



Your Voice, Your Europe: Youth Shaping the Future



Main topic & European value

- ◆ **Core topic:** Youth Participation in EU Decision-Making and Shaping Europe's Future. This game explores the rights, frameworks, and possibilities that enable young people to influence European policy, from local youth councils to the European Parliament, examining how democratic structures invite and depend on active civic engagement.
- ◆ **European values:** Democracy, equality, rule of law, and human rights. Through interactive gameplay, players discover how participatory frameworks translate democratic ideals into concrete opportunities for youth-led change.



Educational objectives

By the end of the game, the player should be able to:

- ✓ Identify the key EU frameworks and institutions that support youth participation in democratic processes.
- ✓ Compare formal and informal pathways through which young people can influence EU policy.
- ✓ Evaluate the effectiveness of existing youth participation mechanisms, such as the EU Youth Dialogue, in representing diverse perspectives.
- ✓ Apply knowledge of democratic rights to design a youth-led policy proposal addressing a real community issue.
- ✓ Explain how the principle of subsidiarity connects local youth action to European-level decision-making.



Scenario overview

The year is 2028. The European Commission has launched the “Future Voices Initiative,” inviting youth organisations from across Europe to submit policy proposals for the next EU Youth Strategy. The player takes on the role of a young civic activist who has been selected to represent their local youth council at a week-long participatory summit held at the European Parliament in Strasbourg.

Upon arrival, the player discovers that the summit is more than a conference: it is a live simulation of democratic decision-making. Participants must navigate four themed challenges, each representing a stage of the EU policy cycle: agenda-setting, consultation, negotiation, and adoption.

Along the way, the player encounters fellow delegates with competing priorities, institutional gatekeepers who test whether proposals meet legal and procedural standards, and community voices demanding to be heard. The central tension is not just writing a strong proposal but learning to build coalitions, manage compromise, and ensure that the process itself is inclusive.

The summit culminates in a plenary vote where delegates decide which proposals move forward, forcing the player to weigh idealism against pragmatism. Through this experience, the player learns that participation is not a privilege granted by institutions but a right that requires knowledge, persistence, and collaboration to exercise effectively.



Core mechanics & tasks

The game combines resource management, decision trees, role-play dialogues, and collaborative puzzles across four themed challenges that mirror real stages of democratic participation.

- ◆ Resource management: the player allocates limited time, credibility points, and coalition tokens to advance their proposal. Coalition tokens



are spent to win the backing of other delegates and stakeholders, and the alliances they secure determine how many votes the proposal can count on in the final plenary vote.

- ◆ Decision trees: at critical moments, the player chooses between competing strategies, such as broadening a proposal to gain allies or keeping it focused to maintain integrity.
- ◆ Role-play dialogues: the player engages in structured conversations with NPCs representing institutional actors, fellow youth delegates, and community stakeholders.
- ◆ Collaborative puzzles: the player must piece together fragments of EU treaties, youth strategies, and legal frameworks to unlock procedural knowledge needed at each stage.
- ◆ Tasks include:
 - ◆ Challenge 1 (Agenda-Setting): Research community needs by reviewing case studies, then rank policy priorities by sorting them on a simple grid that weighs each issue's urgency against how many people it affects.
 - ◆ Challenge 2 (Consultation): Conduct virtual consultations with diverse youth groups across Europe, balancing regional perspectives and identifying common ground.
 - ◆ Challenge 3 (Negotiation): Take part in a committee discussion where institutional representatives respond to the proposal through a series of multiple-choice exchanges. Each choice - defending a core principle or accepting a compromise - branches the conversation and changes how the proposal must be amended.
 - ◆ Challenge 4 (Adoption): Present the final proposal to a plenary assembly, respond to critical questions, and secure a majority vote by activating the coalitions built throughout the game.



Player role

The player is Sam Okafor (default name, customisable; gender-neutral), a 20-year-old university student and local youth-council member who has organised community events but never engaged with EU-level politics. Curious yet unsure whether institutions truly listen to young people, Sam chooses which policy area to champion (education, climate, digital rights, or social inclusion), which stakeholders to prioritise, and whether to take a pragmatic, idealistic, or consensus-building approach - choices that shape the proposal, the coalition, and the final vote.



NPC profiles

Name	Role in the story & function in the gameplay	Personality traits
Dr. Eleni Vassiliadis	Mentor and institutional guide. A senior European Youth Forum adviser with two decades bridging youth organisations and EU institutions. Offers procedural guidance, explains legal frameworks, and pushes the player to think strategically about coalitions.	Calm, methodical, deeply committed. Listens carefully before responding. Believes in the system but acknowledges its flaws. Encourages evidence-based arguments.
Rafi Johansson	Ally and fellow delegate. A 21-year-old Scandinavian climate activist from a grassroots youth network. Explains informal participation channels, offers to co-sponsor proposals, and questions whether institutions truly empower young people or just look inclusive.	Passionate, collaborative, occasionally impatient. Speaks with conviction about climate justice. Values authenticity over protocol and questions bureaucratic language.



Commissioner Hanna Berger	Opponent (nuanced). A fictional EU Commissioner for Youth and Democracy who chairs the plenary. Supports youth participation but insists proposals be feasible, legally compliant, and cross-border applicable; pushes back on vague idealism and demands concrete plans.	Professional, fair, demanding. Not dismissive but expects rigour. Respects well-prepared arguments and rewards delegates who demonstrate knowledge of EU procedures.
---------------------------	---	--



Dialogue options, choices & consequences

Dialogue or dilemma	Available options (2-3)	Short-term & long-term consequences
Challenge 1 (Agenda-Setting): Dr. Vassiliadis presents three competing community needs. The player must decide which issue to champion as their policy priority, knowing the choice will shape the entire summit journey.	○ A) Choose education equity, focusing on equal access to quality learning across EU member states. ○ B) Choose digital rights, proposing stronger protections for young people's data and online safety. ○ C) Choose social inclusion, addressing barriers faced by marginalised youth communities.	○ A) Rafi supportive, but education lacks urgency; coalition-building needs more effort. ○ B) Dr. Vassiliadis praises the timeliness; allies come easier, but competition is fiercer. ○ C) Berger flags high implementation complexity; stronger evidence needed to succeed.
Challenge 2 (Consultation): The	○ A) Present only quantitative data from	○ A) Berger values the rigour but finds it



player must present their policy research to a diverse panel. Rafi suggests that raw data alone will not persuade anyone, while Dr. Vassiliadis insists on methodological rigour.	Eurostat and official EU reports to build a purely evidence-based case. ○ B) Combine statistical data with personal testimonies from youth focus groups to create an emotionally compelling narrative. ○ C) Organise a live virtual consultation with youth delegates from underrepresented regions during the session.	detached from lived experience; moderate credibility gain. ○ B) Vassiliadis and Rafi both endorse it; evidence plus narrative strengthens the proposal. ○ C) The live consultation impresses delegates but adds time pressure; high engagement, risk of delays.
Challenge 3 (Negotiation): The committee session begins. An institutional representative proposes significant amendments to the player's proposal. The player must decide how to respond under time pressure.	○ A) Stand firm on the original proposal, arguing that compromise would dilute its impact on the communities it aims to serve. ○ B) Accept amendments that broaden the proposal's scope, gaining allies but risking loss of focus. ○ C) Propose a phased implementation plan that addresses the committee's concerns while preserving core principles.	○ A) Rafi admires the conviction, but the proposal loses committee support; risk of elimination. ○ B) The broader coalition wins committee approval, but some original supporters feel it is weakened. ○ C) Vassiliadis praises the strategy; the phased plan satisfies idealists and pragmatists - strongest outcome.



Challenge 4 (Adoption): The plenary vote approaches. Commissioner Berger asks the player to present their final proposal. The delivery style will influence the outcome.	○ A) Deliver a formal, data-driven presentation that mirrors institutional communication style. ○ B) Use a storytelling approach, opening with a personal anecdote about why youth participation matters. ○ C) Invite Rafi and a community representative to co-present, demonstrating the collaborative process behind the proposal.	○ A) Berger respects the professionalism; moderate support from formality-minded delegates. ○ B) The personal narrative resonates; strong engagement, but some delegates question the evidence. ○ C) The co-presentation shows inclusive leadership; strongest plenary impact - Berger calls it a model.
---	---	--



Summary, debriefing & reflection questions

- ◆ After completing the summit, consider the following questions:
- ◆ What rights do young Europeans have to participate in EU decision-making? Which specific treaties or frameworks guarantee these rights?
- ◆ Why is coalition-building an essential skill in democratic participation? What did you learn about compromise during the negotiation challenge?
- ◆ Commissioner Berger insisted that proposals must be feasible and legally compliant. Is this a fair requirement or an institutional barrier to youth participation? Explain your reasoning.
- ◆ Rafi argued that informal activism can be more effective than formal institutional channels. Do you agree or disagree? Use examples from the game and your own experience.



- ◆ How does the principle of subsidiarity connect local youth councils to European-level institutions? Why does this connection matter?
- ◆ After playing this game, do you feel more or less confident that your voice can influence EU policy? What would need to change to increase youth participation?



References & additional resources

- ✦ European Commission. (n.d.). EU Youth Strategy 2019–2027.
https://youth.europa.eu/strategy_en
- ✦ European Youth Forum. (n.d.). <https://www.youthforum.org/>
- ✦ European Parliament. (n.d.). Youth in the EU.
<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/141/youth>
- ✦ Council of Europe. (2015). Revised European Charter on the Participation of Young People in Local and Regional Life.
<https://rm.coe.int/doc/0900001680702379>



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

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

Project code: KA220-YOU-000286883