



European Action Plan

A European framework for fair consumption, built by young people

Consumo Justo · Erasmus+ KA220-YOU cooperation partnership
Project 2024-1-FR02-KA220-YOU-000248910

2026



Co-funded by
the European Union

Contents

Contents	2
The Consumo Justo mobile application	4
1 At a glance	5
Five countries, one shared direction	5
Three European actions	5
What success looks like	5
2 Why this plan exists	6
The Consumo Justo purpose	6
Who this plan is for	6
What this plan is	6
3 How young people contributed	6
A local and European process	6
How many young people took part	7
Youth participation standard	7
Limits of the evidence	7
4 What young people identified	8
Personal level: knowing is not the same as being able to act	8
Community level: action needs a place and a coordinating group	8
Political and system level: sustainable choices depend on rules and access	8
What differs between countries	9
5 The European action framework	10
How the five country plans feed the three actions	10
Action 1. Make Sustainable Choices Practical	10
Action 2. Youth-Led Circular and Fair Consumption Actions	11
Action 3. Local Commitments for Youth, Institutions and Business	13
6 Recommendations by stakeholder	15
Youth organisations and youth workers	15
Schools and educators	15
Local authorities	15
Private sector	16
National authorities	16
European institutions and networks	16
7 From proposal to implementation	17
The six-step pilot cycle	17
A small monitoring set	17
Inclusion and access	17
Risk proportionality	17
Resource honesty	18
8 Five country action cards	19
France: Pontonx Sustainable Market	19

Latvia: Clothing Swaps for Sustainable Consumption Awareness	19
Spain: The Chain	21
Norway: Oslo Sustainable Action Days	22
Poland: Bring Your Own Cup Day	23
9 Priorities and expected European value	24
Five priorities	24
Expected European value	24
Closing message	24
10 How this plan was made.....	25
Where the content comes from.....	25
How the five became three.....	25
Consumo Justo	26
Partners	26

The Consumo Justo mobile application

The framework in this plan rests on material that young people and youth workers can use directly: explanatory sheets on fair, ethical, local and sustainable consumption, and activity sheets a facilitator can run with a group. All of it travels in the project's mobile application, so a youth team can reach it in the room where they are working.

The application is free and available on both major platforms.

Google Play



play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=fr.wipsee.consumojusto

App Store



apps.apple.com/app/id6755227445

Google Play: play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=fr.wipsee.consumojusto

App Store: apps.apple.com/app/id6755227445

1 At a glance

Consumo Justo asked young people in France, Latvia, Spain, Norway and Poland to move beyond general awareness and design local responses to responsible consumption. Their proposals are different because their settings are different: a rural community market in France, clothing swaps in Riga, public theatre in Pamplona, a set of repair, swap and food-sharing pilots in Oslo, and a reusable-cup campaign on a Polish university campus.

Together, the five plans carry one message. Sustainable consumption becomes credible when people can practise it, when communities make space for it, and when institutions and businesses remove the obstacles that make the sustainable option the harder one.

Five countries, one shared direction

Country	Youth-led local proposal	What it contributes to Europe
France	Pontonx Sustainable Market: second-hand exchange, local producers and awareness activities.	Connect reuse, local economic life and youth participation in a rural setting.
Latvia	Clothing Swaps for Sustainable Consumption Awareness in Riga.	Offer a simple, repeatable alternative to buying new clothes.
Spain	The Chain: participatory theatre about chocolate production, fair trade and consumer choice.	Use culture and emotion to make global supply chains understandable.
Norway	Oslo Sustainable Action Days: electronics repair, second-hand swapping and food redistribution.	Test several circular-consumption routes through sequenced pilots.
Poland	Bring Your Own Cup Day in a university cafeteria.	Show how a small institutional incentive can make a daily sustainable choice easier.

One of the five has already reached its public. The Spanish theatre action was performed in Pamplona in June 2026, and section 8 describes how it was made and what it achieved. The other four are designed and ready for a first local cycle.

Three European actions

- 1. Make Sustainable Choices Practical.** Young people need usable knowledge, a skill, feedback and sometimes an incentive at the moment they choose.
- 2. Youth-Led Circular and Fair Consumption Actions.** Local occasions where young people repair, exchange, perform or organise together make the alternative visible.
- 3. Local Commitments for Youth, Institutions and Business.** A youth proposal needs a clear route to a venue, a permission, specialist support and a decision about whether it continues.

What success looks like

Success is not a large number written in advance. A good first cycle can be small: a safe pilot with a clear purpose, real youth ownership, a reachable group, simple evidence and an honest decision about what happens next. Its value lies in showing that a more sustainable option can work in a real place, and in making clear what support repetition would need.

2 Why this plan exists

This section explains where the plan comes from and who it is written for.

The Consumo Justo purpose

Consumo Justo is an Erasmus+ KA220-YOU cooperation partnership (2024-1-FR02-KA220-YOU-000248910) focused on fair, ethical, local and sustainable consumption. It promotes young people's engagement in environmental action through practical tools, learning activities and local participation. Responsible consumption is therefore not treated only as an individual moral choice. It is also a question of access, skills, community infrastructure, commercial practice and public decision-making.

Each partner worked with a local youth committee to produce a Local Action Plan. The five plans were then placed side by side and developed into a single European plan for wide dissemination, published in English and in the partner languages and available through the project's mobile application.

This European Action Plan fulfils that synthesis role. It does not replace the local plans. It draws out the common needs, protects meaningful national differences and turns them into a framework that another youth organisation, school, authority or business can use.

Who this plan is for

- **Young people** looking for practical ways to shape consumption in their school, campus, neighbourhood or town.
- **Youth organisations and youth workers** supporting participation, safeguarding and project delivery.
- **Schools and educators** able to connect learning with practical action.
- **Local and national authorities** controlling venues, permits, programmes, small-scale support and enabling policy.
- **European institutions and networks** supporting replication and exchange across countries.
- **Private-sector organisations** able to adjust a daily practice, contribute expertise, prevent waste or make sustainable choices easier.

What this plan is

This is an action framework grounded in five youth-led proposals. It offers a sequence, roles and checks that make local delivery more realistic. Young people's priorities are reported as what the participating committees told the project. Where a practical detail belongs to the team running the action, the plan says so rather than inventing a figure.

3 How young people contributed

This section describes how young people took part, how many were involved, and the standard used to protect meaningful youth ownership.

A local and European process

The project design created five local youth committees, one in each partner country. Local discussion was connected through four documented European online youth sessions:

- 16 April 2025: imagining a sustainable city and introducing shared consumption questions.
- 8 December 2025: comparing barriers such as money, information, access and daily habits.
- 12 February 2026: developing action ideas and linking them to personal, community and system levels.
- 11 June 2026: presenting and discussing the five country proposals.

Partners used different local methods, including online and in-person meetings, guided discussion, brainstorming, collaborative reflection, WhatsApp coordination, creative development and voting. The objective was never to run five identical surveys, but to help young people shape an action that made sense where they live.

How many young people took part

Each committee was deliberately small. These were working groups that met more than once, developed an idea together and carried it through to a written plan, rather than audiences at a single event. Where a source records ages, participants ranged from 16 to 27, spanning school-age, student and early-career perspectives.

Country	Local participation	Source basis
France	Approximately 5 to 10 young people across several meetings and consultation activities.	France Local Action Plan.
Latvia	Six young people in an online co-creation meeting.	Latvia Local Action Plan.
Spain	Eight participants including the coordinator.	Spain Local Action Plan.
Norway	At least five contributors identified across the February and June European sessions.	European youth meeting attendance records.
Poland	The youth team that developed the campus proposal and presented it to the European group.	Youth presentation and European meeting records.

The figures stay at country level and are not added into a European total, because young people who joined more than one session would be counted twice.

Youth participation standard

Across the five plans, youth participation means more than answering questions. Young people are expected to:

- identify the problem and choose the focus;
- shape the format and language of the action;
- contact peers and help negotiate with enabling organisations;
- lead communication and visible delivery roles;
- collect proportionate feedback and practical evidence;
- decide with partners whether an action should continue, change or stop.

This standard protects the "by and for young people" purpose of the whole exercise. Adult organisations provide safeguarding, specialist knowledge, permissions and continuity. They should not take the idea away from the young people who had it.

Limits of the evidence

The consultation is qualitative and project-based. It shows what the participating young people considered important and workable. It does not measure how common each opinion is among young people in the five countries, and it was never designed to. Where a Local Action Plan makes a broad observation about its own community, this European plan presents it as a consultation perspective rather than as a verified statistic.

4 What young people identified

The five plans point to related barriers at personal, community and system levels. This section compares those needs without flattening the differences between countries.

Personal level: knowing is not the same as being able to act

Young people across the plans were not asking only for more general information. They repeatedly described a gap between caring about sustainability and having an affordable, workable opportunity to act on it.

In France and Latvia, fast fashion is visible, cheap and easy to reach, while repair, swapping and ethical alternatives can demand more time or local knowledge. The Spanish plan shows that fair-trade and supply-chain information can feel distant or overwhelming, and proposes theatre as a way to replace helplessness with discussion. The Norwegian proposal responds to missing skills and channels: someone may want to repair a device or avoid wasting food without knowing where to begin safely. The Polish plan works inside an everyday institutional setting, using a possible discount to make the reusable cup the easier choice at the till.

Three personal-level needs emerge:

1. **Practical competence.** Knowing how to repair, reuse, compare, exchange or choose.
2. **A reachable alternative.** A place, event, service or incentive available at the moment of the decision.
3. **Visible feedback.** Evidence that taking part produced a result, even a modest one.

Community level: action needs a place and a coordinating group

Every proposal depends on a place. For the French market that means an open space able to hold residents, producers and sellers at once. The Latvian swap needs somewhere regular and welcoming enough that people come back. Spain needed a public setting where passers-by could stop and watch. The Norwegian pilots each call for a different kind of host, which is part of why they cannot all run at the same time, and the Polish campaign depends less on a room than on cafeteria staff and campus communication channels.

The common barrier is rarely a lack of motivation. It is the work of coordination: agreeing who opens the venue, what can be accepted, what safety rules apply, how the public is reached, who handles leftover items, and what happens if fewer people turn up than expected.

Community action becomes stronger when roles are divided early:

- a **youth lead** protects the purpose and voice of the action;
- an **enabling-organisation contact** supports safeguarding, administration and continuity;
- a **delivery or specialist partner** confirms practical procedures;
- a **documentation lead** records only the evidence needed for learning and a continuation decision.

Political and system level: sustainable choices depend on rules and access

The local plans do not all identify a specific policy failure. They do show how much depends on institutions. A permit for public space can be straightforward or slow, depending on how a municipality handles requests from young people. Schools decide whether a youth group has a room at all. On a campus, the default cup is a commercial decision before it is an environmental one. Food businesses can take part only where a safe surplus procedure already exists. And whether participatory theatre counts as learning or as an optional extra is a judgement made by a cultural or educational institution.

The system-level challenge is therefore operational as much as political. Young people need to be able to see the route from proposal to decision: who can approve a pilot, what minimum information is required, which risks need specialist control, and how the evidence will inform what happens next.

What differs between countries

The synthesis must not erase local context:

- France emphasises rural access, local producers and a shared community event.
- Latvia focuses on a low-cost format that can become regular in schools and youth spaces.
- Spain foregrounds global justice, fair trade, inclusion and culture as a way into critical reflection.
- Norway combines three types of circular action and therefore needs careful sequencing and specialist procedures.
- Poland tests a narrow change inside an institutional purchasing environment.

These differences are useful. They show that a European framework should set a common quality standard while allowing each place to choose the format that fits its people, its risks and the partners available to it.

5 The European action framework

The framework below uses the ten fields agreed for the European Action Plan. The three actions reinforce one another. Practical choices build confidence, community action makes those choices visible, and institutional and business commitments allow a successful pilot to continue.

How the five country plans feed the three actions

Country action	Action 1: practical choices	Action 2: youth-led community action	Action 3: enabling commitments
France: Pontonx Sustainable Market	Information on fast fashion, reuse and local consumption.	Second-hand market, producer fair and youth-led awareness activities.	Venue and permit support, producer participation, recurring local backing.
Latvia: Clothing Swaps	Direct experience of reuse as an alternative to buying new.	Recurring youth-supported clothing swaps in accessible spaces.	Schools, youth centres and municipality enable space, outreach and continuity.
Spain: The Chain	Accessible theatre helps audiences understand production chains and fair trade.	Young people create and perform a public participatory action.	Public-space access, cultural support and discussion of corporate responsibility.
Norway: Oslo Sustainable Action Days	Repair skills, reuse practice and understanding of food redistribution.	Three sequenced pilots: repair, swap and food redistribution.	Safe procedures and cooperation with venues, repair specialists and food businesses.
Poland: Bring Your Own Cup Day	A visible prompt and possible discount support a reusable-cup choice.	Youth campaign and peer communication on campus.	University and cafeteria test an operational rule that could recur.

Action 1. Make Sustainable Choices Practical

Level: Personal

Field	European action
Problem addressed	Young people may value sustainability but lack an affordable alternative, a practical skill, trusted information or an immediate reason to change a familiar habit. Information alone can leave the sustainable option harder to use than the default.
Description	Pair a short learning element with a real choice that can be tried immediately. Depending on context, participants could diagnose a small electronic item with a repair volunteer, exchange clothing, follow a product's supply chain through theatre, compare local and fair alternatives, or bring a reusable cup in response to a campus prompt. The activity ends with one clear next step and proportionate feedback.
Target group	Young people reached through schools, universities, youth organisations and community settings, especially those who support sustainability in principle but lack the opportunity, confidence or affordable alternative. Exact age and capacity are set locally.
Stakeholders and actors	Youth organisers; youth workers or educators; a venue; activity-specific specialists such as repair volunteers, fair-trade educators, cultural facilitators or cafeteria staff; peer communication networks.

Field	European action
Expected impact	Participants understand one consumption issue, try one alternative and know where to repeat it. The pilot records participation and an activity-specific result, such as items exchanged, devices diagnosed, reusable-cup transactions or audience response.
Possible barriers	The alternative may still cost more, require equipment or feel socially unfamiliar. Information can become moralising or too abstract. Participation may concentrate among young people already interested in sustainability. A discount or specialist service may not be approved.
Sustainability potential	Reuse the short learning activity, instructions and feedback questions in schools, youth programmes, campuses and community events. Repeat only the formats that stay understandable, safe and manageable for the local team.
Timeline	A six-step pilot cycle: define the behaviour; confirm the setting and specialist support; prepare the offer; communicate through youth channels; run and document the pilot; decide whether to repeat, adapt or stop.
Resources needed	A youth lead, an enabling adult contact, a suitable setting, activity-specific materials or expertise, clear participant instructions and a simple way to record results. Any discount, equipment or specialist cost is calculated locally before approval.
Youth role	Choose the behaviour and format; test the language; lead peer communication; support delivery; collect feedback without gathering unnecessary personal data; interpret the evidence and recommend the next step.

Minimum evidence for the first cycle

- Number of participants or interactions, reported without claiming unique individuals when that cannot be measured.
- One activity-specific output.
- Short participant and delivery-partner feedback.
- A recorded decision: repeat, adapt, pause or stop.

Local examples

What the five proposals share is that the alternative is encountered somewhere specific rather than described in the abstract. A Latvian participant handles the clothes. A Spanish audience watches the supply chain acted out. In Oslo the skill itself is the offer, whether that is repairing a device or knowing how surplus food can be passed on safely. The Polish prompt arrives at the till, where the decision is actually made, and the French market puts second-hand choices and local producers in the same afternoon. The first cycle should record whether participants understood the offer and could actually use it.

Action 2. Youth-Led Circular and Fair Consumption Actions

Level: Community

Field	European action
Problem addressed	Young people often lack recurring, accessible spaces where sustainable consumption can be practised with others. Relevant actors may exist locally but remain disconnected, which leaves one youth team carrying venue, communication, logistics and safety work alone.
Description	Establish a recognisable programme of youth-led local pilots. Each place selects a format rooted in its context: a second-hand and local-producers event, a clothing swap, a

Field	European action
	participatory performance, a repair workshop, a food-redistribution activity or a campus campaign. Start with one manageable pilot. Publish simple participation rules, divide responsibilities and hold a youth-led review before announcing that it will recur.
Target group	Young people as organisers and participants; peers reached through education and youth networks; local residents, families or community groups where the format is public; local actors able to contribute a venue, skill, product, communication channel or referral route.
Stakeholders and actors	Youth committees and organisations; schools, universities, youth centres or cultural spaces; municipalities; volunteers; environmental, fair-trade and community organisations; local producers, repair groups, food businesses or cafeteria operators as relevant. Inclusion in this list does not imply commitment.
Expected impact	One safe, documented pilot creates a real occasion for reuse, learning, dialogue or waste prevention. Young people gain organising experience and local actors learn what supporting a repeat would require. Longer-term impact becomes possible if the evidence and the workload justify a calendar of repeat actions.
Possible barriers	Participation and logistics can each undo a pilot. On the participation side: low turnout, an inaccessible location or time, inconsistent promotion, and unclear responsibility once the event ends. On the delivery side: weather, volunteer capacity, poor-quality exchange items, unclaimed goods, permit delays, and the specialist risks attached to repair, personal data, food safety and allergens.
Sustainability potential	Build reusable event rules, task lists, registration questions, communication materials and evaluation prompts. Use existing venues and in-kind contributions where appropriate. Rotate formats or dates only when the youth team has capacity. Share the model with another school, neighbourhood or youth organisation after the first review.
Timeline	Preparation is proportionate to risk. A simple swap or campaign can use a short cycle, while food redistribution, public performance or electronics repair may need more specialist preparation. Every cycle includes design, confirmation, communication, delivery, review and a continuation decision.
Resources needed	Youth organisers, a coordinator or safeguarding contact, venue staff, communication support, event-specific volunteers, materials, insurance and permission checks where relevant, and a modest local cost estimate. No common European implementation budget is assumed.
Youth role	Select and design the action; negotiate the participant experience; lead outreach; share delivery responsibility; welcome participants; explain rules; document outputs; identify what was difficult; and keep the right to recommend that an unsafe or unmanageable format is not repeated.

Quality standard for a youth-led pilot

1. The problem and intended change can be explained in two sentences.
2. Young people hold named decision-making and delivery roles.
3. The venue and specialist responsibilities are confirmed before public promotion.
4. Participant rules explain what is accepted, what is not and what happens afterwards.
5. Evidence is light enough to collect and useful enough to support a decision.
6. A successful pilot is not automatically repeated. Workload, inclusion and safety are reviewed first.

Local examples

The five formats sit at very different scales. Spain's was a single public performance; Latvia's swap is deliberately small enough for a school or youth centre to run again without much infrastructure. France proposed a whole-day community festival that brings residents, producers and associations into one place, while Poland embedded its campaign inside an everyday campus service rather than creating an event at all. Norway's umbrella concept is the outlier, because three pilots cannot sensibly be delivered at once. What the formats have in common is a real organising role for young people, and none of them should be announced as recurring until the first evidence on workload, access, safety and participation has been reviewed with the youth team.

Action 3. Local Commitments for Youth, Institutions and Business

Level: Political and system

Field	European action
Problem addressed	Youth proposals depend on organisations that control space, permissions, operating rules, specialist expertise, communication channels or commercial practice. Where there is no clear route to a decision, a workable idea can stay informal or turn into an unrealistic promise.
Description	Create a short local commitment pathway for youth-led responsible-consumption pilots. A youth team presents a one-page proposal; the relevant institution or business names a contact; the parties agree the pilot scope, responsibilities, risk controls and evidence; the pilot runs; and a review records whether support will continue. The commitment is to a fair decision process and an honest pilot. It is not a commitment to permanence.
Target group	Youth committees and organisations seeking to implement a plan; schools, universities, municipalities, cultural venues and public services; private-sector actors such as local producers, repair businesses, food shops, restaurants, fair-trade actors and cafeteria operators.
Stakeholders and actors	Youth representatives; one enabling institution; relevant operational or specialist partners; safeguarding and venue contacts; communications staff; decision-makers able to approve continuation. European and national networks can share models and remove recurring policy barriers.
Expected impact	Youth proposals receive a named route to approval or a reasoned refusal. Pilots begin with clearer roles and fewer hidden assumptions. Evidence from delivery can support recurring venue access, a repeated campaign, a partnership arrangement or a proportionate change in policy or practice.
Possible barriers	Slow approval; unclear authority; businesses unable to absorb costs; institutions asking youth teams for excessive documentation; partnership language that overstates commitment; incompatible safety or data requirements; continuation decisions taken without youth input.
Sustainability potential	Keep the one-page proposal, role agreement and review form reusable. Institutions can offer a recurring application window or a named contact. Businesses can test a bounded contribution before any long-term commitment. Successful arrangements can be adapted rather than copied unchanged.
Timeline	Decision pathway: initial youth proposal; feasibility meeting; written pilot conditions; delivery preparation; pilot; joint review within an agreed period; documented continuation decision. Dates are set locally and confirmed before any public announcement.
Resources needed	Staff time for a named contact, a decision route, an accessible venue or operational setting, specialist checks, communication channels and any agreed in-kind or financial contribution. Who owns which resource must be written down before delivery.

Field	European action
Youth role	Present the case in their own terms; identify non-negotiable youth-participation principles; help shape workable conditions; communicate with peers; take agreed delivery roles; review evidence; and take part in the continuation decision.

A one-page local commitment should answer

- What problem did young people identify?
- What small pilot do they propose?
- Which group should benefit?
- What decision or resource is requested from the institution or business?
- Who controls safety, permission, transactions or specialist practice?
- What will be recorded?
- When will the parties decide what happens next?

Local examples

Each plan asks a different institution for a different kind of yes. In Pontonx it is the municipality and the producers, who between them control the space and the stalls. In Riga the ask is smaller but more repeatable: a school or community venue willing to host swaps and to agree what happens to unclaimed items. Norway's request is the most technical, because repair, data protection and food handling each need a specialist to sign off a procedure before anything is promoted. Poland's is the narrowest and the most operational, since a discount cannot exist until a university and its cafeteria agree to change a transaction rule. Spain's case shows what the pathway looks like once it works: public-space access and cultural support turned a youth proposal into a performance that an audience actually attended.

6 Recommendations by stakeholder

The recommendations below translate the three actions into proportionate requests for the groups most able to support, approve or repeat a youth-led pilot. Each group carries a short evidence note showing which country plans the request is drawn from. No recommendation implies that any named organisation has agreed to take part.

Youth organisations and youth workers

Drawn from all five country plans.

- Begin with the problem young people want to change, rather than a pre-selected event format.
- Give the youth team authority over language, participant experience and the continuation recommendation.
- Keep the first pilot small enough to manage and to document honestly.
- Build safeguarding, inclusion and specialist support into planning without taking ownership away from young people.
- Record what partners have actually agreed, distinguishing an invitation, an expression of interest and a confirmed contribution.
- Use feedback to improve or stop an action. Feedback used only to justify a repeat is not evidence.

Schools and educators

Drawn from all five country plans, which each name a school, campus or youth-education setting.

- Connect responsible-consumption learning to a practical choice or a public action.
- Offer accessible space, communication channels and a named staff contact.
- Recognise repair, swapping, theatre, local-market work and campaign design as opportunities for civic, creative and collaborative learning.
- Avoid placing all organisational work on a small group of volunteers, and agree staff and venue responsibilities in advance.
- Help young people reach peers who are not already involved in environmental activities.
- Make recurring support conditional on a short joint review rather than on unrealistic evidence of long-term impact from a single event.

Local authorities

Drawn from the France, Latvia, Spain and Norway plans, which each depend on municipal space, permits or public-service cooperation.

- Provide a clear contact and a proportionate procedure for youth requests involving public space, venues, permits or outreach.
- Make municipal and community spaces easy for youth-led initiatives to find and use.
- Offer small-scale support or in-kind resources where available, while keeping financial commitments explicit.
- Connect youth groups with repair, reuse, food-waste, fair-trade, cultural and local-producer networks.
- Listen to evidence from pilots when shaping local circular-economy, youth-participation or sustainable-consumption programmes.
- Preserve national and local legal requirements. A youth-led approach does not remove food, electrical, event or data-safety responsibilities.

Private sector

Drawn from the France, Spain, Norway and Poland plans, and from the partnership's decision to address the private sector directly.

- Respond to a youth proposal with a named contact and a clear decision, even when taking part is not possible.
- Test bounded, measurable contributions: a reusable-cup discount, a suitable surplus-food arrangement, repair expertise, venue support, local product visibility or transparent supply-chain information.
- Agree cost, staff, safety, data and communication responsibilities before any public launch.
- Avoid using youth participation as promotional decoration. Young people should help shape the pilot and review its results.
- Communicate limits honestly. A one-day pilot is not proof of a permanent sustainability transformation.
- Where a pilot works, consider making it a recurring operational practice rather than relying on repeated unpaid youth labour.

National authorities

Drawn from system-level needs recurring across the five plans rather than from a single country.

- Support practical responsible-consumption education that includes global justice, labour conditions, reuse and local alternatives.
- Reduce avoidable administrative barriers for small youth-led pilots while maintaining proportionate safeguards.
- Strengthen the repair, reuse, textile-circulation and food-waste infrastructure that local projects need to connect to.
- Include youth organisations in the design of consumption, circular-economy and participation measures.
- Support replication through adaptable tools and small grants rather than by imposing one national event model.

European institutions and networks

Drawn from the youth action plan mandate and the synthesis of the five plans.

- Continue supporting transnational youth processes that connect local action with European exchange.
- Value qualitative youth evidence and small pilots alongside large numerical indicators.
- Fund the time that participation, coordination, safeguarding, translation and validation take. Public events are only the visible part of the cost.
- Share reusable templates for youth proposals, role agreements, pilot evidence and partner review.
- Make room for local differences. A rural producer market, a public performance and a campus discount can serve a common European purpose without becoming identical.
- Ensure public resources are available in relevant languages and usable by smaller youth organisations.

7 From proposal to implementation

This section turns the European framework into a short pilot cycle, a manageable evidence set and practical checks for inclusion, risk and resources.

The six-step pilot cycle

Step	Question	Minimum output
1. Define	What problem and behaviour are young people addressing?	Two-sentence problem statement and a named youth lead.
2. Confirm	Which venue, permission, specialist or business decision is required?	Named contacts and a written status for each.
3. Design	How will participation work safely and accessibly?	Scope, rules, roles, materials and realistic capacity.
4. Communicate	Who needs to hear about the pilot, and through which trusted channels?	Youth-shaped invitation and participant information.
5. Deliver and record	What happened, without collecting unnecessary data?	Attendance or interactions, activity output and short feedback.
6. Decide	Should the action repeat, adapt, pause or stop?	Joint youth and partner decision, with reasons.

A small monitoring set

Every action should select only the indicators it can actually use. A practical minimum is:

- **Reach:** participants or interactions, with the counting method stated.
- **Action output:** items exchanged, devices diagnosed, reusable-cup transactions, audience interactions, participating producers or suitable food portions, depending on the action.
- **Experience:** one or two short questions for participants and delivery partners.
- **Youth ownership:** which decisions and delivery roles young people actually held.
- **Continuation:** repeat, adapt, pause or stop, with the reason.

These measures do not establish long-term environmental impact. They show whether the pilot was understandable, workable and worth developing.

Inclusion and access

The sustainable option should not become another exclusion. Cost, transport and opening hours need checking before a venue is announced, and physical access, language and digital access should be tested against the people the action intends to reach. A format that assumes prior environmental knowledge, specialist equipment or spare money will quietly select its audience. Public communication should offer a practical invitation rather than blame people whose choices are constrained by income or availability. The youth team should be able to name an access barrier before promotion begins, and to record afterwards whether the first pilot actually reached the group it was designed for.

Risk proportionality

Different actions need different controls. A clothing swap needs item rules and a plan for leftovers. Electronics repair needs competent supervision, safe device acceptance and protection of personal data. Food redistribution needs

agreed food-safety, allergen, storage and timing procedures. A public performance needs venue coordination and permission. A cafeteria discount needs a workable transaction rule and clear staff instructions.

The action should not launch until whoever is responsible for the relevant risk confirms the procedure.

Resource honesty

Low-cost does not mean no-cost. Youth time, staff coordination, design and communication are real resources even when no invoice is issued. Transport, insurance, equipment, specialist checks and venue support may add a local cost on top. Each pilot should record what is paid, what is contributed in kind and who carries the work, so that an apparently successful action does not turn out to rest on invisible or repeated unpaid labour. No European budget travels with this framework. Each team funds its own action from local resources, in-kind support or small grants.

8 Five country action cards

The cards give an equal, concise view of each proposal. They keep local differences, state the role expected of young people, and separate the idea from the practical details that each adopting team settles for itself.

France: Pontonx Sustainable Market

Partner: Maison de l'Europe des Landes WIPSEE (MDE40 WIPSEE), the French project partner **Setting:** Pontonx-sur-l'Adour and the Landes area

The idea

A one-day community event combining a second-hand clothing market and swap area, a local-producers corner, and youth-led awareness or creative activities. The proposal connects textile reuse with local and ethical consumption rather than treating them as separate topics.

Why young people proposed it

The French plan describes young people who care about environmental issues but have limited practical opportunities in a rural setting. It highlights fast fashion, textile waste, mobility, few youth-participation spaces and weak visibility for local producers.

Youth role

Young people would help choose the event format and the balance between exchange, local-producer visibility and awareness activities. They would shape peer-facing communication, support stakeholder mapping and contact with participants, and take visible delivery roles during the event, including welcoming visitors, running the exchange area and leading an awareness activity agreed during planning. Afterwards they would help review participation, practical problems, workload and feedback before recommending whether the market should be adapted or repeated. That recommendation should also cover rural access, the treatment of unsold items, and whether the producers who actually took part matched the scope originally proposed.

What Europe can learn

A circular-consumption action can also strengthen local economic connections and rural participation. The market format creates a meeting point between young people, residents, producers, associations and authorities.

Decided by the local team

The date, venue approval, participating producers and organisations, and the budget are decided by the team running the event. The plan's estimates of 100 to 200 visitors, 20 to 30 youth volunteers and 15 to 20 producers or sellers are the youth team's own projections and should be tested against the venue actually secured. Two contingencies need an answer before the day: what happens in bad weather, and what happens to unsold items.

Latvia: Clothing Swaps for Sustainable Consumption Awareness

Partner: Ecological Future Education (EFE) **Setting:** Riga

The idea

Accessible clothing-swap events in schools, youth centres or community venues. Participants bring clean, reusable clothing, exchange items, and encounter a short awareness element on fast fashion, textile waste and circular consumption.

Why young people proposed it

Four young people aged 18 to 24 took part in the local online co-creation meeting. They identified a gap between theoretical sustainability information and practical alternatives to buying new clothes frequently. Their own estimate of the scale of the problem, offered at the final European youth meeting, was that a person discards roughly 10 to 12 kilograms of textiles a year.

Youth role

Young people support the event plan, choose messages that make the swap understandable to their peers, and lead social-media or school-based outreach. They should help test the published rules on item condition, acceptance, exchange and leftovers, so that participants know what to bring and what happens afterwards. During delivery they can prepare the venue, sort acceptable clothing, welcome participants and explain the process, as well as leading the short awareness element and collecting proportionate feedback. Their review should establish what happened to unclaimed items, whether the venue and timing were accessible, how much volunteer work was actually needed, and what should change before another swap is proposed.

What Europe can learn

A flexible, familiar and sociable format can make reuse visible without complex infrastructure. Regularity matters: a recognised recurring swap shifts community norms more effectively than a one-off lecture.

Decided by the local team

The venue, dates, institutional support and the rules on items and leftovers are decided by the hosting team. The plan's working estimates come from the Latvian youth committee: 20 to 50 participants per event, 2 to 4 coordinators, 5 to 10 volunteers, and EUR 50 to 150 per event with a possible venue cost on top. Local prices and the space available will decide whether those hold.

Spain: The Chain

Partner: SETEM Navarra-Nafarroa **Setting:** Pamplona

The idea

A free participatory theatre performance representing the chocolate production chain and contrasting conventional and fair-trade routes. An accessible, visual narrative and an open ending invite the audience to reflect on global inequality, corporate responsibility and consumer choice.

Why young people proposed it

The Spanish youth group identified fragmented communication about fair trade, a sense of helplessness around global inequality, misconceptions about affordability, and a shortage of inclusive spaces for discussion. Theatre was chosen through meetings and brainstorming as a public and emotional way into those barriers.

What happened

The youth committee developed and rehearsed the play between May and June 2026 and performed it in public. The plan sets 10 June 2026 as performance day, at Geltoki in Pamplona, and the European youth meeting held the following day recorded the performance as having taken place. The group reported that a large number of children were in the audience, which surprised them because children were not the intended target, and they took it as a sign that the subject could reach a wider public than expected. Preparation was supported by grants from Pamplona City Council, and a recording of the performance was published on the project's YouTube channel later in June.

Youth role

Young people contributed to the storyline, the scenes and the creative choices used to represent the chocolate supply chain. They took part in rehearsals, communication, practical coordination and performance roles, and shaped how the open ending invited the audience to respond. The source records group decisions on topics, tasks, deadlines and meeting dates, supported by online communication. Their role went well beyond receiving information: they built the public learning experience itself.

What Europe can learn

Responsible consumption reaches well beyond waste reduction. Arts-based participation can make labour conditions, global supply chains and economic justice discussable in a public space, and it can reach an audience that a leaflet or a workshop would not.

What a repeat would need

No audience count or reaction was collected on the day, so the plan's aim of 30 to 50 people was never tested against what actually happened. A team adapting this format should agree in advance how reach and response will be captured, however lightly, so that a second performance produces evidence the first one did not.

Norway: Oslo Sustainable Action Days

Partner: Collective Innovation AS (COLIN) **Setting:** Oslo

The idea

An umbrella concept containing three community pilots: an electronics-repair workshop, a second-hand swap, and a food exchange or giveaway developed with willing restaurants or food shops. The youth presentation describes the three as repair, reuse and reducing food waste.

Why young people proposed it

The youth team identified the habit of replacing small electronics instead of repairing them, the speed at which clothing and household goods are bought and discarded, and the difficulty young people have in reaching food-redistribution channels. Their answer is practical participation rather than another information-only campaign.

Youth role

Young people choose which of the three pilots should be tested first and explain why it is the manageable one. With organisational support they contact possible venues and specialist partners, shape peer communication and hold agreed delivery roles. They should contribute to participant rules and capacity decisions without being made responsible for specialist repair, personal-data or food-safety procedures. During the pilot they can welcome participants and document the agreed activity output and short feedback, nothing more. Afterwards they review evidence, access and workload, keeping a real say in whether the same format should run again and whether the next pilot proceeds, changes or stops.

What Europe can learn

An umbrella identity can connect different sustainability practices, but delivery has to be sequenced. Repair and food redistribution rely on specialist rules that a small youth team cannot improvise.

Decided by the local team

The youth presentation itself lists these as the team's own next steps rather than as settled decisions: which pilot comes first, the venue, repair expertise, which devices are accepted, the data and safety procedure, whether a food business takes part, the food-safety and allergen route, dates, capacity, cost and who leads. The sequencing choice matters most, because it determines which specialist has to be found first.

Poland: Bring Your Own Cup Day

Partner: Mobile Adventure Sp. z o.o. (MOBAD) **Setting:** A participating university cafeteria in Poland

The idea

A recurring campus campaign in which students who bring a reusable cup receive a cafeteria discount. The youth team proposes a four-step route: cafeteria integration, social-media communication, visible signage on the campaign day, and feedback collection.

Why young people proposed it

Disposable cups are part of a repeated daily routine, which is what makes them a useful target. The proposal turns the alternative into something specific and hard to miss, and asks the institution and the cafeteria to test whether an incentive can shift the default.

Youth role

Young people present the reusable-cup proposal in their own terms and shape the campaign message, the signage and peer outreach. Once the operational conditions are agreed they can explain which cups are accepted and when the campaign runs. If a university and cafeteria approve the pilot, young people support visibility and participant communication without taking over staff-controlled transactions or promising a discount that has not been approved. They then interpret the transaction evidence and the student and staff feedback together with the enabling organisations, help separate transactions from unique participants where that is possible, and recommend whether the arrangement should be repeated, adjusted, considered for permanence or stopped.

What Europe can learn

A narrow operational change becomes a system-level youth action when it requires an institution and a service operator to test a new transaction rule. A pilot of this kind generates evidence before anyone is asked for a permanent commitment.

Decided by the local team

The campaign is written to work in any university cafeteria. The host institution and cafeteria, the approval route, the discount value and who funds it, which cups are accepted, the point-of-sale method, the dates, staffing and budget are all agreed locally. The youth team's target of at least 50 participating students is their own proposal and should be adjusted to the size of the campus. One measurement question needs deciding early: whether the till can distinguish repeat transactions from unique participants, because the campaign's headline figure depends on the answer.

9 Priorities and expected European value

The priorities below summarise what should stay consistent when local partners adapt the framework, and what shared European value five different proposals can create.

Five priorities

- 1. Keep sustainable consumption practical.** Every action should offer something a participant can do, try or decide, rather than only information to remember.
- 2. Protect youth ownership.** Young people should influence the design, the delivery and the continuation decision.
- 3. Start with a safe, bounded pilot.** Ambition is valuable, but an unconfirmed venue, budget or partner must never be presented as a promise.
- 4. Make enabling actors visible.** Schools, authorities and businesses should know exactly what decision or contribution is being asked of them.
- 5. Learn before scaling.** Simple evidence and an honest review are worth more than an inflated impact claim.

Expected European value

The plan's European value lies in a common route that can hold different local forms. It shows that responsible consumption can be approached through circular practice, fair-trade education, local production, waste prevention, cultural participation and institutional incentives. It also demonstrates a participation principle the five committees share. Treated as an audience for sustainability messages, young people stay passive. Given the room, they can define a local problem, build a response to it, and negotiate the conditions that make the response possible.

If partners and other organisations use it, the framework can:

- make youth proposals easier for institutions and businesses to assess;
- reduce hidden assumptions about resources and responsibility;
- produce more comparable, proportionate evidence from very different actions;
- support repetition without forcing every country into the same format;
- strengthen the connection between personal behaviour, community opportunity and system change.

These are expected contributions rather than measured impacts.

Closing message

The five Local Action Plans do not ask young people to fix consumption systems on their own. They ask for a fair chance to act: knowledge that can be used, community spaces where alternatives are visible, and institutions or businesses willing to give a clear and proportionate answer. Keeping those three levels connected is the European task.

10 How this plan was made

Where the content comes from

Each of the five countries ran a local youth committee that met over several months, chose the problem it wanted to work on and designed its own response. Those five proposals are the raw material for sections 4 to 8, and they are described in this plan rather than summarised from a distance.

Four European online sessions connected the local work. In April 2025 the committees imagined a sustainable city together. In December 2025 they compared the barriers they each faced. In February 2026 they turned those barriers into action ideas at the personal, community and system levels. In June 2026 they presented their five finished proposals to one another.

How the five became three

The synthesis followed four steps. The needs, actors, expected results, risks, resources and youth roles were drawn out of each country proposal. Those were compared across the three levels. One European action was built at each level. The national examples were kept, because an action is easier to adopt when you can see what it looked like in a real place.

The three European actions are a structured synthesis. They are not text taken from one country and presented as agreement between all five. The same method was applied to every country card, so no country is described in more depth than another.



Consumo Justo

Partners



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are those of the authors 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.

Erasmus+ KA220-YOU cooperation partnership, project 2024-1-FR02-KA220-YOU-000248910. Published 2026 under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International licence.