units”⁸.

In 2009, the European Commission has adopted⁹, in the context of the European Neighbourhood Policy, the Regional Strategy Paper (2007-2013) and the Regional Indicative Programme (2007-2013) for the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, the Euro-Med Youth IV for the years 2010-2013. The Euro-Med Youth IV aims non-formal education and to encourage youth activities involving partners on both shores of the Mediterranean, providing funds to the Mediterranean youth organisations developing activities for youth implemented in Mediterranean partner countries.¹⁰ 35 countries participate in the Euro-Med Youth IV: the **27 EU Member States**¹¹ and eight **Mediterranean partner countries**, signatories of the Barcelona Declaration, namely Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Tunisia and Israel.

The general objective of the Euro-Med Youth Programme, as reiterated also in Phase IV, is “to support and strengthen the participation and contribution of youth organisations and youth from the Euro-Mediterranean region towards the development of civil society and democracy”.¹² Its specific objectives are:

⁷ <http://euromedyouth.net/Description-and-legal-bases.html>

⁸ <http://euromedyouth.net/Description-and-legal-bases.html>

⁹ Commission Decision C(2009) 5215 of 01/07/2009 approving the second part of the 2009 Annual Action Programme in favour of the Mediterranean region to be financed under Article 19 08 01 01 of the general budget of the European Communities. Available at: http://euromedyouth.net/IMG/pdf/aap_2009_enpi-s_en.pdf.

¹⁰ <http://euromedyouth.net/Description-and-legal-bases.html>

¹¹ 25 Member States of the EU are Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and United Kingdom.

¹² <http://www.euromedyouth.net/OBJECTIVES.html>

- **To stimulate and encourage mutual understanding between young people within the Euro-Mediterranean region and to fight against stereotypes and prejudices.**
- **To promote active citizenship among young people and enhance their sense of solidarity**
- **To contribute to the development of youth policies in the different partner countries.**

The Programme works through the promotion of mobility of young people and understanding between peoples through three types of actions, namely Euro-Med Youth Exchanges; Euro-Med Youth Voluntary Service; and Euro-Med Youth Training and Networking activities such as contact making seminars, study visits, training courses and seminars.¹³ The target groups of the Euro-Med Youth Programme are youth non-governmental organisations at local and national level and their partners (as the beneficiaries of the grants); youth leaders, youth workers, volunteers (as the actors and stakeholders of the youth field) and the young people (as the final beneficiaries of the Programme)¹⁴.

Throughout the history of the Programme, hundreds of projects prepared by beneficiaries of the Programme both in the EU and Mediterranean countries were funded by the European Commission, and thousands of young people had the chance to benefit from mobility and intercultural exchange opportunities. For example, throughout the EuroMed Youth III (2007-2008), a total number of 307 projects were financially supported for a total budget of almost 10.000.000 Euro; and, a total of 7.154 participants (young people, youth leaders and youth workers) and 226 youth organisations benefited from the Programme.¹⁵

In its implementation, many different actors function in cooperation with each other for the success of the Euro-Med youth programme. Many actors such as the Euro-Med Youth Units, national youth authorities, youth organisations and youth project leaders and many stakeholders Mediterranean partner countries, European Commission - including European Union Delegations -, National Agencies and National Authorities in charge of Youth in Action programme in each European Union Member States work in

¹³ <http://www.euromedyouth.net/About-EuroMed-Youth-Program,51.html>

¹⁴ <http://www.euromedyouth.net/TARGETS.html>

¹⁵ 2007-2008 Euro-Med Youth Projects, Two years of Euro-Mediterranean Youth Cooperation, Euro-Med III and Youth in Action Programmes, SALTO Euro-Med Resource Centre. Available at: <https://www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17-1830/INJEP%20-%20EuroMed%20Youth%20Projects-Web.pdf?>

coordination and cooperation for the implementation of the Programme¹⁶. In addition, institutions such as Anna Lindh Foundation, Salto Youth Euromed Resource Centre, Euro-Med Youth Platform, ENPI EuroMed Info Centre cooperate for providing support for the implementation of the Euro-Med Youth Programme.

ii. Youth Partnership of the European Union and the Council of Europe

Another (European) international scheme targeting youth is the partnership established between the European Union (EU) and the Council of Europe (CoE) in 1998. The *main aim* of the European Union and Council of Europe Youth Partnership has been to advance synergies between the youth-oriented activities, resources and initiatives of the two institutions. Coupling the commitments and activities of the two partner institutions in the youth field is meant to justify a common European approach in situations and on issues that are of common interest regarding youth to both institutions. In this context, all the activities can be easily considered as being linked to the values and priorities of both institutions, aiming to add value to their political objectives, being complementary in order to avoid overlaps. The Partnership assigns great importance to addressing the needs of young people and the youth field in a wider sense, including decision makers, governmental experts, youth researchers, youth practitioners and youth organisations, in order to ensure the success of the youth partnership.¹⁷

In terms of *thematic focus*, the Partnership first started with the theme of European youth work training, and the cooperation has been enhanced in time towards the development of a strategy in the field of youth training, youth research and youth policy co-operation. In this context, specific themes and issues of European citizenship; human rights education and intercultural dialogue; quality and recognition of youth work and training; better understanding and knowledge of youth; and youth policy development have been of particular interest within the context of the Partnership.

By the 2014, the European Union and Council of Europe members and other signatory states of the European Cultural Convention, as well as neighbouring South Mediterranean countries are within the *geographical scope* of the Partnership. Throughout its history, particular importance for cooperation has been given to South-East Europe, Eastern Europe and the Caucasus and Euro-Mediterranean (rephrased as

¹⁶ <http://www.euromedyouth.net/Key-actors-of-Euromed-Youth.html>

¹⁷ <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/about-us2>

South Mediterranean co-operation for the most recent agreement) to foster youth cooperation with Europe.¹⁸

The most recent Framework Partnership Agreement in the field of youth signed by the European Union and the Council of Europe covers the period of 2014-2016 and has three *specific themes*¹⁹:

1. Participation/citizenship, including new concepts and tools
2. Social inclusion with a focus on outreach, access to social rights, and fighting new forms of xenophobia and discrimination against vulnerable groups
3. Recognition and quality of youth work.

In addition, the new Partnership by the 2014 mainly focuses on better knowledge on youth, for knowledge and evidence-based youth policy and practice, and promotion of youth work.

Throughout its 16 years of history, the Partnership between EU and CoE in the field of youth has a special geographical and political focus on the Mediterranean partner countries. From the Council of Europe's perspective, as an international organisation working for the promotion of human rights and the development of democratic forms of participation, the Mediterranean area has been considered as a highly relevant and connected region, especially within the context of the promotion of peace and human rights. Accordingly, a particular emphasis of the Partnership has been identified as the Euro-Mediterranean youth co-operation, encompassing a focus on the training of trainers and project leaders, human rights education, intercultural dialogue and youth policy co-operation. One of the major objectives of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership in the field of youth has been to guarantee the "quality development and support to Euro-Med youth work", from the perspective of contributing to the quality and quantity of the intercultural youth initiatives between Europe and the Mediterranean, and developing youth workers' and leaders' skills and competences in dealing with the issues of common concern in and between those two regions.²⁰

A closer look at the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation within the context of the Youth Partnership between the EU and the CoE shows that the programme had three major components: human rights education, intercultural dialogue and youth policy

¹⁸ <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/about-us2>

¹⁹ <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/partnership-for-the-period-2014-16>

²⁰ <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/web/youth-partnership/south-mediterranean-cooperation>

cooperation. In this context, *human rights education* refers to the specific objective of the Youth Partnership, namely the promotion of European citizenship human rights education and respect for diversity. The activities for human rights education include the publication of the Arabic translation of Compass²¹, a series of regional training courses in the Arabic-speaking region, with the purpose of supporting the emergence of networks of trainers and multipliers in the region and developing the capacity of youth organisations to introduce human rights education in their work²². Being a cross-cutting theme for the Council of Europe and the European Union, *intercultural dialogue* is considered as a fundamental objective and implicit part of all Euro-Mediterranean youth activities. In this context, Youth Partnership has organised training courses, seminars on intercultural dialogue, as well as launched the project on the indicators for intercultural dialogue in non-formal learning/education activities as a tool for organisers, facilitators, trainers of non-formal learning/education activities.²³ *Youth policy cooperation* was initiated in 2005 by the Youth Partnership together with several national and regional partners, to foster greater cooperation between youth policy stakeholders. Youth policy cooperation aims, on the one hand, to contribute to the recognition of cooperation among institutions responsible for youth policy (public and private), and to result in an expansion of partnerships and co-operation with a variety of institutions concerned by Euro-Mediterranean and Euro-Arab co-operation on the other.²⁴

Many activities have been organised within this framework of the Partnership, in order to provide educational tools and support for youth workers and trainers in Euro-Mediterranean youth work. Seminars and training courses, especially on issues of common concern such as citizenship, intercultural learning and dialogue, human rights and participation in the Mediterranean and the production of training and education materials have been two fields of activity for the Partnership. All those activities have been realised in cooperation with national partners and with other organisations active in the region, such as the SALTO Euro-Med Resource Centre, the Anna Lindh Foundation for Dialogue between Cultures, the Euro-Med Youth Platform, the European Youth Forum and the League of Arab States.

iii. The Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures

Anna Lindh Foundation (ALF) was established in 2005 by the members of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, with the aim of bringing people together from across the

²¹ Compass is the manual on human rights education with young people, produced within the framework of the Human Rights Education Youth Programme of the Directorate of Youth and Sport of the Council of Europe. It is available in many languages at <http://eycb.coe.int/compass/>.

²² <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/human-rights-education>

²³ <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/intercultural-dialogue>

²⁴ <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/youth-policy-co-operation>

Mediterranean to improve mutual respect between cultures and to support civil society working for a common future for the region.²⁵ Developing as a region-wide Network²⁶ of over 4000 civil society organisations involved in the promotion of intercultural dialogue across Europe and the Mediterranean and being supported by the European Commission, ALF is an important initiative in the field, supporting and funding many Euro-Mediterranean youth projects every year.

The main scope of activities of the ALF covers the actions across fields impacting on mutual perceptions – education, culture and media. It works to overcome “the misunderstandings and stereotypes which affect relations between and within the societies of the Region”. ALF also provides recommendations to decision-makers and institutions and advocating for shared values.²⁷

Statutes of the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures²⁸ indicate that the Foundation is established to “promote the dialogue between cultures and contribute to the visibility of the Barcelona Process through intellectual, cultural and civil society exchanges”. For this aim, Foundation aims at:

- promoting knowledge, recognition and mutual respect between the religions and beliefs, cultures, and values which prevail in the partners;
- identifying, developing and promoting areas of cultural convergence between the Euro-Mediterranean countries and peoples, with the aim in particular of promoting tolerance, cultural understanding and avoiding stereotypes, xenophobia and racism;
- encouraging initiatives which aim at promoting a dialogue between religions and beliefs and on ensuring diversity and pluralism in the Euro-Mediterranean region;
- promoting the human dimension of the partnership as well as the consolidation of the rule of law and of basic freedoms; and,
- underlining the vital importance of ensuring that all partners encourage the development and deepening of the cultural and human dimension of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership in all its aspects and its various components at bilateral or multilateral level.

²⁵ <http://www.annalindhfoundation.org/mandate-and-founders>

²⁶ <http://www.annalindhfoundation.org/networks>

²⁷ <http://www.annalindhfoundation.org/mandate-and-founders>

²⁸ Available at: http://www.annalindhfoundation.org/sites/annalindh.org/files/documents/page/04-09-alf_statutes_0_0_0.pdf

In line with its aims and objectives, ALF organises activities on a variety of themes such as the empowerment of women; peace; human rights; learning, education and knowledge societies; Euro-Med heritage; popular music; educational and cultural journalism; culture of religions; and, school textbooks and curricula. Particular importance is given to the development of human resources in a way to strengthen intellectual cooperation and ensure capacity building.

c. Policies regarding youth in five Arab countries

This section briefly looks at the youth related policies at the domestic level in five SAHWA research countries, namely Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia, depending on the available literature. First a summary of the common problems of youth in those countries will be provided, and then each country will be briefly sketched in relation to the institutional characteristics of the policies dealing with youth and situation of youth civil society.

Actually, the literature on the policies targeting youth in most of the Arab Mediterranean countries are rather scarce. There are only limited number of studies and research available on youth related issues and policies, mostly being reports prepared in cooperation with a variety of international institutions, and dealing with particular aspects such as youth political participation and civic engagement (Saghieh, 2012; National Democratic Institute, 2011; World Bank, 2012; UNESCO, 2011; League of Arab States, 2007); labour market, employment and unemployment (Abdellatif and Mohammed, 2014; Lane, Hakim and Miranda, 1999; Boughzala, 2013; Haouas, Sayre and Yagoubi, 2012; Stampini and Verdier-Chouchane, 2011; ETF, 2012; ILO, 2012); transition from school to work (United Nations, 2011; Quintini and Martin, 2014; United Nations, 2011); and, youth exclusion and youth inclusion (Assaad and Barsoum, 2007; Barsoum, 2013; UNESCO, 2013; Boudarbat and Ajbilou, 2007; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 2014; Paciello, 2012). In this context, any study regarding youth policy per se is also limited. Even when they exist, they those studies on youth policy are often prepared by the international organisations (those often act as donors working with the national youth authorities in those countries) such as the World Bank, UN agencies located in Arab countries and the European Union, and the think tanks such as youthpolicy.org²⁹. Scarcity of country specific information regarding the youth policy in the five SAHWA research countries actually point out to the need to produce further information and knowledge through research initiatives.

²⁹ Youthpolicy.org defines itself as an “independent think tank and publishing house, working at the junction of youth policy, youth research, youth media and youth work” in order to provide evidence for youth policy. <http://www.youthpolicy.org/about/>.

In relation to youth policy in the Mediterranean Arab countries, the most comprehensive studies are the “Youth Policy Studies in the Mediterranean Partner Countries (2009) conducted by the Regional Capacity Building and Support Unit at INJEP, France, within the capacity of the Euro-Med Youth III Programme of the European Union. In this framework, 10 youth policy studies³⁰ were produced on the evolution of the youth sector in the Mediterranean partner countries, including Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia. The objectives of these youth policy studies were to identify the remit of existing youth policies, legal regulations and youth structures in the 10 Mediterranean partner countries and explore to what extent the national youth strategies addressed the various needs of young people; and to understand the role and work of youth NGOs, and of other relevant actors.³¹ The aim of the reports is to provide a picture of the actual situation in those countries, in order to provide a tool and a starting point that would allow stakeholders in the youth field and youth project organisers to gain an overview of the youth policies and provisions for youth in those countries. Therefore, the resulting reports of the studies provide comprehensive information on the current youth situation, the challenges faced by the young people, and provision made available, at variant standards, by national, public and non-governmental institutions and organisations. Six main themes were included in the research and subsequent publications³²: youth policy and legislation; young people’s rights as citizens (to what extent the existing policy and legislations addressed the various needs and entitlements of the young people); challenges faced by young people; role and impact of non-formal education; place of the EuroMed Youth Programme within the national youth policy; and, the place and role of other youth support mechanisms.

A brief comparison of the main conclusions of the Youth Policy Studies on Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia show that there are parallel trends regarding approach to youth and development of policies towards young people in those countries. Some common challenges for youth in those countries can be summarised as follows: the difficulties faced by young people in transition to work and employment and the high rates of unemployment; poverty; difficulties faced in terms of education opportunities and quality of education; gender disparities and instances of gender inequalities between young women and young men; dominance of family in the social structure and young people’s (often financial) dependence on their families; lack of support to youth and legal and financial difficulties faced by the non-governmental youth organisations; and, feeling themselves somewhere between tradition and modernity. A very common pattern of reaction to such challenges from many young people in those countries is the desire to immigrate to other countries.

³⁰ The Youth Policy Studies in the Mediterranean Partner Countries. Available at: www.euromedyouth.net/studies-on-youth-policies-in-meda,027.

³¹ <https://www.salto-youth.net/rc/euromed/EMlibrary/emeducpub/EMyouthpolicies/>.

³² <https://www.salto-youth.net/rc/euromed/EMlibrary/emeducpub/EMyouthpolicies/>

In terms of policy responses to such societal problems, it is not possible to argue that in all of the countries a comprehensive youth policy or strategy exists³³. As a result of the comparison of main conclusions of the Youth Policy Studies on Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia, it is possible to argue that many of those countries, policies regarding young people are fragmented through plural strategies, multiplicity of public actors dealing with youth issues, multiplicity of actions and schemes with lack of effectiveness and consistence due to the lack of mechanisms of consultation and coordination of various institutions working on youth issues, lack of a common or comprehensive vision and strategy in the medium or long-term. In most of the cases, it is not surprising to see that priority is given to sports rather than youth. As a result, young people feel themselves disconnected from the public authorities and complain about the absence of the state support and public action and lack of state dynamism concerning the problems of youth. A recent study shows that after the uprisings in 2011, either the transition governments or current regimes in Tunisia, Egypt, Algeria and Morocco have not attempted to “reorient economic policies toward a development model that is more inclusive of youth”, which eventually reflects “a continuity in the political economy of youth exclusion, albeit with important differences between North African countries” (Paciello, 2012: 23).

The following section attempts to sketch the existence and major characteristics of youth policies, as well as its institutional set up, in five SAHWA research countries individually.

Algeria

In 2009, young people constituted 30% of the overall population in Algeria, corresponding to more than 10 million young individuals aged 15-29 (Rarrbo, 2009a: 6). With a score of 0.51 at the Youth Development Index³⁴, Algeria is ranked as the 116th country (out of 170) reflecting a medium level youth development (Commonwealth,

³³ Only in Morocco and Lebanon there are youth policy documents, adopted in 2003 and 2012 respectively.

³⁴ The Youth Development Index (YDI), as an initiative of Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP), composes of 15 key indicators in five domains, namely education, health and well-being, employment, political participation and civic participation for young people, in a way to measure youth development in 170 countries. The YDI is to measure basic needs such as health, nutrition and adequate education, as well as secondary needs such as political, economic and social participation. The YDI calculates a score for each country between 0–1 as the national average and then groups the countries into high, medium and low youth development levels. The aim of the YDI is “to inform policy-makers and raise public awareness about the key opportunities and barriers to improving youth development in the Commonwealth” and to act as “a data advocacy tool, highlighting the importance of gathering national level statistics on key indicators of youth development”. <http://youthdevelopmentindex.org/views/faq.php> and <http://youthdevelopmentindex.org/views/about.php>.

2013: 10). Although the share of youth within the overall population is quite high, Algeria has no comprehensive youth policy framework or strategy that could be labelled as youth policy per se. Instead, it has various regulations and programmes that affect youth, with a multiplicity of public actors dealing with youth issues (Rarrbo, 2009a: 7).

Studies on Youth Policies in the Mediterranean Partner Countries: Algeria states that youth issues primarily fall under the competence of the Ministry of Youth and Sports along with other institutional actors namely the Ministries of Employment, Solidarity, National Education, Vocational Training, Culture and Justice. The main investments are observed in the sectors of education and training, however, in 2007, for the first time, the government convened a meeting dedicated to youth policy with two underlying objectives: to examine how policies are relevant and able to address youth concerns and to respond satisfactorily to their expectations; and to define the content and main lines of a coherent and integrated policy in its vision towards youth, with a participatory approach (Rarrbo, 2009a: 7). In 2008, two programmes on youth unemployment were initiated: one on young graduates and one on opportunity to get first job (Rarrbo, 2009a: 7). In terms of the provision of youth services, through its directorates throughout the country, the Ministry of Youth and Sport supervises local youth centres, youth hostels, village halls, youth camps, and sport facilities (youthpolicy.org, 2014a). Other ministries such as of Employment and Social Security and of National Solidarity offer programmes and incentives to support employment of young people with education (Rarrbo, 2009a: 20). In terms of the character of the policies targeting youth, Rarrbo (2009a: 19) argues that political and administrative organisation of the Algerian institutions is strongly centralised and accordingly there is no transversality on public action, which refers to the lack of a multi-sectoral approach regarding the youth issues.

Regarding the representation of young people and youth organisations, in Algeria there is no local or national youth councils, nor any formal federation for Algerian youth associations dealing with social development or youth matters (Rarrbo, 2009a: 23). A newspaper article states that the Secretary of State responsible for Youth announced the first national youth forum, to “discuss their experiences, their concerns but also their ambitions” (youthpolicy.org, 2014a).

Egypt

According to the Egypt Human Development Report, in 2010, young people aged 18-29 is estimated to cover 23.5% of the total population of Egypt, corresponding to 19.8 million young individuals (UNDP, 2010: 2). With a score of 0.64 at the Youth Development Index, Egypt is ranked as the 86th country (out of 170) reflecting a medium level youth development (Commonwealth, 2013: 10). Youthpolicy.org (2014b) classifies the existence of youth policy in Egypt as “unclear”. Although in 2009 a Proposed National Policy for Youth in Egypt was developed by the National Council for Youth (predecessor of the Ministry of State for Youth Affairs), there is no evidence that it was

adopted as a national youth policy; there exists only some political statements from the Ministry of State for Youth Affairs in 2013 regarding the development of a Youth Act (youthpolicy.org, 2014b).

Proposed National Policy for Youth in Egypt dated 2009 by the previous National Council for Youth addressed 12 policy areas: employment; political participation; education; health; population; culture; mass media; social activities and volunteer work; social welfare; sports and recreation; environment, and; studies and research (UNDP, 2010: 13-15). By the 2009, the overall outlook regarding the institutional set up of youth policy in Egypt was reflecting a variety of authorities and actors such as the National Council for Youth, the National Council for Sport, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Higher Education (Abdelhay, 2009: 7). The National Council for Youth was in charge of formulating and implementing cross-sectorial policies, however, uncertainty about its ability to guarantee effective implementation of those policies was stated by Abdelhay (2009: 7), to the extent that “there was only a restricted cross-sectorial national youth policy without strong linkage to other youth-serving ministries”. According to the Fact Sheet on Egypt (youthpolicy.org, 2014b), recently the Ministry of State for Youth Affairs, which has taken over the role of previous National Council of Youth in the post-2011 period, is responsible for child and youth related measures in Egypt, with the strategic goals for 2013-2017 of enhancing political participation of youth, building cultural awareness, and developing training and research on youth.

Studies show that the share of youth organisations in comparison to the overall number of NGOs in Egypt is rather small (less than 0.5%) Abdelhay (2009: 7). They generally face major obstacles to become more effective, such as limited funding, poorly qualified staff, and difficulty in attracting unpaid volunteers (Human Development Report, 2008: 72-73 quoted in Abdelhay (2009: 8).

Lebanon

In 2009 young people aged 18-29 constituted 27% of the total population of about four million in Lebanon (YAP and Youth Forum for Youth Policy, 2012: 3). With a score of 0.69 at the Youth Development Index, Lebanon is ranked as the 57th country (out of 170) reflecting a medium level youth development (Commonwealth, 2013: 10). Lebanon is one of the two SAHWA research countries that have a national youth policy. It was adopted by the Council of Ministers on 3 April 2012, with a Ministerial Decree; and it was launched by the President with a ceremony on 1 December 2012 (YAP and Youth Forum for Youth Policy, 2012).

The Ministry of Youth and Sports is responsible for youth affairs in Lebanon since the 2000 (youthpolicy.org, 2014c). A separate department for youth besides sports within the Ministry was established in 2009, with a special focus on youth development and

policy issues (youthpolicy.org, 2014c). However, it is argued that the role and authority of the Ministry is not clearly defined, since the ways of the Ministry's following up youth policy implementation by other ministries is not identified (UNESCO, 2013: 36).

The making of the national youth policy in Lebanon can be considered as a joint effort started in 2000 within the framework of Youth Advocacy Process (YAP) (YAP and Youth Forum for Youth Policy, 2012). Launched in 2000 by a group of youth organisations, and in partnership with the Ministry of Youth and Sports and the United Nations Youth Task Force (YAP, 2012), Youth Advocacy Process (YAP) has defined itself as "a network of youth organisations working together to have a national youth policy in Lebanon, which provides youth with opportunities to participate in the public life as decision makers" (YAP, 2010: 1). The way in which Youth Advocacy Process worked was based on: "identifying youth needs; categorising them into sectors; and forming task forces in each sector; developing youth policy recommendations in each sector; presenting these to the Ministry of Youth and Sports; lobbying various decision makers to acknowledge these recommendations" (UNESCO, 2013: 36). As an outcome of this process, not only "a consensus building process over the youth policy document" was approved by the Council of Ministers' decision No. 80/ 2007 entitled "National Advice over the Youth Policy" in 2007, but also the Youth Forum for Youth Policy, as a national youth organisation/platform that comprises of youth NGOs and the youth wings of political parties nationwide, was established with the aim "to influence decision makers through its youth policy recommendations, monitor the endorsement of the youth policy, as well as its implementation and evaluation" (YAP and Youth Forum for Youth Policy, 2012: 5).

Regarding the substance of the national youth policy in Lebanon, it is possible to outline five policy categories: demography and migration; labour and economic participation; education and culture; health; social integration and political participation (youthpolicy.org, 2014c). In a document prepared by UNESCO (2013: 36-38), Lebanese youth policy is analysed as a case study by using a checklist. According to that study, it is positively identified as having a clearly defined target group (youth as those aged 15-29); having a concrete and transparent strategy (transparent development of youth policy, including all political parties, 12 ministries and civil society organisations and proposing concrete policy measures); promoting youth participation in economic, political and social senses; and, having a cross-sectoral, integrated approach to youth policy by covering different issues in one document (UNESCO, 2013: 36-38). Some other aspects of the national youth policy in Lebanon are considered to be "somewhat" existing: a clearly defined government authority on youth; a knowledge-based policy approach to identify the necessary changes required for implementing the youth policy; youth people as a resource, not a problem; inter-ministerial cooperation; and, a separate budget (UNESCO, 2013: 36-38). The youth policy is considered as not establishing links between local, regional and national levels, but rather adopts a perspective based on central government action (UNESCO, 2013: 38).

In Lebanon, hundreds of associations work in the youth field and most of those associations face many difficulties such as financing, location, recognition of public and religious authorities...) in developing their activities (Rarrbo, 2009b: 19). In 2011, the Lebanese youth organisations' directory listed 103 youth organisations, as published within the context of the project on "Youth Empowerment and Participation in Lebanon", a joint initiative of UNICEF, UNDP, ILO, UNFPA and UNESCO (UNICEF, 2011).

Morocco

According to a World Bank report, in Morocco, young people aged 15-29 constitutes about 30% of Morocco's total population (World Bank, 2012: ix). With a score of 0.62 at the Youth Development Index, Morocco is ranked as the 94th country (out of 170) reflecting a medium level youth development (Commonwealth, 2013: 10). Morocco is one of the two SAHWA research countries that have a proclaimed youth policy. The New National Youth Policy (NPNJ), providing a framework of a global approach for young people, children and women, was adopted in 2003 (Floris, 2009a: 7). Recently, the Ministry of Youth and Sport is stated to draft the National Integrated Youth Strategy (Stratégie Nationale Intégrée de la Jeunesse - SNIJ), identifying the priorities and objectives in the youth field to be achieved by 2020 (CoE, 2012).

The National Integrated Youth Strategy is developed to address the identified gaps in youth services and increase the efficiency as well as the quality of the youth services (World Bank, 2012: 61). It aims "to stimulate creativity and initiative, to incite participation, to instate a new form of dialogue, to assist in project completion, to privilege literary and artistic expression, to develop mobility and dialogue, and to promote individual accomplishment such as associative engagement amongst youth, in the framework of a global and coherent plan based on the values of openness, solidarity, democracy, and tolerance" (Floris, 2009a: 16). It also intends to ensure the expansion of the network of youth services throughout the country, in a way to ensure the increasing access of the under-served regions, through activities such as "extra-curricular activities geared towards social inclusion, sports facilities and organised activities, ICT access and training, as well [as] employment training and entrepreneurship" (World Bank, 2012: 98).

Youth related policies in Morocco are implemented by various ministries. The Ministry of Youth and Sports is the main authority for youth issues and it is assisted by the Ministries of Childhood Affairs, Female Affairs, Education and Interior (Floris, 2009a: 16). The responsibilities of the Ministry of Youth and Sports include "developing socio-education programmes that ensure the protection of youth, children and women; promoting regional and international cooperation in the field of youth and children, and; preparing and supporting research" (youthpolicy.org, 2014d). Local governments also assist the Ministry in the implementation of youth policy (Floris, 2009a: 16).

According to 2009 data, there are about 8.500 associations working on youth in Morocco, but there is no youth council, in spite of the existence of 11 federations (Floris, 2009a: 19). In 2012, thousands of young people are reported to take part in “a nation-wide consultation to discuss the formation of a national consultative council (youth council)”, foreseen to be created by the 2011 Constitution of Morocco although there is no information whether the council has formally convened or not (youthpolicy.org, 2014d).

Tunisia

According to a recent study entitled “Youth Work in Tunisia after Revolution”, young people aged 15-29 constitutes over 28% of Tunisia’s 10.6 million population (Churchill, 2013: 8). With a score of 0.65 at the Youth Development Index, Tunisia is ranked as the 80th country (out of 170) reflecting a medium level youth development (Commonwealth, 2013: 10). Prior to 2011 elections in Tunisia, it was not possible to talk about the existence of a youth policy, but rather “plural strategies concerning youth” (Floris, 2009b: 9). A recent study dated 2013 states that the Ministry of Youth, Sports, Women and Families is “in the process of formulating a new youth policy that will be ‘a product of the revolution’” and the Ministry is implementing a study on Tunisian youth to form “the basis for cross-sectoral policies across various ministries” (Churchill, 2013: 12).

In Tunisia, the state authority in charge of the implementation of the policies related to youth is the Ministry of Youth, Sports, Women and Families (youthpolicy.org, 2014e). Since 2002, the National Youth Observatory (ONJ) has organised regular consultations for the drafting of the development plans and carried out studies on Tunisian youth, representing a change in the state’s approach towards recognising youth (Floris, 2009b: 19 and 28). Other ministries such as the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Higher Education, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Culture also share responsibilities for the policies related to youth (Floris, 2009b: 19). Delivery of services to youth is provided by centralised administrative units and a network of youth centres (youthpolicy.org, 2014e). After the 2011 elections, decentralisation of government services has appeared to be an issue towards a change in the official policy, which was argued to give “greater flexibility to design youth programs that correspond to the specific needs” (Churchill, 2013: 13).

Before the 2011 elections, the Tunisian Union of Youth Organisations (UTOJ), argued to be aligned with the political party in power then, was the main coordination body of youth organisations and “represented young people on the Higher Youth Council, a government forum of consultation on youth issues” (youthpolicy.org, 2014e). A recent research indicates the challenges for the civil society as the need to synergise efforts, build sustainability, and a lack of funding (British Council and AUC, 2013: 7-8).

d. Main trends, main links, main conclusions

This section discusses the major points of reflection in terms of the links between youth and public policy; the approaches to youth and public policy especially with regards to the relevance and problems of the governance approach and globalisation; and the relevance and limitations of the international cooperation schemes on youth.

The first reflection point refers to the link between youth and public policy. The literature survey shows that such a link can be established through the concept of “youth policy”, in spite of the fact that there are different trends in approaching youth policy. To the extent that the impact of the European Union on the youth related matters and policies of the Arab Mediterranean countries is concerned, the dominant trend appears to be the tendency in Europe toward considering youth policy in a comprehensive way, as an integrated approach, underlying the priorities of youth empowerment and youth participation in economic, social and political life, which are actually quite normative priorities.

This brings the discussion to the reflection upon the relevance and limitations of the approaches to youth and public policy especially with regards to the governance approach developed within the context of globalisation. Such an approach refers to a conceptual shift within the context of the transition from welfare state (in which the primary problem-solving actors are the states/governments) into neo-liberalism, where there is a multiplicity of actors within the structures of governance, both in the making and implementation of the policies.

One can observe a dilemma here. On the one hand, public policy as an act and action of the governments has a highly domestic characteristic. Thus any analysis of public policies related to youth necessitates a focus of the existing political systems in five Arab countries. Especially under rather authoritarian regimes, the mechanisms of defining youth (as a problem or as a resource) and the measures targeting youth can take different forms from those defined by other actors than the domestic governments. Then the question becomes how and why the international definitions of the problems related to youth and the measures to overcome those problems are translated into the domestic policy processes and to what extent they are influential at the domestic policy arena.

On the other hand, increasing impact of globalisation and involvement of a multiplicity of actors including international actors into the public policy making (especially at the policy formulation and policy implementation levels) at the domestic level requires understanding the functioning of governance mechanisms, as well as its limitations. Panoply of actors, including the international and supranational bodies as the main proponents of an integrated youth policy, also carries the risk of definition of the policy problems at other levels than the domestic. Accordingly, creation (or even imposition) of templates for the solutions to the defined problems may not actually prove to be the best suitable policy option vis-à-vis domestic realities, and accordingly may turn out to carry a limited problem solving capacity. Then, the political meaning of public policy in the sense that the agenda is set in a certain way and not in another way becomes critical.

An equally relevant reflection point refers to the domestic actors that could have benefited from the international support as an area of “freedom”, especially by the political oppositions and local actors.

In very much related to these, another reflection point refers to the relevance and limitations of the international cooperation schemes on youth. Looking at the international cooperation schemes in the field of Mediterranean youth developed at the European level, it is possible to observe that all the schemes can be considered as policy tools designed to fulfil particular objectives, especially depending on the objectives of the international institutions designing the schemes. This situation seems to have two significant repercussions in the Arab Mediterranean context. On the one hand, referring to the problem definition, the question appears to be to what extent the real needs of the young people correspond with the priorities of the international cooperation schemes. On the other hand, the way in which the programmes created within the context of the cooperation schemes are implemented reflects particular characteristics that might have the potential to conflict with the existing national systems and ways of making and implementing policies.

The major issue here is to understand that public policy is not free from politics. This is to say that neither at the domestic level, nor at the international or supranational levels, public policy is neutral. For example, when the overall significance of the youth in the European context is considered, it is possible to state that European economic policies as identified within the context of the Europe 2020 strategy underline the importance of economic growth through competitiveness, in order for Europe “to become a smart, sustainable and inclusive economy”, to be achieved via priorities of “high levels of employment, productivity and social cohesion”³⁵. One of the three flagship initiatives of the Europe 2020 strategy is defined as “Youth on the Move”, as “a comprehensive package of policy initiatives on **education** and **employment** for young people in Europe”³⁶, which aims “to improve young people’s chances of finding a job by helping students and trainees gain experience in other countries, and improving the quality and attractiveness of education and training in Europe”³⁷. An important tool used at the European level to achieve a link between education, training and employment has been the Youth in Action Programme. Thus, on the one hand, the Euro-Med Youth Programme can be perceived as an extension of the European Union’s increasing interest in youth within a wider economic perspective. Cooperation in the field of youth with the Mediterranean Arab countries often defined with a youth bulge can also be perceived within the context of economic development in an interdependent global economy. On the other hand, a foreign policy perspective as put forth by the Barcelona declaration to “turn the Mediterranean into a common area of peace, stability and prosperity through the reinforcement of political dialogue, security, and economic, financial, social and

³⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm

³⁶ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=950&langId=en>

³⁷ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=956>

cultural cooperation”³⁸ also defines the increasing involvement of the EU in youth issues at the region, especially in the aftermath of Arab uprisings.

Similarly, when frameworks such as the Youth Partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe is concerned, normative priorities such as the promotion of human rights, development of democratic forms of participation and democratic citizenship to be adopted within the context of international cooperation make all the following questions relevant to the analysis: “what does the concepts (such as democratic participation or citizenship) mean for both sides of the cooperation schemes?”, “who and which kind of youth projects are going to be supported?”, “how are the international cooperation schemes perceived by the domestic governments and governmental actors once they are signed?”, “what are the mechanisms to avoid or overcome any disagreements between the governments and the international actors?”

Accordingly, any research aiming to understand the role of the international/European cooperation schemes on the youth issues should take into account the political character of the public policies and youth politics and the interaction between the domestic and international levels of policy processes.

III. Research Design

Analysing policy may refer to different aspects of a policy process, depending on the purpose of the analysis. In the policy studies, a distinction is made between “analysis of policy” and “analysis for policy” (Gordon et al., 1977; Hill, 1997; Ham and Hill, 1986; Dye, 1995; Hogwood and Gunn, 1984). In fact, “analysis of policy” is an attempt to furthering understanding of policy, whereas “analysis for policy” refers to more prescriptive accounts about how to improve the quality of policy (Ham and Hill, 1986: 8).

Analysis of policy includes “analysis of policy determination and analysis of policy content” (Gordon et al., 1977). Analysis of policy determination refers to the processes in which the public policy is constructed, and the emphasis is placed upon the inputs and transformational processes operating upon the construction of public policy; whereas analysis of policy content denotes the importance of the origin, intention and operation of specific policies within a given administration and social policy field (Gordon et al., 1977). To put it differently, analysis of the policy process deals with how problems are defined, agendas are set, policy is formulated, decisions are made and policy is evaluated and implemented (Parsons, 1995: xvi). Hill (2005: 5) also elaborates that analysis of policy includes policy content (the genesis and development of particular policies, their emergence, implementation and results), policy outputs (variation in the levels of expenditure or service provision over time or between cases) and policy process (the ways in which decisions are made and shaped).

³⁸http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/external_relations/relations_with_third_countries/mediterranean_partner_countries/r15001_en.htm

Analysis for policy includes “policy advocacy, information for policy and policy monitoring and evaluation” (Gordon et al., 1977). It encompasses the use of analytical techniques, research and advocacy in problem definition, decision-making, evaluation and implementation (Parsons, 1995: xvi). Hill (2005: 5) states that within the context of analysis for policy, evaluation sets the borderline between the “analysis of” and “analysis for” policy. Also referred as impact studies, and by either being descriptive or prescriptive, evaluation is concerned with the analysis of the impact that policy have on the target group or population (Hill, 2005: 5). Analysis for policy gives a particular importance to information as a basis for its pragmatic concern of “what works”, in a way to “ensure that policy and practice are ‘evidence based’” (Davies, Nutley and Smith, 2000 quoted in Hill, 2005: 5). Policy advocacy as a final component of analysis for policy is “to improve the nature of the policy-making systems through the reallocation of functions and tasks, and through efforts to enhance the basis for policy choice through the development of planning systems and new approaches to option appraisal” (Hill, 2005: 5)

When it comes to the place of research in youth studies, the notion of the “Magic triangle”, developed by authors such as Lynne Chisholm, Filip Coussée and Howard Williamson as referred in the SAHWA WP1 Concept Paper, clarifies the need for interdependency between policy makers, organised civil society and research.

“At the centre of the triangle are the young people, individually or organised in groups. In the first vertex are public authorities, responsible for formulating, legislating and implementing youth policies. In the second vertex is academia, whose main function is to generate knowledge regarding young people; it has ceased to be an external actor and become a subject with direct involvement. In the third vertex is civil society, responsible for intervention in the world of young people, via youth organisations and professionals whose role is to implement youth action. Exchanges take place between the three vertices; they are not always symmetrical, but are necessarily multidirectional, in which everyone learns from everyone else. When these exchanges are numerous, fertile or positive, the result is to strengthen areas for youth participation and to strengthen youth public policies. When these exchanges are scarce, sterile or negative, the magic triangle can become a Bermuda Triangle, where young people go from being the subject to the object, becoming invisible or disappearing symbolically and physically from centre stage...” (Oliart and Feixa, 2012; Soler, Planas and Feixa, 2014 quoted in SAHWA WP1 Concept Paper, 2014: 8).

Research proposed within the context of the “public policy and international cooperation” component of the SAHWA project aims at exploring the link between public policy and youth, which has become more and more internationalised in today’s world. In this regard, the place of youth in the domestic/national public policies and the relationship between those policies to the international cooperation schemes is the major focus of research interest. This is also complemented by another question regarding the political significance of public policy within the context of international

cooperation schemes. The geographical scope of the research is limited to the SAHWA research countries, namely Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia, and the international/European cooperation schemes that those countries are involved into, namely the Euro-Med Youth Programme and Youth Partnership between European Commission and Council of Europe.

This is an exercise both in terms of the “analysis of” and “analysis for” policy both at the national and international levels, with a particular concern, on the one hand, regarding the analysis of the ways in which the societal problems of youth are defined and brought into agenda, policies on those problems are formulated and implemented; and regarding the analysis of the impact of those policies on the young people and accordingly contribution to the quality development of those policies depending on evidence on the other. “Analysis for policy” aspect also includes drawing up policy recommendations for the EU policy makers as well as other stakeholders (business, non-governmental organisations, lobbyists, etc.) and adaptation of the recommendations to the various plausible scenarios.

a. Research Questions

The research objective(s) can be made amenable to theoretical and empirical research through general research questions and their sub-questions. The major research questions can be summarized as follows:

- Why do public institutions develop programmes and policies for young people (real policy aim)?
- How do they affect young people’s lives in Arab Mediterranean countries?
- Is the EU cooperation relevant for the youth in the region?
- How could such a relevance be improved?

In a more detailed manner, for different phases of the research, the following sub-questions can also be formulated:

How can be the place of youth in public policies defined in theory and practice?
(Theoretical approach)

Can youth policy be defined as a domain of public policy?

How is youth as a policy issue integrated into the public policy processes?

What is the role of policy environment in which public policies are made and implemented?

How does globalisation and transition from government to governance affect the analysis of the relation between youth and public policies?

What are the characteristics of the public policies targeting youth in Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia? (National Level)

How are the perceptions towards youth shaped?

How is the political agenda shaped by societal problems of youth?

What are the actors of public policies towards youth? How do public and private agencies interact and cooperate?

What policy instruments have been developed and used?

How is the agenda of current structural reforms (employment, education, economy) relate to youth?

How can the role of international organisations in supporting youth be conceptualised? (International/European Level)

What are the implications of the new economic and political dynamics for the EU in defining youth policies at the European level?

How are the European youth policy frameworks, especially of the EU and Council of Europe, defined?

How is the European youth policy integrated into the context of EU's policies towards the Mediterranean Partner Countries such as European Neighbourhood Policy and EU's Foreign Policy agenda?

What kind of cooperation schemes and policy instruments regarding youth does the EU develop and implement towards the Mediterranean Partner Countries?

What are the impacts of the EU programmes and other international actors (WB, ILO...etc.) on youth in the SAHWA research countries? To what extent international cooperation schemes help eliminating the problems of young people in those countries?

What resources and strategies should be developed to support reforms in the youth field in Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia? (*Integration of National and European Levels; Prescriptive approach*)

b. Research Methods: Empirical data collection

In addition to a comprehensive desk study, the research will also make use of a combination of quantitative (e.g. questionnaires, surveys) and qualitative (e.g. interviews, focus groups, text analysis) research methods at different stages. The data and knowledge gathered through thematic Work Packages will continuously feed the research.

Concretely, major research activities of the Work Package include:

- Taking stock of youth projects supported by the European institutions in the Mediterranean (desk study).
- Taking stock of young people benefited from these programmes (desk study).
- Focus groups and semi-structured interviews with the institutional project beneficiaries (youth organisations etc.) in the SAHWA research countries.
- Mediterranean region-wide online surveys and focus groups with the youth project participants.
- Semi-structured interviews with the representatives of the institutions implementing youth programmes in the Mediterranean region, such as the Euro-Med Youth Units.
- Semi-structured interviews with the representatives of the institutions initiating and implementing youth programme schemes in the Mediterranean region, such as the European Commission, Anna Lindh Foundation, SALTO-Youth Euro-Med Research Centre etc.
- Semi-structured interviews with the stakeholders at the European and Mediterranean level such as European Youth Forum, Euro-Med Platform etc.
- Analysis of the civil society texts from those organisations that work with and for young people at the Mediterranean region.

c. Outcomes/Deliverables

The research will produce a set of policy reports, policy papers and academic articles.

IV. Bibliography

Abdelhay, A. T. (2009) *Studies on Youth Policies in the Mediterranean Partner Countries: Egypt*, Euro-Med Youth III Programme; Regional Capacity Building and Support Unit at INJEP.

Abdellatif, C. and Mohammed, B. (2014) "The Role of Public Policies in the Activation of the Employment Policy in Algeria", *European Scientific Journal*, October 2014 Edition, Vol.10, No.28.

Anderson, J. (2003) *Public policymaking: An introduction*. Boston: Houghton.

Assaad, R. and Barsoum, G. (2007) Youth Exclusion in Egypt: In Search of "Second Chances", *Middle East Youth Initiative Working Paper*, Wolfensohn Center For Development, Dubai School Of Government. No. 2, September 2007.

- Barsoum, G. (2013) "The alignment of the policy objectives of youth inclusion and population regulation in post Arab-Spring Egypt: A discussion paper", *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, Vol. 33 No. 7/8, 2013 pp. 410-425.
- Boudarbat B. and Ajbilou, A. (2007) "Youth Exclusion in Morocco: Context, Consequences, and Policies", *Middle East Youth Initiative Working Paper*, Wolfensohn Center For Development, Dubai School Of Government. No. 5, September 2007.
- Boughzala, M. (2013) *Youth Employment and Economic Transition in Tunisia*, Global Economy and Development at Brookings Working Paper 57, January 2013.
- British Council and American University in Cairo (2013) *The Revolutionary Promise: Youth Perceptions in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia*, British Council and American University in Cairo, Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement.
- Churchill, E. (2013) *Youth Work in Tunisia after the Revolution*, Regional capacity building support unit (RCBS) for Euromed Youth Programme IV in collaboration with SALTO-YOUTH EuroMed Resource Centre.
- Commonwealth (2013) *Youth Development Index*, Results Report, September 2013, the Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Council of Europe (2012) *Neighbourhood Co-operation Priorities for Morocco 2012-2014*, Document produced by the Council of Europe Secretariat, DGProg/Inf(2011)4rev, 2 April 2012. Available at: https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1883613&Site=CM#P368_57538.
- Deacon, B. (2007) *Global Social Policy and Governance*, Sage Publications: London.
- Deacon, B., Michelle H. and Paul S. (eds) (1997) *Global Social Policy: International Organizations and the Future of Welfare*, Sage Publications: London.
- Dewey, J. (1927) *The public and its problems*, New York: Holt.
- Djbou, T. (2012) "Towards a better understanding of the model of EU youth policy", *Studies of Changing Societies: Youth Under Global Perspective*, Vol. 1(5) 2012, pp. 15-36.
- Dye, T. R. (1995) *Understanding Public Policy*, Prentice Hall: New Jersey.
- Ervik, R., Kildal, N. and Nilssen, E. (eds) (2009) *The Role of International Organizations in Social Policy: Ideas, Actors and Impact*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham and Northampton.
- European Training Foundation (ETF) (2012) *Union for the Mediterranean Regional Employability Review: the Challenge of Youth Employment in the Mediterranean*, European Training Foundation.
- Floris, S. (2009a) *Studies on Youth Policies in the Mediterranean Partner Countries: Morocco*, Euro-Med Youth III Programme; Regional Capacity Building and Support Unit at INJEP.

Floris, S. (2009b) *Studies on Youth Policies in the Mediterranean Partner Countries: Tunisia*, Euro-Med Youth III Programme; Regional Capacity Building and Support Unit at INJEP.

Gordon I., Lewis, J. and Young, K. (1977) "Perspectives on theory analysis", *Public Administration Bulletin*, 25, 1977, pp. 26-30, reprinted in M. Hill (ed) (1993) *The Policy Process: A Reader*, Harvester Wheatsheaf: New York.

Ham, C. and Hill, M. (1986) *The Policy Process in the Modern Capitalist State*, Harvester Press: Sussex.

Haouas, I.; Sayre, E. and Yagoubi, M. (2012) *Youth Unemployment in Tunisia: Characteristics and Policy Responses*, *Topics in Middle Eastern and North African Economies*, electronic journal, Volume 14, Middle East Economic Association and Loyola University Chicago, September, 2012, <http://www.luc.edu/orgs/meea/>.

Hill, M. (1997) *The Policy Process in the Modern State*, Prentice Hall/ Harvester Wheatsheaf: London.

Hill, M. (2005) *The Public Policy Process*, Fourth Edition, Pearson Longman.

Hill, M. and Hupe, P. (2002) *Implementing Public Policy: Governance in Theory and in Practice*, Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

Hogwood, B. and Gunn, L. (1984) "Why 'perfect implementation' is unattainable", from B. W. Hogwood and L. A. Gunn, *Policy Analysis for the Real World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, reprinted in Hill, M. (ed) (1997) *The Policy Process a Reader*, Second Edition, Prentice Hall, Harvester Wheatsheaf: London.

International Labour Office (ILO) (2012) *Regional Report: National Events on Youth Employment in the Arab States*, Youth Employment Programme.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (2014) *Tunisia: Breaking the Barriers to Youth Inclusion*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank Group.

Lane, J.; Hakim, G. and Miranda, J. (1999) *Labor Market Analysis and Public Policy: The Case of Morocco*, The World Bank Economic Review, Vol. 13, No. 3: pp. 561-78.

League of Arab States (2007) Arab Youth Issues "Arab Youth Participation" Annual Report: 2007, Series on Population and Development in the Arab Region, Population Policies and Migration Department, League of Arab States.

Minogue, Martin (1983) "Theory and practice in public policy and administration", *Policy and Politics*, 11, 1983, pp.63-85, reprinted in M. Hill (ed) (1993) *The Policy Process: A Reader*, Harvester Wheatsheaf: New York.

National Democratic Institute (2011) *Youth Perceptions in Morocco: Political Parties and Reforms, Findings from Qualitative Research in Morocco*, Conducted in July 2011, National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI).

Paciello, M. C. (2012) "Youth Exclusion in North African Countries Continuity or Change?" in *Reversing the Vicious Circle in North Africa's Political Economy*, Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI), Rome, Italy and German Marshall Fund of The United States (GMF), Washington DC, United States, pp. 23-38.

Parsons, W. (1995) *Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham and Northampton.

Quintini, G. and Martin, S. (2014), "Same but Different: School-to-work Transitions in Emerging and Advanced Economies", *OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers*, No. 154, OECD Publishing.

Rarrbo, K. (2009a) *Studies on Youth Policies in the Mediterranean Partner Countries: Algeria*, Euro-Med Youth III Programme; Regional Capacity Building and Support Unit at INJEP.

Rarrbo, K. (2009b) *Studies on Youth Policies in the Mediterranean Partner Countries: Lebanon*, Euro-Med Youth III Programme; Regional Capacity Building and Support Unit at INJEP.

Richards, D. and Smith, M. J. (2002) *Governance and Public Policy in the UK*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Sabatier, Paul A. and Jenkins-Smith, Hank C. (1999) "The advocacy coalition framework", in P. A. Sabatier (ed) *Theories of the Policy Process*, Westview Press: Oxford.

Saghieh, N. (2012) "Youth Participation in the Law", *The National Youth Policy Document 2011 – 2016*, UNESCO Regional Bureau - Beirut 2012.

Stampini, M. and Verdier-Chouchane, A. (2011) "Labor Market Dynamics in Tunisia: The Issue of Youth Unemployment", *Review of Middle East Economics and Finance*, Vol. 7: No. 2, Article 1.

United Nations (UN) (2009) *African Youth Report 2009 Expanding opportunities for and with Young people in Africa*, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, 2009.

United Nations (UN) (2011) *African Youth Report 2011: Addressing the youth education and employment nexus in the new global economy*, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2002) *Arab Human Development Report 2002: Creating Opportunities for Future Generations*, Regional Bureau for Arab States (RBAS).

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Institute of National Planning, Egypt. (2010) *Egypt Human Development Report 2010: Youth in Egypt: Building our Future*, outcome of the Human Development Project, executed by the Institute of National Planning, Egypt, under the project document EGY/01/006 of technical cooperation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) (2011) *Arab Youth: Civic Engagement and Economic Participation*, UNESCO Regional Bureau for Education in the Arab States – Beirut.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) (2013) *Social Inclusion, Democracy and Youth in the Arab Region*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Beirut Office.

UNESCO Regional Bureau - Beirut (2011) *Youth Organization Directory in Lebanon*, UN joint project on “Youth Empowerment and Participation in Lebanon” (UNICEF, UNDP, ILO, UNFPA and UNESCO), UNESCO Regional Bureau - Beirut 2011.

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) (2012) *Youth Development in MENA Cities: A Crisis and an Opportunity*.

Wallace, C. and Bendit, R. (2009) “Youth Policies in Europe: Towards a Classification of Different Tendencies in Youth Policies in the European Union”, *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 441–458.

Williamson, H. (2002), *Supporting young people in Europe – Principles, policy and practice*, Council of Europe Publishing.

Williamson, H. (2008), *Supporting young people in Europe. Volume 2*, Council of Europe Publishing.

World Bank (2012) *Kingdom of Morocco: Promoting Youth Opportunities and Participation*, Middle East and North Africa Region, Sustainable Development Department, June 2012.

Yıldız, M. and Sobacı, M. Z. (2013) “Kamu Politikası ve Kamu Politikası Analizi: Genel bir Çerçeve” [Public Policy and Public Policy Analysis: A General Framework], in M. Yıldız and M. Z. Sobacı (eds.) *Kamu Politikası: Kuram ve Uygulama* [Public Policy: Theory and Practice], Adres Yayınları: Ankara.

Youth Advocacy Process (YAP) and Youth Forum for Youth Policy (2012) *The Youth Policy in Lebanon, Case Study*, Prepared by the Youth Advocacy Process and the Youth Forum for National Youth Policies.

Youth Advocacy Process (YAP) (2010) *E-Newsletter Issue # 1: Breakthroughs in National Youth Policy in Lebanon*, January 2010.

Youthpolicy.org (2014a) *Factsheet: Algeria*. Available at: <http://www.youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/algeria/>.

Youthpolicy.org (2014b) *Factsheet: Egypt:* Available at:
<http://www.youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/egypt/>.

Youthpolicy.org (2014c) *Factsheet: Lebanon.* Available at:
<http://www.youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/lebanon/>.

Youthpolicy.org (2014d) *Factsheet: Morocco.* Available at:
<http://www.youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/morocco/>.

Youthpolicy.org (2014e) *Factsheet: Tunisia.* Available at:
<http://www.youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/tunisia/>.



Researching
Arab Mediterranean Youth:
Towards a New Social Contract
www.sahwa.eu



This project has received funding from the European Union's
Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological
development and demonstration under grant agreement no 613174.

The SAHWA Project ("Researching Arab Mediterranean Youth: Towards a New Social Contract") is a FP-7 interdisciplinary cooperative research project led by the Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) and funded by the European Commission. It brings together fifteen partners from Europe and Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries to research youth prospects and perspectives in a context of multiple social, economic and political transitions in five Arab countries (Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt and Lebanon). The project expands over 2014-2016 and has a total budget of €3.1 million. The thematic axis around which the project will revolve are education, employment and social inclusion, political mobilization and participation, culture and values, international migration and mobility, gender, comparative experiences in other transition contexts and public policies and international cooperation.



METU

