

# **The RYCO Working Group: Looking back at a successful working process in order to draw lessons learned for the future**

**Report from the evaluation meeting of the RYCO Working Group,  
Berlin, 20-23 September 2016**

## **A. Introduction**

At the Western Balkans Summit in Vienna in August 2015, the governments of Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Kosovo\*, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia officially emphasised their will to create a “Regional Youth Cooperation Office” (RYCO) in the Western Balkans (WB), aiming to “promote the spirit of reconciliation and cooperation between the youth in the region” through exchange. In order to establish this new institution, the six WB governments created a Working Group (WG) tasked to develop “concrete proposals for the mission, structure, activities and financing of the Regional Youth Cooperation Office, to be finalized by 1 March 2016”. With the support of a Moderation Team (MT) of the Franco-German Youth Office (FGYO), this WG met four times between November 2015 and February 2016, and on 1 March 2016 delivered its common proposals to the six governments. Key elements among these proposals were the Agreement on and the Statute of RYCO, which, without substantial changes, were then officially signed by the Prime Ministers of the WB-6-Participants on 4 July 2016, at the WB Summit in Paris.

The process of establishing RYCO is not finished yet. Currently, the implementation phase of the RYCO Agreement and Statute is taking place, and after its opening – foreseen in the first months of 2017 – RYCO will have to become a functional and vibrant organization. But with the signature of the RYCO Agreement, a first and decisive step has been reached, and it is on the basis of the Agreement and the Statute that all future steps are being and will be taken.

What are the reasons that can explain that this first phase, which ended with the signature of the RYCO Agreement, came to a successful conclusion? And what are the lessons learned which can be drawn from this first phase, which could be useful for the ongoing and upcoming phases of the establishment of RYCO, and also more generally for future initiatives of regional cooperation in the Western Balkans and beyond?

In order not to lose the experiences and expertise made during this first phase of the establishment of RYCO, and to make them fruitful and beneficial for the future as well, the FGYO organized in Berlin, from 20th to 23rd September 2016, a concluding evaluation meeting with the RYCO Working Group and the Moderation Team which had been in the core of the working process that led to signature of the RYCO Agreement and Statute. Building

upon the experiences of the different participants, during this meeting especially the three following questions were discussed:

1. What have been the challenges the Working Group has been facing, and how have these challenges been addressed?
2. What are the reasons which can explain how the working process came to a successful conclusion?
3. Which lessons and recommendations can be drawn from this process for the implementation of RYCO?

Additionally, the FGYO Moderation Team worked during this meeting also on the question what this working process has meant so far for the FGYO.

The following report summarizes the main results of the discussions during this meeting. It aims to constitute a basis for future reflections and discussions within the implementation process of RYCO.

The WG and the MT also hope that this report will be helpful for persons and organizations involved in future initiatives of regional cooperation in the Western Balkans and beyond, by providing them with stimulating food for thought, ideas, suggestions or question marks for their own work. The experience of the WG has shown how useful it can be to look at other examples, successful and unsuccessful ones, in order to take inspiration and ideas which need then to be adapted within each new and specific context.

The following persons participated in the evaluation meeting:

From the RYCO-Working Group: Djuro Blanusa, Marija Bulat, Krenare Gashi, Vedat Jashari, Edin Koljenović, Dafina Peci, Krsto Vukadinović

From the FGYO-Moderation Team: Bujar Luma, Nicolas Moll, Frank Morawietz

From the Balkan Trust for Democracy: Nataša Petrović (in part)

## **B. Main findings of the evaluation meeting**

### **B.1. What have been the challenges the Working Group has been facing? How have these challenges been addressed?**

#### ***1. To invent / build up a new structure which did not exist before***

There has been already regional youth exchange in the Western Balkans before RYCO has been founded, and also institutions which support international youth exchange within the Western Balkans, between the Western Balkans and the European Union and within the European Union, such as for example the Franco-German Youth Office, the German-Polish Youth Office or the Erasmus+ Program of the EU. But until now, there has not been a regionally owned institutional mechanism within the Western Balkans to support youth

exchange. This means that something completely new needed to be invented. In order to address this challenge, a lot of points needed to be taken into consideration, which will appear throughout the following report. But one way to address this challenge should already be mentioned here: It was important for the Working Group to look at already existing experiences, such as youth-exchange support structures in Western/Central Europe as well as regional structures in the Western Balkans as the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC). By this, the members of the Working Group got inspiration and ideas, and at the same time became aware of the fact that copy-pasting could be no solution, as something new needed to be built up and adapted to the specific situation and specific needs related to the context of the WB-6.

## ***2. How to deal with the diversity within the WB-6 and with various actors who have different backgrounds, experiences, and interests?***

Working on RYCO meant dealing with a high degree of diversity and complexity. The initiative involved six different WB-Participants with specific histories, cultures and legislations, and within each of the WB-6 there were a lot of different actors, especially on the one hand governmental structures and on the other hand civil society organizations in the field of youth.

One crucial precondition to deal with this complexity was to constitute the Working Group to reflect this diversity: all six WB-Participants were represented in the Working Group, and for each of them there were representatives from the government and from the civil society acting in the field of youth. This is how it was guaranteed from the outset that each of the main actors had a voice in the process.

Another way to address this challenge was to define a common ground within the Working Group, a topic which will be addressed further below in point 3.

An important point was also always to take into consideration the specificities of each of the WB-6 and to respect different legal procedures during the working process.

Another very important point was to constantly engage in exchange between the members of the Working Group and persons and organizations outside the Working Group, on the governmental and civil society level, in order to keep them constantly involved in the process (see also below point 6).

## ***3. Seeking common ground within the Working Group***

The diversity of backgrounds and experiences within the Western Balkans was also reflected within the Working Group. In order to build up a common ground, during their first meeting the members of the WG agreed on common goals and on common working principles aiming to allow a constructive and productive working process. Many of the principles were inspired by the daily work and the intercultural experiences of the FGYO. Attitudes that figured among these principles included commitment to an open-minded spirit and to listen to the arguments, suggestions and opinions of others, and also to take all decision in consensus. Informal activities, such as common visits or common dinners during the meetings, also contributed to creation of a team spirit within the WG. Throughout the working process, all members of the WG showed a clear readiness to compromise, and stood behind the motto “Let’s think

regionally”, in order to overcome unilateral interests. To deal with difficult questions, the WG was also ready to think “outside the box”, for example through creative exercises proposed by the Moderation Team.

#### ***4. Facing disagreement on some crucial points***

Despite all good will and commitment within the Working Group and from the involved governments in general, in a first phase, no agreement existed between the six governments for two important questions. One concerned the question of the seat of the future Office, where various proposals had been expressed by different governments already before the Working Group had begun its work. Another point concerned the question of the financing of RYCO (the amount of the budget and the contributions of each Contracting Party).

The WG addressed this challenge in the following way: Knowing that an agreement in these two sensitive points could only be reached at the highest political level, it put these two questions aside from its own agenda and took the position that the six governments should take their responsibilities and should directly and quickly resolve these issues by a common decision; at the same time, it asked external actors – the FGYO and the governments of Germany, France and Austria – to assist in this communication- and decision-making-process. Following this, the relevant decision-makers of the WB-6 met twice in specific meetings organized with the support of the FGYO and the governments of Germany, France and Austria, and during these meetings a common agreement was found on the seat (Tirana) and the financing (with an annual budget of 2 million euro, and contributions of each Contracting Party calculated on the basis of different and clearly defined factors.)

#### ***5. To do a lot with little time and little money***

After the Vienna-Summit in August 2015 it took some time to nominate all members of the Working Group, so that its first meeting could only take place at the end of November 2015, leaving just three months to accomplish the task for which the WG had been mandated. Furthermore, as the Working Group had not been foreseen earlier in the year, there was also no budget foreseen for its meetings, and the different governments explained that they had no available funds (except for covering the travel costs of the governmental representatives to the WG). The Moderation Team responded in a quick and efficient way, by seeking alternative sources and actively fundraising and communicating with different donors during the whole process; thankfully, several foundations reacted quickly, positively and in a flexible way, so that the Working Group meetings could all take place as planned despite the tight time window. The FGYO stepped in and provided additional aid when needed. Concerning the time pressure, the MT developed, in agreement with the WG, a structured working concept with a clear timeline; the timeframe could be respected because the MT fulfilled the role of timeline keeper during and between the meetings of the WG, and thanks to the commitment and sense of responsibility of the members of the WG.

#### ***6. Communication with governments, civil society and other actors***

Because of the diversity of actors involved in one way or the other in the establishment of RYCO, various communication channels were necessary during the entire working process, at different levels: between the governmental representatives in the WG and their governments,

between the civil society representatives in the WG and other civil society organizations in each of the WB-6, between different governmental bodies within each Contracting Party (Youth Ministry, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Finances, Prime Minister), and between the WG and MT and different actors on the European level. Communication was not always easy, mainly because most of the actors outside the Working Group logically had many other priorities to deal with and not just RYCO, which was not even born and therefore remained somehow vague. The answer of the Working Group and of the Moderation Team was never to get discouraged, to expect that communication would not be easy, and to always inform the various actors outside the Working Group in order to get them or keep them involved, also to repeat things over and over again if necessary. This communication work in order to involve and include a maximum of different players in the process was facilitated by the strong commitment of various persons within the governments of the WB-6 and on the European level as well as within the civil society. A specifically created website, [www.rycowesternbalkans.org](http://www.rycowesternbalkans.org), administrated by the MT, also helped document all steps of the working process in a transparent way and to spread information about RYCO, as well as various – internal and public – information activities about RYCO organized during the entire working process.

### ***7. How to build a good relation between the FGYO Moderation-Team and the Working Group?***

At the request of the WB-6-governments, after the Vienna conference the Franco-German Youth Office had designed a Moderation Team of three persons in order to cooperate with the Working Group. How to establish a good working relation between the Moderation Team and the Working Group? There have been several factors which can explain that a very constructive and productive working relationship came about: 1) The intercultural experience and competence of the members of the MT and their knowledge of the Balkans; 2) The fact that the three members had already worked with the Fact-Finding Mission before the Vienna Summit, and therefore had already had a good contact and cooperation with several of the WG members; 3) The consequent attitude of the MT to stay neutral and objective when different content-positions were present, and at the same time to find ways for resolving disagreements and to find positive solutions; this did prevent the MT from sharing its experiences regarding certain questions, which was also helpful towards reaching a decision within the WG; 4) The commitment and competence of the MT in organizing, structuring and moderating the meetings (including seeing to it that the meetings would be efficient and at the same time take place in a constructive atmosphere), and to ensure fluid and active communication with the WG and other stakeholders between the meetings; 5) Between the first and the second meeting, a disagreement arose in an organizational matter between the MT and the WG, but this did not have negative consequences for the working relationship, because the MT accepted the opinion of the WG, and because the foundation for a relationship of trust between the WG and the MT had already been laid.

## **B.2. What are the reasons that can explain that the working process came to a successful conclusion?**

The process between the Vienna Summit and the Paris Summit was not an automatic one, and there was no guarantee that the “Joint Declaration” of August 2015 would necessarily lead to signature of the RYCO Agreement and Statute in July 2016. What are the main factors that can explain that the process of establishing RYCO came to a successful conclusion?

### ***1. Involvement of Civil Society Organizations (CSO) from the outset.***

The involvement of CSO was very important because it brought the voice of civil society organizations directly into the process – with concrete suggestions and recommendations from the ground. The involvement of CSO was articulated by its direct participation within the Working Group, on an equal level as the government representatives, and by broad consultations, throughout the working process, with other interested CSOs that deal with youth and could contribute to the work based on the steps and needs of the process.

### ***2. Commitment of the Working Group.***

The members of the Working Group were individuals who showed clear commitment to the process, sharing the same principles and values when it came to regional youth cooperation. Although coming from different national contexts and with different individual backgrounds they have shown capability to discuss in an open-minded spirit in order to find solutions and agree upon details and more general issues. Having the same goal – the establishment of RYCO – they showed the capacity to have the same voice towards other parties in advocating, explaining and helping the process. The fact of meeting in four four-day meetings within three months helped to build a common ground and a team spirit within the WG, which was furthermore facilitated by trust-building measures and informal activities during the meetings from the first meeting on.

### ***3. Combination of bottom-up approach and top-down approach.***

The RYCO process was initiated by the highest political level in the region – the Prime Ministers of the Western-Balkans-6 Participants – and supported by the other political levels concerned by the process (especially Ministries of Youth or equivalent, Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Ministries of Finance). At the same time, the process was also welcomed and actively supported by CSO, youth representatives and other interested parties who constantly followed and contributed to the process.

### ***4. External support.***

The support of the German, French and Austrian government has been crucial for the success of the process. As the idea to establish RYCO was born with and became an integral part of the “Berlin process”, this provided the constant involvement of the named governments with the goal of having concrete follow-up by the next Western-Balkans Summit. This involvement was also expressed by the constant support from the Embassies of Germany, France and Austria in the WB-6 during the process, which helped to resolve internal issues within the WB-6. Also decisive during the entire process was the huge support by the FGYO, from the highest level – the two General Secretaries – to the staff level with regard to the moderation of

the process by experts of the FGYO (see also below point 6). Also noteworthy in this connection was active support by foundations – the ERSTE Foundation, the Robert Bosch Foundation and especially the Balkan Trust for Democracy / German Marshall Fund – which funded an important part of the meetings of the Working Group, and also from the EU and international organizations of the OSCE, which constantly showed active interest in the development of RYCO and expressed their will to support the future institution.

#### ***5. Political will and political momentum.***

Since the first Western-Balkans Summit in Berlin, in August 2014, there has been the clear will, first expressed by the governments of Serbia and Albania, then joined by the governments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo\*, Macedonia and Montenegro, to commit themselves to the establishment of RYCO. This was repeated time and again thereafter, as first articulated by the “Joint Declaration” during the Vienna Summit in August 2015 and the establishment of the RYCO Working Group, then by the common adoption of the proposals of the RYCO Working Group, and finally by signature of the RYCO Agreement and Statute in July 2016 during the Paris Summit. The political will could express itself even stronger as it coincided with a positive political momentum and context – the “Berlin process” that encouraged and facilitated the governments to commit themselves to RYCO. The political commitment of the six governments to RYCO also appeared in their readiness to respond to the calls of the Working Group to find consensual solutions in situations in which the process was stuck in conflicting positions – as happened with regard to the seat of RYCO and the financing of RYCO – and at the same time to let the WG complete its work according to its mandate.

#### ***6. External moderation and consulting.***

The experience and competence of the FGYO in general, and of the FGYO Moderation Team in particular, was a major key to the process, especially as an external and objective party with expertise and knowledge a) in institutionalized international youth cooperation, b) in work with and in the Western Balkans, and c) in moderating international working groups, methodologically and substantively. The FGYO also contributed to the process by being a constant and efficient link between the WG and many other involved actors. It was also important to associate an experienced external expert who helped develop and finalize the different draft documents which were proposed to the six governments.

#### ***7. Clear mandate and timeframe.***

In their “Joint Declaration” at the Vienna Summit, the six WB-governments had given the Working Group a clear mandate – to develop “concrete proposals for the mission, structure, activities and financing of the Regional Youth Cooperation Office” – and the clear timeframe “to be finalized by 1 March 2016”. Therefore, it was clear for the WG what it had to do and by when; the members of the WG knew that they would not be the final decision-makers – this would be the six governments – but they also knew that whatever they delivered would need to be good enough for everything to be ready for signature of the Agreement and Statute at the next Western Balkans Summit in Paris. This also implied involving as many stakeholders as possible in the working process (different Ministries within the governments, CSO), in order to guarantee that the proposals would find acceptance among all key

stakeholders. The timeframe could be kept because the FGYO MT developed a well-structured working concept from the beginning, with a clear time-table, and because all the participants in the working process had stuck to this schedule.

#### ***8. To build up on previous work and experiences.***

The concrete working process on RYCO did not just begin with the first meeting of the RYCO Working Group in November 2015. In June 2015, the FGYO had invited representatives of youth ministries and civil society from the Western Balkans to a Fact-Finding Mission in Paris, Berlin and Vienna, and the same group then met again in Tirana in July 2015 to develop a concept paper for the establishment of the Regional Youth Cooperation Office, which became the working basis for the RYCO Working Group established after Vienna. This means that the Working Group did not have to start from point zero. Also several members of the Fact-Finding Mission became members of the RYCO Working Group, which also helped a lot to bring in and transmit the work already done to the entire group.

#### ***9. Public recognition of the work.***

From the beginning, the Working Group was aware that it was not enough to limit its work to internal discussions and procedures, but that it was necessary to have an external communication strategy, through the created website, through public discussion activities during the meetings, and through regular information activities between the meetings in each of the WB-6. This constant external communication with different stakeholders contributed to public recognition of the work of the WG and provided its members with additional motivation for their work.

### **B.3. Which lessons and recommendations can be drawn from this process for the implementation of RYCO?**

It is not because the agreement is signed or the office has opened that RYCO will become a success story. A new institution has been created that can develop in many different ways. What is crucial in the eyes of the WG for RYCO to become a real success story?

1. That the governments of the WB-6 are taking full responsibility to ensure a political *long-term* commitment and regional ownership, and at the same time are respecting the status of RYCO as an independent regional institution.
2. That the civil society actors in the WB-6 constantly push the governments in the direction mentioned above, and also that the civil society actors push themselves to become committed within RYCO and to take the opportunity offered to them in order to actively contribute to the shaping and development of RYCO.
3. That RYCO should be accounted and foreseen by all involved actors and stakeholders as a unique and original structure with a big potential, which should not be reduced to an administrative funding mechanism, but also become a space of discussion, debate and

innovation in relation to relevant questions for our societies, and also an integral part within the larger process of regional cooperation and Europeanization of the Western Balkans.

4. That the future decision-makers of RYCO establish long-term strategic partnerships and also efficient communication links with different stakeholders, which will contribute to the visibility and promotion of RYCO and its programs, and to make them accessible for as many young people as possible, and especially to reach out for young people who are not active at all.

5. That RYCO makes sure to hire motivated, innovative, competent, and open-minded staff, in the head office and the local branches, that capacity-building measures are organized for the RYCO staff, including visits to all six WB Participants, also in order to build team spirit within the staff and an intercultural understanding for the differences within the WB-6.

6. That RYCO develops, in partnership with those who are organizing the youth exchange projects on the ground and other stakeholders, training-for-trainer measures as well as monitoring and evaluation tools/activities regarding projects supported by RYCO, in order to help organizers realize their projects in the best possible ways, as well as research activities in order to stay in touch with possible evolutions of youth issues.

It is furthermore to recommend that RYCO, for example in the framework of capacity-building measures, uses the expertise and experience of the WG and the MT that they have gained through the entire working process.

## **B.4. Challenges, impact and lessons learned for the Franco-German Youth Office**

### **B.4.1. A new challenge also for the FGYO**

For the FGYO, participation in the process of establishment of RYCO represents an involvement in a totally new setup and a new experience. Created in 1963, the FGYO has now has more 50 years' experience in coordinating and supporting international youth exchange. In the past decades, time and again, international delegations from other regions and continents have visited the FGYO in order to gain insights which might be useful for their own contexts. But these were in general meetings of some hours, and the interaction was limited to this. Continuous, long-term work of consultation, moderation and facilitation for the establishment of youth exchange structure elsewhere, as was the case for RYCO, has never been done before by FGYO in its history. This means also that the FGYO had to define and find its own position in this process.

The history of active involvement by FGYO in the RYCO process started concretely in February 2015, when the General Secretaries of FGYO visited Aleksandar Vučić, Edi Rama and Ali Mustafa in Belgrade, Tirana and Pristina in order to talk about the planned structure and the role which the FGYO could play in the process of establishing this new structure. By its own initiative and in the aftermath of the 15<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the FGYO initiative in South Eastern Europe (SEE) in Sarajevo in June 2015, the FGYO then proposed and organized the

Fact-Finding Mission which took place in Summer 2015 and came up with concrete and timely proposals for the WB Summit in Vienna. On this occasion, the WB-6 governments officially asked and tasked FGYO to get actively involved in the working process.

While the “Joint Declaration” from Vienna described quite precisely the mandate for the Working Group, the mandate for the FGYO was formulated much more vaguely (“will provide the Working Group with technical assistance”). In discussions with the concerned governments, this “technical assistance” appeared to especially translate into “facilitate and moderate the working process” around the newly established RYCO Working Group. But also this left room for interpretation: how far would the role of FGYO go, what was exactly understood by moderation/facilitation?

In fact, this role included mainly the following tasks:

- to organize logistically the meetings of the Working Group
- to find funding for the meetings of the Working Group and other costs related to the working process
- to moderate the substance of the meetings of the Working Group
- to ensure communication with and within the WG between meetings
- beyond the work with the WG and in cooperation with it, to ensure communication and interaction with four working levels:
  - a) highest decision-making levels in France, Germany, Austria and EU, as well as their Embassies in the WB-6
  - b) highest level of key players in the WB-6-governments
  - c) civil society organizations in the WB-6
  - d) donors

This represented a big amount of work, for the three members of the FGYO Moderation Team, and also for the General Secretaries of FGYO, as well as the employee within the FGYO working with the Moderation Team.

Within this process, the FGYO also had to strike a balance between being active and not taking over too much. This balance was not always easy to maintain: To what extent was it really the role of FGYO to find funding for the meetings?

Another challenge the FGYO was facing was that everything had to be done in a very short-term way, in particular the logistical organization as well as the financing of the WG meetings. This challenge could be faced by a lot of pro-active commitment by the MT, by the flexibility of different donors, and by the total support of the highest levels in the French, German and Austrian government, and also of the two General Secretaries of the FGYO. At the same time, not everybody in the French and the German government, or in the FGYO, was convinced that it was the role of the FGYO to participate in this process, thinking that it should concentrate on its usual tasks and on the Franco-German cooperation. But this did not impact the working process, because of the already mentioned total support of the highest levels in the governments and also in FGYO.

A more general challenge for the FGYO as an institution was that the RYCO-working process and the FGYO involvement were very much process-oriented, with a lot of unpredictability

and many uncertainties. For an institution such as FGYO, which is very much used to clear rules and structures and a results-oriented approach, and which likes to work with clear and secured steps in order to reach a goal, this meant dealing with a certain loss of control. The reservations related to this partial loss of control could only be addressed by a permanent dialogue and communication among the different persons of the FGYO involved in the process, by showing a capacity of improvisation and an aptitude for limiting risks, as well as by the readiness of the General Secretaries to accept a certain unpredictability within this unusual working process.

#### **B.4.2. The positive impact for the FGYO**

The fact that the working process facilitated and moderated by the FGYO has been successfully concluded with the signature of the RYCO Agreement in Paris can be seen as very positive also for the FGYO on different levels:

1. The highest governmental stakeholders in the WB-6, France, Germany, Austria and beyond have noticed and underlined the important role of the FGYO in the establishment of RYCO; this means that the FGYO has gained broad political recognition for its active commitment and contribution to the entire process. This recognition is also illustrated by the fact that the FGYO is currently part of the “Joint Coordination Team” for implementation of the Agreement and Statute until the opening of RYCO, and therefore continues its active role after the Working Group had completed its task.
2. The FGYO enlarged and deepened its own competences, concerning a) facilitating and moderating working and political processes in the field of institution-building, b) learning how to deal with new situations and with insecure processes
3. The RYCO involvement of the FGYO is also a success for all the work done by the partner organizations of FGYO in the framework of its SEE initiative, which helped to open the way to RYCO. Without the 15 years of commitment of the FGYO in the Balkans, it is also unlikely that the WB-6 governments would have asked the FGYO to contribute so actively to the entire process.
4. The involvement of the FGYO in this process led, furthermore, to the stabilization, enlargement and deepening of its network in the region, among civil society actors on the one hand, and on the institutional level on the other.
5. The FGYO is now much more visible within the WB-6, and has become a more important player in the Western Balkans more generally.
6. The entire process contributed to strengthen the self-understanding of FGYO as an institution which can play an important political role.

#### **B.4.3. Lessons learned for the FGYO**

The following lessons learned can be drawn from the experience of the involvement of the FGYO in the process of establishing RYCO:

1. The FGYO can play a useful role in institution-building in post-conflict areas, not only as inspiration, but also as facilitator.

2. Because of the tight link created, the FGYO should keep in institutional touch with RYCO. It should discuss how it could support or cooperate with RYCO once it is functional and provide ad-hoc aid, such as training-for-trainers in order to create a regional trainer pool as quickly as possible.
3. The FGYO is able to master new challenges and to deal with insecure situations and processes, and should remain sensitive and open for other new initiatives that can be beneficial to all parties involved.
4. The MT consisted of persons working *with* FGYO, but not *in* FGYO: For such unusual situations and processes in which FGYO becomes involved, this might also be an appropriate model for the future, as such a configuration permits more flexibility, more ability to improvise and innovate, and shorter and faster decision-making processes.
5. Once again, the entire process illustrated the importance of intercultural sensitivity and intercultural learning also in political processes.
6. The successful contribution of the FGYO to the establishment of RYCO is a concrete example how Franco-German cooperation can contribute to integration and cooperation processes in Europe.