



DOCUMENTATION

# DINNER DIALOGUE Tomorrow's EU Democracy – Giving citizens a say

18 September 2019

Bertelsmann Stiftung in cooperation with  
King Baudouin Foundation and Open Society Foundations  
Host: Federal State of Baden-Württemberg

## Content

---

### First plenary discussion

Foundations' points of view and discussion on citizens and the EU: A window of opportunity for new ideas and better participation formats	3
--	---

### Table discussions

Citizens' Dialogues, Consultations and Mini-Publics on the rise: Practical examples from EU Member States and the European Commission	4
<i>Grand Débat</i> in France	4
The Citizens' Assembly in Ireland	5
Empowering people to make a difference. Experiences of the Scottish Government	6
The European Citizens' Consultations and how to carry the flame	7
Learning from three multi-lingual, cross-border EU-Citizens' Dialogues	8

### Second plenary discussion

Participation in tomorrow's EU: How to develop better and new citizens' participation formats? What next?	9
--	---

Agenda	10
--------	----

List of participants	11
----------------------	----

### DINNER DIALOGUE

On 18 September 2019, the Bertelsmann Stiftung together with the King Baudouin Foundation and the Open Society Foundations organised a DINNER DIALOGUE at the Representation of the Federal State of Baden-Württemberg in Brussels. The topic of the evening was citizens' participation in the European Union. For many years, the three foundations have been active in strengthening and expanding citizens' participation, and the German state of Baden-Württemberg has been a pioneer in the field.

The DINNER DIALOGUE brought together around forty national and EU level policy-makers, academic experts and civil society representatives active in the field of citizens' participation. During the evening, the participants took stock of ongoing developments, challenges and opportunities in the field of citizens' participation at both national and EU level. The program of the event combined plenary presentations and discussions addressing the more general field of EU citizens' participation, and table exchanges that zoomed in on specific citizens' participation exercises from both the national and EU level. Lastly, the event was seen as a starting point in bringing together 'participation pioneers' with the aim of stimulating a more intense dialogue on how to strengthen the participatory and deliberative nature of EU democracy by means of new participation formats.



## First plenary discussion

Foundations' points of view and discussion on citizens and the EU:  
A window of opportunity for new ideas and better participation formats

In her opening words, Gisela Erler, the State Councilor for Civil Society and Civic Participation in the State Ministry of Baden-Württemberg, stated that deliberation among randomly selected citizens is the best way to get to interesting and ambitious reform proposals. Furthermore, she believed that the European Union could very well benefit from such additional democratic instruments, and therefore welcomed the Commission President-elect's commitment to a Conference on the Future of Europe.

Dominik Hierlemann, Senior Expert in the Future of Democracy Program of the Bertelsmann Stiftung and moderator of the event, underscored the momentum there is for EU citizens' participation, which concerns not only the Conference on the Future of Europe, but also the integration of EU citizens' participation in ordinary policy-making processes.

After these opening remarks, the three foundations involved in organising the event introduced themselves and their organisations' involvement in the field of EU citizens' participation. Christina Tillmann, Director of the Future of Democracy Program of the Bertelsmann Stiftung, explained that her foundation had previously been focused on participatory democracy in Germany, and now aims to share and expand on this expertise at the transnational, EU level. Stefan Schäfers, Director for European Affairs at the King Baudouin Foundation, explained the key lesson he drew from their long-time experience in the field, dating back to the 'Meeting of Minds' project in 2005: If you do citizens' participation, you have to do it right. If you do not care about the process or do not care about the results, better not do it! Lastly, Finn Heinrich, Division Director for Transparency, Accountability and Participation at the Open

Society Foundations, highlighted the important potential of deliberative democratic instruments to bring in citizens that are left underrepresented through the traditional channels.

In the panel that followed on 'Citizens and the EU: A window of opportunity for new ideas and better participation formats', Pia Ahrenkilde Hansen, Director-General for Communication in the European Commission, stated that the European Union is at a juncture when it comes to citizens' participation. The European Commission has learned a lot from the previous exercises, which have inspired the European political agenda. It intends to take its engagement with citizens to the next level with the Conference on the Future of Europe, giving Europeans a greater say in policy-shaping.

In his contribution, David Mair, Head of Unit in the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, explained his own professional involvement when it comes to citizens' participation: Not only is the EU faced with a crisis of democracy, but also a crisis of epistemology, of expert authority. By means of citizens' participation, the EU can tap into citizens' collective intelligence and increase citizens' trust in science and EU policy-making as well.

Gisela Erler, in turn, building on her own experiences in Baden-Württemberg, emphasized how important it is to implant citizens' participation in the DNA of EU policy-making. Furthermore, when citizens participate and give input, it is the responsibility of politicians to answer them and explain why they decide to follow up on citizens' recommendations or not. "The bigger the question, the more suitable it is for citizens' participation," she concluded.

# Table discussions

Citizens’ Dialogues, Consultations and Mini-Publics on the rise:  
Practical examples from EU Member States and the European Commission

## 1 Table discussion

### Grand Débat in France

#### Where and when

President Emmanuel Macron launched the *Grand Débat* in January 2019 and announced the conclusions on 25 April.

#### Intention

Letter from President Emmanuel Macron: “I want to transform the anger of the citizens into solutions”.

#### Participating organizations

**Initiator:** President Emmanuel Macron

#### Participating Organizations:

- Two coordinating Ministers, Sébastien Lecornu and Emmanuelle Wargon
- A group of “guarantors”, Jean-Paul Bailly, Nadia Bellaoui, Guy Canivet, Isabelle Falque-Pierrotin and Pascal Perrineau
- The Mission *Grand Débat*, 7-person-team
- The French National Library to digitize the contributions
- Public Opinion institutes and other consultants to structure the huge volume of data

#### Facilitators:

- A decentralised organisation, local and regional politicians and administrators
- A group of moderators and service providers

#### Selection of participants

Different ways of recruiting participants: random selection (Regional Citizens’ Conferences), self-selection and targeted random selection (National Youth Conference).

#### Format

- 16 000 citizens’ books opened in the municipalities to collect citizens’ expectations and proposals, 27 000 letters and emails from citizens spontaneously sent to



the Mission *Grand Débat*/Ministries/Elysée and 5 000 Contributions on the proximity stands set up in stations or post offices

- 10 000 local meetings of local initiative: events organised by localities and civil society to debate and propose, 21 Regional Citizens’ Conferences with 1 400 randomly selected citizens and 41 subjects discussed in the National Thematic Conferences
- 1.9 million Online contributions on the platform <https://granddebat.fr/>
- “Synthesis” of the summaries and internet proposals, reports with the recommendations from the regional conferences

#### Evaluation

The *Grand Débat* was a success in terms of public involvement: If the political will exists, the mobilisation is easier. The biggest challenges were to guarantee a good methodology and quality due to the amount of activities and information/suggestions collected.

#### Lessons learned for the EU level

- **Defining the framework:** importance of the political will, defining the mandate and facilitating the impact on policy-making, from communication to participation and information, articulation between representation and participation.
- **Defining the addressee:** partnerships, random selection/complementary modalities, the place of organized civil society and experts, transnational and national dynamics.
- **Defining a process and guaranteeing quality:** methodology in line with the purpose and the public resources, monitoring the process.

## 2 Table discussion

# The Citizens' Assembly in Ireland

### Where and when

- 2012–2014 Constitutional Convention
- 2016–2018 Citizens' Assembly in Dublin

### Intention

To involve citizens in political and constitutional reforms.

### Participating organizations

Irish government

### Participants

**Constitutional Convention:** 33 national politicians, 66 citizens, 1 independent chair

**Citizens' Assembly:** 99 citizens, 1 independent chair

### Selection of participants

#### Constitutional Convention:

- Selection of citizens: random stratified selection
- Selection of politicians: nominated by the parties represented in both the Irish and the Northern Irish parliaments
- Selection of chair: appointment by government

#### Citizens' Assembly:

- Selection of citizens: random stratified selection (age, gender, social class, regional spread)
- Selection of chair: appointment by government

### Format

**Constitutional Convention:** Participants met during 10 weekends over the course of 14 months. 10 topics were discussed, 8 of which were given by the government, 2 selected by the Convention. It resulted in 43 recommendations, 18 of which would require constitutional amendment by a referendum. In response, there have been extensive parliamentary reforms and three referendums, two of which have been successful (on marriage equality in 2015 and blasphemy in 2018), and one unsuccessful (on reducing the age requirement of presidential candidates).

**Citizens' Assembly:** Participants met during 12 weekends over the course of 14 months. 5 topics were discussed, all



selected by the government. Its conclusions and recommendations have led to one successful referendum on abortion in 2018.

During the meetings, participants were given objective information, listened to and questioned experts and persons concerned, and then engaged in facilitated (small group) discussions about policy issues. The participants also took into account the views from stakeholders submitted on the website.

### Evaluation

- **Effective combination:** The key to success in the case of the Irish Citizens' Assembly is the effective combination of deliberative, representative and direct democracy: The Citizens' Assembly only had an advisory role vis-à-vis the parliament, which after careful deliberation decided on a number of referendums to change the constitution.
- **Public recognition:** The biggest success is the fact that citizens' assemblies are increasingly recognised as an important part of the political system.
- **Thematic focus:** The citizens dealt with too many topics at the same time. They did not receive an appropriate financial compensation for the great amount of time they invested in the Citizens' Assembly.

### Lessons learned for the EU level

- **Hot topic:** The topic of abortion was a highly salient issue across the Irish population. The question is whether a similar issue could be identified at EU level, considering that different issues are salient in different places in Europe. Nonetheless, two possible candidates are migration and climate change.
- **Close connection of Citizens' Assemblies with European institutions:** At the moment, EU-wide referendums are non-existent. In the absence thereof, one may wonder if Citizens' Assemblies can still be an effective vehicle for political change. Consideration needs to be given as to how best to link civic participation with the existing EU institutions.

### 3 Table discussion

## Empowering people to make a difference. Experiences of the Scottish Government

#### Where and when

Citizens’ Panel on the Social Security System conducted in the framework of the Open Government Action Plan 2018–2020.

#### Intention

Two intentions are pursued. On the one hand, ideas for the specific policy area of social security should be generated, and, on the other hand, a framework for public servants to understand their role in using citizens’ participation as part of the way their work should be developed.

#### Participating organizations

- Scottish Open Government
- Both Scottish Open Government participation framework and the social security work (separate agency)
- A small team inside government work, with civil society, and stakeholders

#### Participants

2400 citizens took part at the Citizens’ Panel for Social Security.

#### Selection of participants

The Citizens’ Panel was recruited by phone, post and online, following accessibility guidance and with advice from inclusive communications experts to produce the invitations and forms. The participants are a diverse group from all over Scotland: The Citizens’ Panel were all in receipt of social security benefits, but for the deliberative elements of the work a set of criteria were applied to ensure geographical, demographic and other important weighting to have a properly representative group.

#### Format

2400 Citizens’ Panel members were asked to get involved into a large program of research to inform key decisions in the design of social security in Scotland. There has been a range of activities and topics to suit different members,



dealing with the social security system in general and more specific activities on specific benefits. Various participatory elements were introduced, ranging from the Citizens’ Panel, quantitative/qualitative surveys, direct involvement in service design for the new benefits and the specific deliberative exercise to develop a Social Security Charter. The Charter has been developed to meet the requirements of the Scottish Parliament.

Additionally, the participation framework development is continuing and will learn from the results of this work.

#### Evaluation

Improved social security system, political buy-in for the level of citizen involvement to support conventional evidence. The biggest difficulty – making this ‘the way we do business’. It is possible for citizens’ participation to be a significant part of how governments work, routinely. The Participation Framework can be scaled, it will be possible, with investment, to create a system, and our work in Scotland could help identify some of the challenges.

#### Lessons learned for the EU level

- If the EU takes citizens’ participation seriously, there is a need to invest in empowering both citizens and public servants along with civil society.
- The importance of recruiting by random selection, quality facilitation and the techniques of ensuring positive dialogue. Involve always people affected by specific policy proposals, but don’t forget about involving a wider group of citizens. A wider approach helps to improve policy-making.
- Don’t use a one-size fits all participatory method. Instead, use a flexible approach by offering a toolbox to policy-makers from which the appropriate participatory approach can be selected depending on context and needs.
- Participation reduces costs as quality and effectiveness of policies increases.

## 4 Table discussion

# The European Citizens' Consultations and how to carry the flame

### Where and when

The Citizens' Panel on the Future of Europe took place in Brussels on 4-6 May 2018, the European Citizens' Consultations (online) at EU level from May 2018 to May 2019. The majority of national initiatives took place between February 2018 and October 2018.

### Intention

The consultations were intended to improve the quality of democracy in the European Union. European citizens should be able to express their views on the European Union.

### Participating organizations

European Commission, national governments, civil society organisations.

### Participants

- Citizens' Panel: 96 citizens from 27 EU Member States
- European Citizens' Consultations (online) at EU level: 87 000 from all 27 EU Member States
- The number of participants varies from one Member State to another, in France 65 000 participants, in Lithuania, there was an average of 40 participants per event, in Spain, up to 150 citizens took part in an event.

### Selection of participants

- Citizens' Panel on the Future of Europe: The 96 citizens were selected to represent the European population according to gender, age, employment and economic status.
- European Citizens' Consultations at EU level: Anyone could participate.
- European Citizens' Consultations at national level: Mostly interested citizens. For some of the consultations, special care was given to involve groups that usually did not participate in such events, and sometimes the participants were selected or screened.



### Format

The ECCs took place at EU and Member State level. At the European level, an online questionnaire was developed by the Citizens' Panel in Brussels, which was then translated and disseminated by the European Commission in all EU languages. At Member State level, national governments organised consultations and summarised the results. The 27 participating Member States have all designed the ECCs with an immense variety (including in terms of their name, format, reporting). The results of the consultations at both levels were discussed by the European Council in December 2018.

### Evaluation

- The ECC process marked the first occasion whereby all EU27 Member States were actively involved in EU citizens' participation. This is an important first step that any future process could build on.
- The ECC consultations were very broad and therefore did not lead to specific policy or other reform proposals.
- The ECC process (at least in some of the Member States) mostly reached EU-friendly, engaged citizens, the so-called 'usual suspects'.

### Lessons learned for the EU level

- **Choose the right topics:** The choice of topics is important; most suitable are issues which are of direct relevance to citizens (ethical issues, digital life, climate etc.).
- **Learn from previous experiences:** The buy-in from Member States' governments is key.
- **Sufficient resources available:** The need for significant resources for these consultations to ensure the diversity of represented views (e.g. not only in cities; resources for child care, translation etc.) and a careful and competent process design (e.g. for process facilitators, moderation, information material and websites).
- **Clarify beforehand how the results will be handled:** It should be clear at the beginning what happens with the input/deliberations by citizens.

## 5 Table discussion

# Learning from three multi-lingual, cross-border EU-Citizens’ Dialogues

### Where and when

- Frankfurt/Oder on 24 May 2018, 1 day
- Passau on 6 December 2018, 1 day
- The Hague 17 May 2019, 1 day + get-together the evening before

### Intention

The European Commission initiated the EU Citizens’ Dialogues in order to improve the understanding between the political elite in Brussels and EU citizens at grassroots level. The intention was to create more interactive dialogues, have more diversity by means of random participant selection, and apply a new interpreting format for multilingual communication.

### Participating organizations

- European Commission, DG Communication, Representatives of the European Commission in Austria, Germany, Czech Republic and the Netherlands
- Bertelsmann Stiftung, Program Future of Democracy

### Participants

- 200 citizens from Poland and Germany in Frankfurt/Oder
- 120 citizens from Austria, the Czech Republic and Germany in Passau
- 120 citizens from the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Germany and Ireland in The Hague
- Representatives from the European Commission (Frans Timmermans, Martin Selmayr, Ann Mettler and others), MPs, diplomats and regional and local politicians

### Selection of participants

**Random Selection:** The citizens from the different countries were selected at random. The process invites a wide range of citizens, not only pro-European. The process followed pre-determined criteria including gender, age and educational background.

### Format

**More interaction:** The World Café format invites discussions in small groups to give everybody a say: a) table discussions between the citizens about their experiences



and ideas, agreements about their proposals. b) exchange of ideas and proposals with politicians and experts at the tables. c) Citizens’ Dialogue with European Commissioner about the results of the tables in plenary session.

**Multilingual communication:** A new interpreting format at the tables ensures direct communication between citizens in small multi-lingual groups.

### Evaluation

More than 95% of participants from the three dialogues stated that the event was very good. The cross-border character of the event was the most popular aspect. The quality of the discussions was high in terms of process and outcome.

After participating, the citizens are more satisfied with the European Union and EU politicians. The politicians gained greater insight into how citizens really feel about the future of Europe.

Participants expect more attention for their proposals, they are hoping that politicians take them into account and integrate them into the policy-making process after the dialogue.

### Lessons learned for the EU level

- Multilingual cross-border EU Citizens’ Dialogues with randomly selected citizens’ guarantee a wide variety of experiences, perspectives and opinions. The diversity of citizens and good structured interactive discussion formats enrich the content and the quality of the results. This type of dialogue should form an important part of the Conference on the Future of Europe announced by the new President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen.
- The EU must make a clear distinction for future citizens’ dialogues and participation projects between decision-shaping and decision-making. Clear communication helps citizens as well as politicians.
- The results of citizens’ participation procedures (citizens’ proposals) should be seriously considered by policy makers. Feedback to citizens and accountability for dealing with the results should become mandatory. At the very least, the process (not the content) should be made binding.

# Second plenary discussion

Participation in tomorrow's EU: How to develop better and new citizens' participation formats? What next?

From the second plenary discussion, and the evening as a whole, we can distil three central items of discussion.

## Topic selection & the policy cycle

A returning discussion during the evening was the type of topics that would be most suitable for new deliberation and participation formats. It was argued that the bigger ethical and politically salient questions – such as artificial intelligence, climate change or migration – are among the best candidates. Additionally, it was stated that citizens' participation and deliberation forms are of high relevance in the very first stage of the policy-making cycle – the moment at which a particular issue is framed and political priorities are defined.

## The role of the media

Another much-discussed topic is the role of the media. Some participants perceived journalists as being relatively sceptical about and disinterested in citizens' participation. Journalists, it was argued, are not interested in deliberative processes, only in the political output and impact. Others argued that those organising citizens' participation processes should not rely on traditional media, but make better use of social media.

## The institutionalization of citizens' participation

A last argument that was repeatedly made during the evening was to go beyond one-off participation exercises, and to make new forms of citizens' participation a regular part of ordinary policy-making processes. It was argued that processes like the European Citizens' Consultations should be learned from, informing new and recurring processes of EU consultation. It is only then that citizens' participation can have a lasting impact.

## Closing

At the end of the evening, participants were asked to write down what they perceive as the most pressing issue in the field of democracy and participation at the EU level, and what their expectations are towards the foundations that organised the event. Judging by their responses, there is a lot of work to do when it comes to strengthening EU participatory democracy. Foundations have an important role to play in this field, among others as independent facilitators of events like this, bringing together relevant experts and stakeholders in order to learn from each other. Stay tuned for follow-up initiatives!



# Agenda

---

18:30 – 19:00

**Arrival and informal stand-up reception**

19:00 – 19:05

**Welcome**

**Gisela Erler**, State Councilor for Civil Society and Civic Participation in the State Ministry of Baden-Württemberg

19:05 – 19:15

**Introductions, the foundations' points of view:**

**Strengthening new forms of Citizens' Participation in Europe**

**Dominik Hierlemann**, Senior Expert, Program Future of Democracy, Bertelsmann Stiftung

In conversation with:

- **Christina Tillmann**, Director Program Future of Democracy, Bertelsmann Stiftung
- **Stefan Schäfers**, Director for European Affairs at the King Baudouin Foundation
- **Finn Heinrich**, Division Director, Transparency Accountability and Participation, Open Society Foundations

19:15 – 19:45

**Citizens and the EU: A window of opportunity for new ideas and better participation formats**

In conversation with:

- **Pia Ahrenkilde Hansen**, Director-General, Directorate-General for Communication, European Commission
- **David Mair**, Head of Unit, Joint Research Centre, European Commission
- **Gisela Erler**, State Councilor for Civil Society and Civic Participation in the State Ministry of Baden-Württemberg

19:45 – 20:30

**Citizens' Dialogues, Consultations and Mini-Publics on the rise:**

**Practical examples from EU Member States and the European Commission – What can the EU learn from these examples?**

**Presentations and discussions at five round tables**

**Table 1:** Citizens' Consultations on Europe and *Grand Débat* in France: Including diverse citizens through random selection and mobilizing a broader public through online technologies.

**Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul**, European Union Directorate, French Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs

**Table 2:** The Citizens' Assembly in Ireland: Deliberation of a Mini-Public and its relationship with parliament and referendum

**David Farrell**, Head of School of Politics and International Relations, University College Dublin

**Table 3:** Empowering people to make a difference. Experiences of the Scottish Government

**Doreen Grove**, Head of Open Government, Scottish Government

**Table 4:** The European Citizens' Consultations and how to carry the flame

**Corina Stratulat**, Head of the European Politics and Institutions Programme, European Policy Centre (EPC)

**Table 5:** Learning from three multi-lingual, cross-border EU-Citizens' Dialogues

**Anna Renkamp**, Senior Project Manager, Program Future of Democracy, Bertelsmann Stiftung

20:30 – 22:00

**Participation in tomorrow's EU: How to develop better and new citizens' participation formats? What next?**

**Summary reports from the table discussions, plenary discussion, outlook and farewell**

# List of participants

<b>Pia Ahrenkilde Hansen</b>	Director-General, DG for Communication, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Prof. Alberto Alemanno</b>	Jean Monnet Professor of EU Law & Policy, HEC Paris, France
<b>Stefan Appel</b>	Head of Unit, DG for Regional and Urban Policy, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Dr. Johanna Becker-Strunk</b>	Head of Office, Brussels Representation Rhineland Palatinate, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Dr. Franziska Brantner</b>	Member of German Parliament, Berlin, Germany
<b>Pierluigi Brombo</b>	Head of Unit, European Economic and Social Committee, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Obhi Chatterjee</b>	Head of Sector - Learning Technologies, DG for Human Resources and Security, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Maarten de Groot</b>	Project Manager, Program Future of Democracy, Bertelsmann Stiftung, Gütersloh, Germany
<b>Charles de Marcilly</b>	Adviser, European Political Strategy Centre, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Céline Diebold</b>	Project Manager, Program Future of Democracy, Bertelsmann Stiftung, Gütersloh, Germany
<b>Andrew Duff</b>	President, Spinelli Group, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Gisela Erler</b>	State Councilor for Civil Society and Civic Participation in the State Ministry of Baden-Württemberg, Stuttgart, Germany
<b>Prof. Dr. David Farrell</b>	Head of School of Politics and International Relations, University College Dublin, Ireland
<b>Jennifer Fitzsimons</b>	Thematic Networks Coordinator, European Foundation Centre, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Michaela Gehring</b>	Case Handler, European Ombudsman, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Heather Grabbe</b>	Director, Open Society European Policy Institute, Open Society Foundations, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Doreen Grove</b>	Head of Open Government, Scottish Government, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
<b>Dr. Ângela Guimarães Pereira</b>	Team Leader, DG Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Harald Hartung</b>	Head of Unit, DG for Research and Innovation, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Dr. Finn Heinrich</b>	Director, Transparency Accountability and Participation, Open Society Foundations, Berlin, Germany
<b>Dr. Thomas Hieber</b>	Legal expert, ECI e. V., Brussels, Belgium
<b>Dr. Dominik Hierlemann</b>	Senior Expert, Program Future of Democracy, Bertelsmann Stiftung, Gütersloh, Germany
<b>Assya Kavrakova</b>	Executive Director, European Citizen Action Service, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Dr. Raphaël Kies</b>	Research Scientist, University of Luxembourg, Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg
<b>Richard Nikolaus Kühnel</b>	Director, DG for Communication, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>David Mair</b>	Head of Unit, DG Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Irena Moozova</b>	Director, DG Justice and Consumers, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Niklaus Nuspliger</b>	Political Correspondent / Author, Neue Zürcher Zeitung (NZZ), Brussels, Belgium
<b>Dr. Joachim Ott</b>	Head of Unit, DG for Communication, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Alexandros Parassidis</b>	Unit for Civil Society and Civic Participation, State Ministry of Baden-Württemberg, Stuttgart, Germany
<b>Gilles Pelayo</b>	Head of Unit, Europe for Citizens, Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Wolfgang Petzold</b>	Deputy Director for Communication, European Committee of the Regions, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Jonathan Ponchon</b>	European Parliament Liaison Office in Luxembourg
<b>Anna Renkamp</b>	Senior Project Manager, Program Future of Democracy, Bertelsmann Stiftung, Gütersloh, Germany
<b>Dr. Gaëtane Ricard-Nihoul</b>	European Union Directorate, French Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs, Paris, France
<b>Cyril Robin-Champigneul</b>	Policy Coordinator, DG for Research and Innovation, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Inga Rosińska</b>	Director for Information and Outreach, Council of the European Union, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Dr. Stefan Schäfers</b>	Stefan Schäfers, Director for European Affairs, King Baudouin Foundation, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Winfried Schröder</b>	Head of office of the Minister-President at the Representation of the State of Baden-Württemberg to the European Union, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Astrid Solhaug</b>	Policy Officer, DG for Regional and Urban Policy, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Renaud Soufflot de Magny</b>	Policy Assistant to the Director-General / Senior Expert, DG for Communication, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
<b>Dr. Corina Stratulat</b>	Head of the European Politics and Institutions Programme, European Policy Centre (EPC), Brussels, Belgium
<b>Markus Teglas</b>	Head of Office Minister of State for Europe Michael Roth MP, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin, Germany
<b>Christina Tillmann</b>	Director, Program Future of Democracy, Bertelsmann Stiftung, Gütersloh, Germany

## Address | Contact

### **Bertelsmann Stiftung**

Carl-Bertelsmann-Straße 256  
33311 Gütersloh  
Germany  
Phone +49 5241 81-0

Anna Renkamp

Program Future of Democracy

Phone +49 5241 81-81145  
anna.renkamp@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

Dr. Dominik Hierlemann

Program Future of Democracy

Phone +49 5241 81-81537  
dominik.hierlemann@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

### **King Boudain Foundation**

Dr. Stefan Schäfers

European Affairs

Phone +32 2 549 0239  
schaefers.s@kbs-frb.be

### **Open Society Foundations**

Finn Heinrich

Transparency Accountability and Participation

Phone +49 30 34382050  
finn.heinrich@opensocietyfoundations.org

### **Further information can be found on**

[www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/en/our-projects/  
democracy-and-participation-in-europe/](http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/en/our-projects/democracy-and-participation-in-europe/)

[www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/en](http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/en)