

# GLOBAL REFLECTION MEETING FINAL REPORT

**7-11 APRIL 2025**



**MUSIC AND VOLUNTEERING  
FOR A DECOLONIAL AND SOCIAL JUSTICE AGENDA**



**Written by Helene Perold  
Independent Social Research Consultant,  
South Africa**



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

Co-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. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



# Table of Contents

**Acknowledgements 4**

**Executive Summary 5**

**Project Overview 6**

**Introduction 7**

**Day 1 – 7 April | Deep Reflection on IVS – Past & Present 10**

1.1 Mapping the IVS journey 12

1.1.1 The IVS timeline 12

1.1.2 Voices for Change 13

1.1.3 IVS Needs Assessment Survey 13

1.2 Historical & Strategic Analysis of IVS 15

1.2.1 Pre-WWII: Origins of IVS 16

1.2.2 Post-WWII: Rebuilding through volunteering 17

1.2.3 1990s-2000s: Expansion and institutionalisation 18

1.2.4 Present-day: Challenges and future prospects 18

1.3 CCIVS and UNESCO 19

1.4 Debating ‘Then’ and ‘Now’ 19

1.4.1 What were the challenges 20 years ago vs. today in IVS? 19

1.4.2 What opportunities exist now that didn’t before? 21

1.4.3 What would happen if international Institutions fail? 22

1.5 New Trends in IVS 22

1.5.1 How does IVS adapt to these trends? 23

1.6 Strengths, Vulnerabilities and Opportunities for IVS 24

1.6.1 IVS SWOT Analysis 24

**Day 2 – 8 April | Looking Forward – Futures & Foresight 28**

2.1 Shaping the Future of IVS: Policy, Advocacy, Social and Climate Justice 29

2.2 Identifying possible futures for IVS 31

2.2.1 What are the likely key drivers of change in IVS? 32

2.2.2 Envisioning IVS future scenarios 33



## Table of Contents

2.2.3 Translating vision into action 35

2.3 Reflection 37

**Day 3 – 9 April | Strategy Development – Bridging Present & Future 39**

3.1 Defining Key Priorities for IVS Advocacy 40

**Day 4 – 10 April | IVS Advocacy & Policy Implementation 44**

4.1 Advocacy Training 45

4.1.1 Applying IMC approach to Advocacy Asks 46

4.1.2 Identifying Recognition and Funding stakeholders 47

4.2 Strengthening the IVS Policy Role 50

4.2.1 Summary of the debate 50

4.3 Future Scenarios for IVS Policy & Funding 51

4.4 Translating Advocacy Asks into Tangible Actions 53

**Day 5 – 11 April | Wrap-Up & Next Steps 54**

5.1 Reviewing Advocacy Outcomes & Defining Follow-Up Actions 55

5.2 Evaluation 55

5.2.1 Individual reflections, grouped by theme 55

5.2.2 Written evaluation results 57

5.3 Closing Observations 61

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of this report was supported by several members of the GRM team. The note-takers and photographers who documented the group discussions provided carefully structured records that made it possible to navigate the complex material generated across five intensive days. Their work in capturing the content generated on Post-its and flipcharts was invaluable.

The author also wishes to thank the members who responded to requests for details and additional clarification during the drafting process, and the Director of CCIVS for the guidance and flexibility that made it possible to produce the report as scheduled. In capturing the information generated on Post-its and flipcharts, the author relied extensively on AI assistance, which was also used to summarise and analyse feedback under close guidance. In all cases the details were checked back against the original flipcharts to ensure accuracy of capture. Without this facility the report would have taken considerably longer to produce.

Sincere thanks go to all the participants who worked so hard to chart the elements for CCIVS's strategic journey going forward, and for providing the opportunity to share in this experience.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The CCIVS Global Reflection Meeting (GRM), part of the Voices for Change project co-financed by the European Union, was held from 7–11 April 2025 at L'Ermitage, Versailles. The meeting gathered 28 participants representing CCIVS member organisations, the CCIVS Youth Committee, the Executive Committee, activists, partners, and facilitators. Its purpose was to reflect deeply on the history, current realities, and future of International Voluntary Service (IVS), particularly against a backdrop of geopolitical, environmental, and technological change. Participants explored the evolution of IVS since its inception post-World War I, examining key historical milestones, current challenges, and future opportunities. Sessions included mapping the IVS journey, analysing survey findings from 75 global organisations, and debating shifts in inclusion, diversity, climate action, digitalisation, and decolonisation. Key insights emerged around the resilience and relevance of IVS despite major shifts: from early civil reconstruction efforts to today's struggles with shrinking civic space, restrictive mobility policies, and funding challenges. Trends such as voluntourism, climate justice advocacy, AI integration, and intergenerational volunteering were critically analysed to inform strategic future directions, and a SWOT analysis was conducted to identify strengths, vulnerabilities and opportunities for the movement in the volatile global context.

A central focus of the meeting was the futures and foresight work, which applied scenario planning and strategic visioning methodologies. Participants identified four key drivers likely to shape the future of IVS: funding barriers, natural disasters, artificial intelligence (AI), and voluntourism. Using the Futures Wheel and 2x2 Matrix tools, they mapped possible and probable future scenarios, exploring how different combinations of these drivers could impact IVS. Scenarios considered the balance between technological advancement and human connection, and between funding availability and disaster frequency. This exercise allowed participants to envision preferred futures and to propose strategic milestones, partnerships, and success indicators needed to navigate these complex trends.

The meeting reinforced the Advocacy Asks priorities for IVS, but identified the need to define them more clearly and concisely, and to communicate the value and uniqueness of IVS projects to external audiences effectively. Participants discussed how to connect broader policy goals to specific, achievable local actions, and mapped stakeholders, decision-makers, allies, and influencers critical to achieving intended outcomes. Practical next steps were defined to strengthen IVS's policy role through strategic partnerships, improved communication, diversified funding, and deeper community engagement.

The evaluation of the GRM showed overall positive feedback from participants, particularly in terms of facilitation (4.52/5) and pre-event communication (4.48/5). Sessions were generally well-received, with high scores for the Experts Round Table and historical reflections, though future-oriented discussions scored slightly lower. Advocacy Asks and Future & Foresight were highlighted as standout sessions. The GRM concluded with a strong affirmation of CCIVS's values-driven identity, commitment to decolonised practices, and the necessity for innovation and adaptability to ensure that IVS remains a transformative force in an increasingly complex and fractured world.

## **PROJECT OVERVIEW**

### **Voices for Change Music and Volunteering for a Decolonial Environmental and Social Justice Agenda**

"Voices for Change" aims to strengthen the International Voluntary Service (IVS) movement by developing new partnerships, integrating volunteer actions and connecting with the International Music Council to address global environmental and social justice challenges. This project focuses on amplifying marginalised voices, fostering inclusion and diversity, and advocating for policy change through participatory processes. It seeks to revolutionise the perception of IVS, emphasising to young people that it entails more than just participating in a volunteer project - it is also about the life-changing experience of volunteering.

The activities include capacity building, knowledge exchange, hands-on community actions, and advocacy. Voices for Change will culminate in a "Change Capsule" comprising a Song, Videos, Policy Proposals, and an Advocacy Strategy, all underpinned by Impact Measurement. The project underscores the imperative of global solutions to global challenges, rejecting limiting regional approaches and affirming the right of people worldwide to contribute to EU policymaking for a decolonised environmental and social justice agenda.

It is coordinated by the Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service (CCIVS), in partnership with the International Music Council (France), GSM-Youth Services Centre (Turkey), Cantieri Giovani (Italy), Kenia Voluntary Service (Kenya), South Africa Workcamps Association (South Africa), Legambiente (Italy), Field Services and Inter-Cultural Learning (India), ESTYES (Estonia), INEX-SDA (Czech Republic), Fundación Proyecto Ecológico Chiriboga (Ecuador), and the Palestinian Center for Media, Research and Development (Palestine).

# INTRODUCTION



The CCIVS Global Reflection Meeting (GRM) – Voices for Change was held at L'Ermitage in Versailles from 7-11 April 2025 (<https://www.ermitage-fondacio.fr/>). At this time of enormous change in the global environment, the intention was to create a space to delve deeply into the needs of the IVS movement, to reflect on what has come before and what is coming next, and to enable members to share their concerns and ideas for the future development of the network.

**In particular, the purpose of the GRM was to:**

- Undertake a comprehensive assessment of current IVS trends in respect of inclusion and diversity, environmental sustainability, digital developments in AI, and a decolonised approach
- Increase the knowledge, skills and understanding of the consortium members through an analysis of current geo-political scenarios, and lay the groundwork for advocacy and policy-making within a decolonised approach

The GRM built on the results of the Future Trends in IVS Study Session (funded by the COE) that took place in Budapest in February 2025.

Twenty eight participants attended the meeting from the Consortium partnership: 17 representing CCIVS member organisations, seven representing CCIVS in France, two representing the International Music Council, and two facilitators. The methodology used during the GRM included non-formal education tools such as storytelling, participatory mapping, interactive debates, engagement with experts in IVS and advocacy, and networking spaces through which participants were able to share best practices. In preparation for the meeting, participants were expected to review these documents:

1. CCIVS Strategic Plan 2022-2027
2. CCIVS Impact Measurement Report (2010-2020)
3. Results from the Study Session on Future Trends in IVS
4. 5 IVS Advocacy Asks Document
5. Advocacy & Policy Aspects of the Voices for Change Project
6. Results of the Needs assessment VFC
7. IVS statistics
8. IVS Exchange Guidelines
9. CCIVS Constitution



**DAY 1 - 7 APRIL**

**DEEP REFLECTION  
ON IVS:  
PAST & PRESENT**

	DAY 1	DAY 2	DAY 3	DAY 4	DAY 5
09:00 - 10:30	WELCOME & CONTEXT SETTING	EXTERNAL POLICY INFLUENCE & EU ADVOCACY	DEFINING KEY PRIORITIES FOR IVS ADVOCACY	LEARNING FROM THE INTERNATIONAL MUSIC COUNCIL (IMC)	REVIEW ADVOCACY OUTCOMES & FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS
11:00 - 12:30	HISTORICAL & STRATEGIC ANALYSIS OF IVS	FUTURES & FORESIGHT METHODOLOGY - 1 -	IVS & IYUSD2020	UNDERSTANDING THE 5 IVS ADVOCACY ASKS	EVALUATION & CLOSING
14:00 - 15:30	THE ROLE OF IVS TODAY ↳ INSIGHTS FROM THE NEEDS ANALYSIS	FUTURES & FORESIGHT METHODOLOGY - 2 -		FUTURE SCENARIOS FOR IVS POLICY & FUNDING	MANAGEMENT MEETING
16:00 - 17:30	STRENGTHS, VULNERABILITIES & OPPORTUNITIES FOR IVS	FUTURE & FORESIGHT METHODOLOGY - 3 -		TRANSLATING ADVOCACY INTO POLICY ACTION	





**The objective of Day 1 was to examine the historical evolution of IVS, discuss its current challenges, and gain insights from the Needs Analysis conducted in March 2025 as well as the outcomes of the Future Trends in IVS Study Session held in February 2025.**

The meeting was opened by the Director of CCIVS, who welcomed participants and introduced the two facilitators. Following a brief overview of the programme, a warm-up exercise invited participants to greet each other in at least three languages they had not previously known, after which each participant introduced themselves and shared their connection to CCIVS.

## **1.1 MAPPING THE IVS JOURNEY**

This session presented a process through which participants could explore the history of CCIVS from 1920 to 2025, locate their own experience within this timeframe, and draw lessons from the organisation's history about what needs to change going forward.

### **1.1.1 The IVS timeline**



The day started by participants placing post-its on a timeline from 1920 – 2025, and then sharing in pairs the patterns that emerged in their IVS experience and what shifts they had seen occurring. Two people started their IVS journey in 1977 and 1986 respectively, 11 joined in the 1990s, 7 between 2000-2010, and 7 between 2010-2025.

Patterns in people's experience include the focus on building civil society, witnessing a tremendous growth of IVS between 1995 and 2010, and how CCIVS as the global coordinator of IVS organisations gave people's views a 'home'. Shifts in IVS over time included its expansion beyond Europe into other parts of the world, as well as shifts in participants' personal and professional development through their involvement with IVS. In the recent past, however, the IVS movement has been challenged by growing barriers to mobility such as visa restrictions, particularly for Global South participants.

Several observations emerged from the discussion. The value of convening such a diverse, intergenerational gathering from different countries and backgrounds was noted. The decline in IVS participation beginning around 2010 was attributed not only to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic but also to the significant influence of European youth programmes on the IVS environment. On a positive note, the Erasmus programme opened new possibilities for cooperation between Europe and other parts of the world. The shift from physical to digital volunteering during Covid was also discussed, with technology identified as playing an increasingly important role in the IVS space.

### **1.1.2 Voices for Change**

The Director of CCIVS presented the Voices for Change project flow, showing how the project will amplify CCIVS's advocacy messaging through music and storytelling, bringing in community-based voices from different parts of the globe. Six organisations located outside the EU are involved. The aim is to connect grassroots activism with institutional advocacy, ensuring that local realities inform global decision-making through a decolonial approach to social and climate justice. Following the training, local actions will take place between June and August to gather community stories in Estonia, Italy, Turkey, Czech Republic, Palestine, Kenya, South Africa, Ecuador and India, supported by those trained in Impact Research and the MSC technique (April to August). The project feeds into the Symposium on Environmental and Social Justice to be held in South Africa in November, followed by the in-person Project Management Meeting in Palermo, Sicily, which will prepare the ground for the online summit EmpowerEU in September 2026.

### **1.1.3 IVS Needs Assessment Survey**

The results of the IVS Needs Assessment Survey were presented to the GRM. The report offers a comprehensive evaluation of the IVS movement across 75 participating organisations from four continents. The survey aimed to identify organisational challenges, capacity-building needs, youth engagement barriers, environmental and social justice priorities, policy advocacy efforts, funding challenges, and partnership dynamics.



## KEY FINDINGS OF THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

### 1. Organisational needs and capacities

Organisations, particularly in the Global South, face significant challenges in implementing IVS projects, mainly due to limited funding, restricted access to cross-border partnerships, and a lack of formal recognition. Capacity-building needs center around impact measurement, fundraising, governance, and advocacy skills.

### 2. Youth participation

Barriers to youth engagement include financial constraints, lack of local recognition of IVS, and limited non-formal educational opportunities fostering leadership. Training priorities include climate action, social justice, digital skills, and intercultural learning, highlighting a strong interest in empowering youth for civic engagement.

### 3. Environmental and social justice

Pressing issues identified are climate change, biodiversity loss, land degradation, water scarcity, and systemic inequalities in energy transition. IVS is seen as a key platform for promoting environmental awareness, youth leadership, and community-based sustainability initiatives. However, colonial legacies and lack of resources continue to hinder progress.

### 4. Advocacy and policy development

Organisations recognise the need for stronger advocacy strategies to influence IVS-related policies at national, EU, and UN levels. Primary policy challenges include restrictive mobility policies, limited volunteer recognition, funding barriers, and a lack of decolonial approaches. There is a notable gap in awareness of EU and UN policies among surveyed organisations.

### 5. Funding and financial sustainability

Long-term, stable funding is the most critical challenge for organisations, especially those outside the EU. Participants advocate for diversified funding sources, capacity-building in fundraising, and equitable resource distribution favoring Global South initiatives. Bureaucratic hurdles and dependence on EU partners further complicate access to financial support.

### 6. Partnerships and collaboration

Equitable partnerships, capacity building, financial support, cultural sensitivity, and grassroots empowerment are essential for strengthening IVS collaborations. Participants emphasised the need for transparent communication, long-term sustainability, and inclusive decision-making processes.

### 7. Digital tools and AI

While AI and digital tools offer potential for enhancing advocacy, project management, and volunteer engagement, concerns about environmental impact, data privacy, and accessibility persist. Organisations advocate cautious and ethical use of digital technologies, ensuring they align with sustainability and social justice goals.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Formal recognition of IVS across local, national, and international levels is critical.
- Sustainable, long-term funding mechanisms must be developed to support IVS activities.
- Capacity-building efforts should be enhanced in areas such as advocacy, project evaluation, and financial sustainability.
- IVS organisations must foster more equitable partnerships, particularly involving grassroots and Global South stakeholders.
- Climate justice, anti-racism, decolonization, and youth empowerment must be integrated into all IVS initiatives.
- Digital engagement should be balanced with environmental considerations, promoting hybrid models where appropriate.

By addressing these findings, the IVS sector can enhance its impact, empower young people, and contribute meaningfully to environmental and social justice worldwide.

### 1.2 HISTORICAL & STRATEGIC ANALYSIS OF IVS

This session drew on the importance of memory as a tool for building the future, and identified three functions of memory that are particularly relevant for IVS.

The first is memory as a moral guardian. For memory to fulfil this function it must maintain a genuine and honest relationship with truth, not become a selective narrative that justifies some actions while ignoring others. The IVS movement's history of solidarity across conflicts and borders carries a moral weight that must be actively kept alive, not allowed to become rhetorical.

The second is that memory is short. CCIVS itself once played a significant role in bridging East-West divides at a time when those divides appeared fixed and permanent. Only 35 years later, many of the same divides have returned. IVS's own history offers a reminder that bridges can be built across borders, and that the work of breaking down enemy images is never permanently finished.

The third is memory as mediator. Drawing on traditions such as the griot tradition in West Africa, where the singing of family histories has been used to resolve conflicts by revealing shared roots, the session pointed to the therapeutic dimension of historical memory: digging into the past to reveal what is genuinely valuable, what connects people, and what must be preserved.

Running through all three functions is a central question the session was designed to address: do the values on which IVS was founded still apply today? Values are not immutable; they evolve. The memory of where the IVS movement comes from can help validate whether the same commitments to humanity, intercultural mutual learning, and respect for life remain the right foundation for where it needs to go.

The session also introduced the CCIVS Memory Project, an ongoing effort to build a systematised, decolonised archive of IVS history, collecting living memory through audio and video across the global network and making it accessible to IVS practitioners, students, educators, civil society, and decision-makers through a digital platform linking physical and digital archives.

With this framing established, participants divided into four groups to examine specific periods in the history of IVS, drawing on archival materials and photographs. Each group received a picture of an action from a given period, accompanied by explanatory notes and a matrix summarising the historical context, the structure of IVS organisations, the financial sources, and key words characterising the type of IVS of that period. Groups were then asked to discuss whether those words described the IVS of that period well, partially or not at all, and to suggest alternative or additional terms.

### 1.2.1 Pre-WWII: Origins of IVS

The IVS movement originated from concrete projects. The first workcamp took place in Esnes-en-Argonne, near Verdun, in 1920 to reconstruct a village destroyed during World War I. The early projects were shaped within the framework of civil service as an alternative to military service, with the intention of building international understanding and friendship among ordinary people across borders, while demonstrating seriousness and discipline in the process.

The focus was on assisting local populations through concrete, physical work – particularly reconstruction after disasters. A larger project was held during the Spanish Civil War to assist children and women. Projects often lasted several months. Most participants were male, with women in traditional support roles. The first projects in Asia were held in India from the mid-1930s. Voluntary service organisations existed in only a small number of countries at this stage; it was only after World War II that more national organisations were established and that international coordination began.



**1918-1945 FIRST WORKCAMP IN ESNES, VERDUN 1920; SCI ACTION DURING THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR, 1937-1942  
PHOTOS SOURCED FROM THE INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVE OF SCI**

## 1.2.2 Post-WWII: Rebuilding through volunteering

The post-WWII era was characterised by conflicts and resistance movements. The IVS movement during this period was underpinned by a drive for humanism – a motivation to act without expectation of return. It was focused on solidarity action and on lobbying to change things politically, rather than being driven by funding or external compulsion. The IVS movement aimed to bring East and West together at a time when both sides held images of the other as the enemy. IVS provided a real, if small, channel through which people could meet and change, at a time when such encounters were otherwise impossible.

This period also saw concrete solidarity actions on the global stage, including statements of solidarity in response to conflicts and their distribution to international institutions. This dimension reflects what participants identified as a core value of the IVS movement: a political and activist identity that goes beyond technical network functions or statistical reporting.

“I think that it's very important because we have to see how much change we can achieve with our projects, bringing people to do work construction work or working with children, but how much influence they have done and impact on the locals and on themselves.”



**RECONSTRUCTION WORKCAMP AFTER THE WAR IN  
ALGERIA, 1963  
PHOTO SOURCED FROM THE INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVE  
OF SCI**



### 1.2.3 1990s-2000s: Expansion and institutionalisation

The historical context of this period significantly influenced the formation of many organisations in Europe and elsewhere. In Europe, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of communism contributed to increased participation in IVS. In Southern Africa, international solidarity work helped generate new workcamp organisations in Zimbabwe (1991), Mozambique (1993), and Zambia. Economic globalisation during this period produced cheaper travel options, enabling cross-border exchanges on a larger scale, and between 1995 and 2000 large numbers of young people came together to live and work in solidarity.

Significantly, European funding during this period was more flexible and less condition-heavy than it is today. Partnerships were genuinely collaborative and responsive to local needs, in contrast to the current situation where projects tend to be tailored to meet funder requirements rather than community aspirations. IVS also gave young people an international identity and status through their participation.

### 1.2.4 Present-day: Challenges and future prospects

The present period is marked by youth dissociation as a major challenge for IVS. The current generation is increasingly withdrawing from political issues and social justice engagement, with declining participation driven in part by social media use. Political shifts to the right in different parts of the world and the significant US funding cuts to international institutions have heightened uncertainty and anxiety among young people. The relatively limited social media presence of IVS organisations was identified as a significant concern requiring strategic attention.

In summing up the historical analysis, facilitators observed that a common thread running throughout the history of CCIVS is attachment, solidarity, and the will to change things. This orientation distinguishes CCIVS from purely technical networks. Attention to strategic use of social media was identified as a priority for the movement going forward.



### 1.3 CCIVS AND UNESCO

Following these discussions, a presentation was made on the history of CCIVS's relationship with UNESCO, covering the organisation's evolution as a UNESCO-affiliated body and the significance of that relationship for CCIVS's advocacy and institutional positioning.

### 1.4 DEBATING 'THEN' AND 'NOW'

Continuing the exploration of the historical and strategic analysis of CCIVS, participants were asked to debate three questions using a fishbowl methodology in which four participants at a time occupied seats in the middle of the room, vacating them for others as the discussion progressed:

- What challenges existed 20 years ago versus today?
- What opportunities exist now that did not exist before?
- What would happen if international institutions fail?

#### 1.4.1 What were the challenges 20 years ago vs. today in IVS?

A key theme in this discussion was the dominance of technology, which is reshaping the environment in which CCIVS operates. The pace of technological change and the complexity of digital communication were identified as central challenges. In the past, participants could focus more clearly on core issues such as peace, solidarity and rebuilding; today, many of the challenges facing the movement are less visible and more complex to understand and address.

While today's easier access to cross-border communication was acknowledged as a positive development – participants noted that in the past, people needed to wait a long time for a reply to a workcamp application, and that language learning is now more widely available – there was also recognition that genuine motivation to volunteer has become harder to find. The challenge of motivating young people to take part in voluntary service was a recurring concern.

Discussion also addressed the competitive nature of the volunteering context. The way workcamp projects are organised – around sending and hosting organisations – was seen by some as outdated in comparison with voluntourism, which is more attractive to young people because it is faster and more customised. This dynamic was seen as putting CCIVS at a disadvantage in attracting new participants.

A shift in travel behaviour was also noted: from local, greener choices to a greater reliance on air travel. At the same time, participants emphasised that AI should not be seen primarily as a threat – rather, the challenge is to harness it for peacebuilding rather than for isolation. The fundamental aspiration of workcamps – to live with people, exchange, and be together – was affirmed as central to what IVS offers.



*“Work camps mean you can learn to know other people, to grow with them, to gain the truth. Are we losing the possibility of changing ourselves given the dominance of digital communication?”*  
GRM participant

The possibility of a more intergenerational approach was raised, opening IVS to families and older generations, not just youth. Growing interest from teenagers in some contexts was noted as an opportunity, as was the increasing tendency in some regions for people to travel internationally – bringing new motivation – while visa restrictions remained a persistent barrier.

“We can work together.”

“We may need to start shifting, open to a more intergenerational approach.”



## 1.4.2 What opportunities exist now that didn't before?

Several new opportunities were identified in this discussion. Reference was made to networks doing similar work to CCIVS that are effectively reaching teenage participants, suggesting the value of studying and adapting good practices from comparable organisations. Loneliness and social isolation – now recognised as a major public health concern, particularly in Europe – were identified as a context in which mixed-age volunteering could be highly relevant. People who volunteered when young and now want to repeat the experience, as well as older generations who still want to contribute, were seen as an underexplored audience.



*“Basically tourism is a culture. Things are changing so much that we can't always do traditional things.”*

Online and tourism-based volunteering were noted as growing phenomena, alongside a recognition that tourism itself has become embedded in many people's cultures. It was emphasised, however, that the community must remain at the centre of IVS activities – placing all emphasis on the volunteer, to the exclusion of community ownership, risks undermining the project's integrity.

The growth of digital tools also opens opportunities to widen the network and build relationships with specific organisations and individuals through platforms such as LinkedIn. CCIVS's existing network, skills and experience were seen as assets that should not be underestimated in developing new programmes.

*“the community needs to stay at the centre of our activities. If we put all the emphasis on the volunteers, the project will die.”*



### 1.4.3 What would happen if international Institutions fail?

A number of participants felt that international institutions are already failing. The discussion identified a need for CCIVS to continue engaging with institutional funders while simultaneously developing alternatives – including regional funding sources – to reduce dependence on international institutions. Young people’s perception that they will be failed by programmes funded by global institutions was noted as a significant concern. The critique was also made that international organisations often impose programmes on the Global South without adequate engagement with local needs and aspirations, and that structural adjustment policies have historically forced many organisations in the Global South to close. Against this, it was observed that in many African contexts, volunteering is deeply embedded in social and cultural life and will endure regardless of institutional instability


*“which is why they are failing us. They are not protecting us; they only look at the figures, at money.*

*Structural adjustment forced a lot of organisations to close.*

*In Africa volunteering is part of our social fabric so it will never fail.”*

### 1.5 NEW TRENDS IN IVS

This session presented the New Trends in IVS as identified during the Futures and Foresight Study Session in Budapest. Noting the downward trend in volunteer participation in IVS as identified in the Global IVS Statistics Report of 2023, the study session had identified a number of factors related to this development: decolonisation, climate injustice, new social movements, individualism, volunteers becoming clients, and mis/disinformation. The two critical trends selected for further study were Climate Justice and Voluntourism. Using the ICS Centre’s Toolkit for Tomorrow, high and low development scenarios were generated for both issues.



## The outcomes of this analysis produced the following projects and proposals:

- IVS partnering with Education (official recognition by schools and universities)
- International annual IVS fair
- Volunteers without borders
- Study session on decentralising CCIVS

## Actions and next steps were identified as follows:

- Partnerships with educational and humanitarian institutions
- Decentralise networks
- Creating common guidelines within IVS to ensure we cooperate with organisations sharing our values
- Diversity funding streams

### 1.5.1 How does IVS adapt to these trends?

Following the presentation, participants divided into four groups to discuss their responses to the trends presented above. Some groups focused on process while others looked at themes that can be impacted by IVS;

**Group 1** Raised the issue of intersectionality, exploring how to connect different contexts in which IVS is functioning, such as contexts of genocide, social change, and environmental disruption.

#### Group 2

- Transformation is important in IVS
- Activities should be formalised so volunteers can form a community
- Critical thinking is getting lost in an overload of information, making it more difficult to produce genuine critical analysis
- Intergenerational synergy should be at the forefront of IVS – IVS has been targeting youth but should not neglect middle and older generations
- Hands-on action is important for gaining transformative experience, compared with more virtual activities
- Generational transfer is being disrupted by social fragmentation, causing isolation, and the important fabric of society is at risk

This report back prompted discussion about the experience of migrants in foreign countries who lack intergenerational contact, and the recognition that CCIVS, in trying to fight isolation, faces a generation that is more comfortable acting independently. It was also noted that in the Global South, only younger people tend to have the time to volunteer, while in the Global North an intergenerational approach is more likely to work.

### Group 3: How to adapt to these trends?

- IVS has successfully adapted to new trends many times in its history
- Formal education increasingly requires volunteer hours, presenting an opportunity for IVS
- The potential for recognition of IVS through cross-sectoral connection between non-formal and formal education – in universities and schools – could demonstrate the value of volunteering
- Ethical questions around accepting funding from large donors were raised

### Group 4: Based on the needs analysis ...

- Partner organisations are often small, with limited skills and resources
- A gap exists between individual capacity and community needs
- Technology presents both a challenge and an opportunity
- Motivation is key to the volunteer organisation: in different contexts – India, Europe, Zimbabwe – what drives engagement varies
- IVS can create empathy and support people in sharing a common objective

## 1.6 STRENGTHS, VULNERABILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IVS

Building on the previous sessions, participants were invited to consider the strengths and vulnerabilities of IVS today, and to look at opportunities and threats facing the organisation in the current context. This analysis would feed into the next day's work in the foresight sessions. Four group discussions produced the results of the SWOT analysis overview here and summarised below.

### 1.6.1 IVS SWOT Analysis

#### Strengths

- **Extensive global network and grassroots presence:** IVS boasts a worldwide reach with strong connections in local communities. This global network and local engagement enable the organisation to operate effectively at the grassroots level and collaborate across diverse regions. Such breadth provides access to diverse views and resources and fosters resilience through broad support

- **Established experience and infrastructure:** With a long history and well-established structure, IVS benefits from decades of experience and a solid organisational infrastructure. These core competencies mean IVS has the institutional knowledge and stability to organise and manage volunteer projects efficiently, leveraging its settled infrastructure and accumulated expertise
- **Values-driven mission and social impact:** The organisation is deeply value-oriented, promoting ideals of peace, tolerance, and human rights in its activities. IVS volunteers and staff demonstrate empathy, compassion, and non-violent communication, enhancing humanity and social capital in the communities they serve. This strong ethical foundation bolsters IVS's credibility and motivates stakeholders around a common humanitarian purpose
- **Diverse and inclusive culture:** Diversity is a clear strength – IVS brings together people of different ages and backgrounds (intergenerationality) and embraces a wide range of perspectives. The inclusive culture not only enriches the volunteer experience but also helps IVS adapt to various cultural contexts. By valuing diversity and fostering broad participation, the organisation can draw on a rich pool of ideas and talents
- **Strong volunteer engagement and skills:** IVS has a proven ability to organise and involve people effectively, resulting in highly motivated volunteers and staff. The movement's members possess extensive knowledge and skills, and they practice synergy and collaboration in their work. This human capital – combined with adaptability and resilience – allows IVS to maintain robust programs and respond to challenges capably

## Weaknesses

- **Chronic resource constraints:** A major challenge for IVS is the lack of sufficient funding and human resources. Limited finances (and minimal fundraising capability) make the current model difficult to sustain. Likewise, the shortage of staff/volunteers – compounded by high turnover rates – strains the organisation's capacity, leading to a decline in volunteer numbers and loss of institutional knowledge over time
- **Weak communication and visibility:** IVS struggles with its communication strategy and external visibility. The organisation has not kept pace with modern communication channels – there is a noted lack of development in using new media and social networks – which contributes to low public recognition of its work. Inconsistent external communications and unclear messaging make it harder to attract volunteers and partners, limiting IVS's profile and influence



- **Limited partnerships and inclusivity:** Another weakness is insufficient connectivity with diverse partners and certain communities. IVS has relatively few collaborations with new stakeholders like universities or companies (as noted by "lack of connectivity with diverse partners"). Additionally, some programmes are not accessible to people from certain countries due to visa issues or grant restrictions, which undermines the organisation's inclusive ethos. The needs and contributions of younger participants may also be under-emphasised, suggesting the organisation could do more to engage youth fully
- **Organisational and skills gaps:** IVS faces internal skills gaps that hinder its effectiveness. There is a lack of project management and planning expertise within the team, as well as shortcomings in fundraising know-how. These deficiencies, along with difficulty of adapting quickly to a changing world, impede the organisation's ability to innovate and execute long-term strategies. Operational inefficiencies like these can prevent IVS from maximising its impact and responding nimbly to new challenges

## Opportunities

- **Strengthening strategic partnerships:** There are significant opportunities to expand IVS's network through partnerships. Collaborating with universities, governments, and companies can provide new resources and increase credibility. Likewise, building stronger connections within global movements (e.g. through CCIVS, United Nations Volunteers) or partnering with specialised organisations (such as mental health groups) could open avenues for joint initiatives and broader support
- **Enhanced outreach and visibility:** IVS can greatly improve its public profile by leveraging modern communication tools. Increased use of social media and engagement with influencers would raise awareness of IVS's mission and projects. By boosting recognition and showcasing its credibility and success stories, the organisation can attract more volunteers, donors, and community support. Proactive outreach campaigns and better storytelling about IVS's impact represent a growth area for the future
- **Programme innovation and expansion:** The organisation can diversify and innovate its programme offerings to stay relevant. For example, IVS could develop more projects involving local volunteers (not just international placements) and promote its programmes as valuable educational or internship opportunities (aligning with schemes like Erasmus). Embracing intersectionality in project design – addressing multiple social issues and engaging people from varied backgrounds – would allow IVS to remain inclusive and impactful. New focus areas such as combating social isolation (positioning IVS projects as a way to fight loneliness and support mental health) are also promising avenues to increase social value and attract support

- **Embracing technology and innovation:** Adopting new technologies can make IVS more efficient and extend its reach. There is an opportunity to utilise digital platforms and even AI tools to streamline operations, enhance volunteer matching, or measure impact – provided this is done without compromising the human touch central to volunteering. Better use of online tools and data can help IVS adapt to changing trends and engage a tech-savvy generation of volunteers
- **Financial diversification and sustainability:** Finally, IVS can pursue financial independence by diversifying funding sources. Reducing over-reliance on a single grant or donor stream (in effect “cutting off” vulnerable funding ties) would give the organisation greater freedom and stability. This might involve developing income-generating activities, improving fundraising skills, or seeking endowments. Strengthening financial sustainability will allow IVS to invest in long-term growth and weather external shocks

## Threats

- **Reliance on external funding:** IVS’s heavy dependence on external funding is a significant external risk. Changes in donor priorities or cuts in grants could severely impact operations. The broader decline in humanitarian/NGO funding and economic downturns also threaten the financial stability of the organisation, putting its programmes at risk if new funding sources are not secured
- **Competitive volunteer landscape:** The organisation faces competition from other volunteer and travel programmes. Initiatives like Erasmus-based volunteering, work-and-travel schemes, and a growing number of voluntourism companies or volunteer-matching apps present alternative opportunities for IVS’s target volunteers. These competitors can draw potential volunteers and funding away, forcing IVS to differentiate its offerings and demonstrate unique value to remain attractive
- **Adverse political and policy environment:** International volunteering can be hindered by government policies and political trends. Strict visa regimes and travel restrictions (sometimes tightened due to concerns about illegal migration) make cross-border volunteer exchanges more difficult. Additionally, rising nationalism or political extremism in some countries can create a less welcoming climate for international cooperation. Such external factors can limit where and how IVS operates, regardless of its internal strengths
- **Global crises and uncertainty:** Large-scale crises pose ongoing threats to IVS’s activities. The COVID-19 pandemic, for instance, demonstrated how a global health crisis can halt travel and in-person projects. Similarly, climate change and natural disasters may disrupt communities where IVS works, while wars or armed conflicts can suddenly make regions inaccessible or unsafe. In addition, deteriorating economic conditions or instability worldwide can reduce volunteer participation and support. These unpredictable events require IVS to remain highly adaptable and prepared for rapid changes in its operating environment

**DAY 2 – 8 APRIL**

**LOOKING FORWARD –  
FUTURES & FORESIGHT**





## **2.1 SHAPING THE FUTURE OF IVS: POLICY, ADVOCACY, SOCIAL AND CLIMATE JUSTICE**

The first session was presented by an expert panel comprising four presenters, each discussing one of the following topics:

- Policy trends affecting IVS (EU & UN perspectives), presented by **Gabriella Civico, Director, Centre for European Volunteering (CEV)**
- How can IVS influence funding and institutional priorities? Presented by **Barbara Eglitis, European Solidarity Corps Resource Centre**
- Linking IVS to climate justice, decolonisation and inclusion efforts, presented by **Helene Perold, Independent Social Research Consultant (South Africa)**
- Green Colonialism and Climate Justice in IVS, presented by **Patrick Okoyo Awino, Communication specialist, Senior Hansard Report, CAK (Kenya)**

**Gabriella Civico, Director, Centre for European Volunteering (CEV)**, outlined evolving policy trends for international voluntary service at EU and UN levels. Key observations included the growth of 'voluntourism' via commercial platforms, the shift from role-based to task-based volunteering, and greater precarity in young people's lives that drives last-minute, short-term engagement. The shift towards task-based approaches was seen as well-suited to international voluntary service setups and workcamps, where the collaborative nature of doing tasks together is central. The question of how AI can be used in volunteer placement and management was addressed, as well as the potential of predictive analytics for understanding social needs and volunteer deployment requirements. Caution was also expressed about the risks of AI, including the potential for biases and disinformation to enter the work and for the technology to radically alter the role of volunteers. The presentation highlighted confusion in legal frameworks between traineeships and volunteering, advocated linking IVS impact to the SDGs, and urged partnerships that reconcile intercultural learning with the EU Green Deal and decolonisation agendas.

**Barbara Eglitis, European Solidarity Corps Resource Centre**, examined how IVS actors can influence funding and institutional priorities, especially within the European Solidarity Corps. It stressed the importance of targeted advocacy: researching which EU departments own which youth or green agendas, feeding concrete evidence through stakeholder consultations and surveys, and networking through national authorities to amplify the sector's voice. There was a call for clear definitions of 'flexible funding', transparent reporting on organisational support costs alongside volunteer outcomes, and for defenders of volunteering to link it to EU strategic priorities such as democracy, security and competitiveness to secure long-term funding.

**Helene Perold, Independent Social Research Consultant (South Africa)**, focused on decolonisation, stressing that true localisation in IVS means shifting leadership, funding decisions, and knowledge production to Southern partners. It warned against persistent Northern distrust – rooted in assumptions about capacity – and its habit of channelling funds through European intermediaries. The presentation urged co-creation of projects from design through evaluation, direct funding of core costs for local organisations, and strengthening of civil society networks, so that IVS becomes a genuinely reciprocal exchange rather than a neo-colonial imprint.

**Patrick Okoyo Awino, Communication Specialist, Senior Hansard Reporter, CAK (Kenya)**, defined 'green colonialism' in IVS as the imposition of Western conservation models without local consent, which risks land-grabs, displacement of pastoralist communities, and extractive carbon-offset projects. Key risks identified included paternalism, lack of community input, short-termism, and resource exploitation. Proposed advocacy strategies included raising volunteer awareness through case studies, lobbying for enforceable equitable conservation policies, supporting grassroots land-rights movements, promoting community-led ecotourism revenue sharing, and instituting rigorous participatory monitoring to safeguard climate justice in IVS.

## **Key issues raised in the Q&A discussion**

### **1. Proving and measuring social impact**

Panellists agreed that it is difficult but feasible to measure impact if approached systematically. Recommendations included establishing clear baseline indicators before volunteers arrive, then using a '360°' approach – gathering data from three key stakeholder groups (the organisation, the volunteers, and members of the local community) at baseline, mid-point and end-point. The importance of keeping measurement simple – choosing two or three metrics that can be reliably tracked – was emphasised. Digital platforms such as VCal enable organisations to log volunteer hours and perceived impacts, aligning outputs to SDGs for comparability.

### **2. Online/virtual vs. cross-border or community-based volunteering**

Virtual volunteering is task-focused and can reach large numbers of people, particularly in crises or for digital heritage projects, but it lacks the immersive, intercultural, human-connection aspects of in-person service.

It also requires significant staff time to onboard and sustain engagement, and depends on reliable internet availability. Cross-border and community-based volunteering embeds volunteers in a new environment, fosters deeper cultural exchange, tackles loneliness through face-to-face interaction, and builds local relationships that virtual modes cannot replicate.

### 3. Intergenerational volunteering

Although 'intergenerational fairness' has recently gained policy attention, mixing ages in volunteering is not new. Whether in international camps or local programmes – older volunteers mentoring youth, youth supporting older adults, or multi-age teams in schools – intergenerational exchange has always been present in IVS. What is new is the opportunity to highlight and fund it deliberately, and to revisit past schemes that specifically engaged older volunteers.

### 4. Racism in IVS


A persisting colonial mindset that underrates local capacities in the Global South was identified, characterising African communities as perpetually 'in need' and untrustworthy with funds, despite decades of independence. This distrust channels resources through European intermediaries, reinforces neocolonial power imbalances, and fuels racist narratives that must be actively challenged through genuine partnerships, shared leadership, and by showcasing local expertise.

## 2.2 IDENTIFYING POSSIBLE FUTURES FOR IVS

In the next session, participants received a short introduction to the Futures and Foresight methodologies, which explore the seven dimensions of the future using the following key concepts:

- What is Possible (might – what might happen?)
- What is Plausible (could – what could happen?)
- What is Probable (likely – what is likely to happen?)
- What is Preferable (should – what should happen?)
- 

In using the methodology to explore possible futures for IVS, the importance of bold and creative long-term thinking was emphasised.





## 2.2.2 Envisioning IVS future scenarios

The next part of the process was a visioning exercise to imagine IVS in 2035. In plenary the participants decided to focus on four out of the five drivers identified in the previous exercise: Natural disasters; funding; voluntourism; and AI. Working in two groups, the participants built IVS future scenarios using a 2x2 Matrix approach and connected them to the advocacy proposals.

### AI and Voluntourism - 2x2 matrix scenarios

#### High AI

This scenario focuses on equipping staff with the skills to use AI to further the mission and values of IVS. A key milestone is securing an expert to provide training, with success measured by how many people receive training on ethical AI use and its promotion in networks.

#### Low Volunteerism / Low AI

This scenario emphasises the internal development and improvement of tools to support operations. The goal is to harmonise systems across organisations, improving efficiency and consistency. Indicators include tool completion, staff efficiency, and organisational adoption rates.

#### High Human / Community Touch / Connection

This scenario prioritises human connection and local engagement through national and international meetings and shared experiences. Stakeholders include local communities, volunteers, and IVS organisations. Success is measured by the number of projects, community involvement, and the integration of decolonised approaches to AI.

#### High Volunteerism

This scenario emphasises the consistent promotion of IVS values in collaboration with institutions. The focus is on increasing the number of volunteers, institutional partnerships, and active projects.



## Natural Disasters & Funding – 2x2 matrix scenarios

### More funding – more natural disasters

With increased funding amid a rise in natural disasters, in this scenario communities and national volunteers are highly prepared for disaster response. There is a strong emphasis on environmental restoration, sustainable food production, and access to essential materials. Training incorporates both ancestral knowledge and modern technology, fostering a dual approach to education. These conditions create opportunities for developing robust community survival skills, as well as improved disaster adaptation and mitigation efforts.

### Less funding – more natural disasters

In a context of limited funding and frequent natural disasters, resilience in this scenario stems from community and volunteer engagement grounded in ancestral practices and low-tech solutions. Increased migration and the establishment of new partnerships with specialised agencies highlight the need for strategic re-evaluation. Volunteers coordinate efforts based on local environmental needs, forming a non-monetary economy supported by grassroots fundraising efforts such as GoFundMe. Recognition grows from hands-on action, leading to long-term skill-sharing and post-disaster learning.

### More funding – fewer natural disasters

With more funding and fewer disasters in this scenario, organisations can prioritise capacity-building through training and volunteer opportunities. This calm context allows for long-term strategic planning with targeted high-impact initiatives. Volunteers are formally recognised in national emergency plans and take on implementation roles during crises. The role of IVS and volunteers becomes central to environmental protection and disaster mitigation strategies.

### Less funding – fewer natural disasters


In this scenario, when both funding and disasters are limited, the focus shifts to future preparedness. Communities and organisations seek alternative funding sources, restructure responsibilities, and build strategic partnerships across sectors. Emphasis is placed on developing reserves and implementing emergency preparedness and safety strategies to ensure long-term resilience.



## 2.2.3 Translating vision into action

Having shared the outcomes of the previous exercise, participants again worked in groups to identify key milestones, stakeholders and success indicators for each of the future scenarios they had crafted.

### AI and voluntourism



<p><b>Local &amp; international volunteers provide hands-on action, post-disaster, for long-term impact.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● They are not specialised; they learn by doing and share their skills.</li><li>● They can also support by finding funding (e.g. Gofundme).</li><li>● This could lead to recognition &amp; could eventually alleviate funding barriers.</li></ul> <p><b>Key milestones:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Successfully recruit local and international volunteer groups</li><li>● Partnerships with other operating sectors (emergency relief; government agencies; first responders)</li><li>● Understanding the needs &amp; what is required.</li></ul> <p><b>Stakeholders</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Place/people/community</li><li>● Operating sectors</li><li>● Volunteers</li><li>● Experts in climate mitigation &amp; adaptation</li><li>● Funders</li></ul> <p><b>Indicators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● No of established partnerships</li><li>● No of volunteers</li><li>● No of successful trainings</li><li>● No of funds raised</li><li>● No of successful projects implemented</li></ul>	<p><b>Provide training for members, local communities &amp; volunteers in low-tech ancestral knowledge / adaptation and mitigation.</b></p> <p><b>Key milestones:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Develop training programme</li><li>● Find the funding</li><li>● Local traditional training methods</li></ul> <p><b>Stakeholders</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Members of the IVS movement</li><li>● Experts in the field (locally)</li><li>● Local people / local communities</li></ul> <p><b>Indicators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● No of people trained &amp; identified</li><li>● No of volunteers</li><li>● No of successful trainings</li><li>● No of funds raised</li><li>● No of projects organized</li><li>● No of communities involve</li></ul>
---	--

A comparison between the two sets of proposals reveals interesting similarities and differences. Both the AI/voluntourism and the natural disasters/funding proposals are underpinned by a strong commitment to the IVS values of community-based action, learning by doing, and partnerships with other agencies, both governmental and non-governmental.

For example, the Low AI/Voluntourism scenario prioritises human connection, traditional knowledge, grassroots action and building resilience through local knowledge. Similarly the Natural Disasters/Funding scenario is focused on local (and international) volunteer engagement in disaster response, not as specialists but by providing hands-on support and learning through action; in this way the scenario envisages long-term impact through capacity building and skill-sharing. In other words, both these proposals aim for resilience through community empowerment, inclusive participation and low-tech adaptation.

By contrast, the High IA/Voluntourism scenario emphasises technological integration and system optimisation, while focusing on efficiency and strategic visibility. It is also likely to be scalable, but reliant on expertise and funding. What prevents this approach from becoming corporatised is the drive to align AI with ethical values and decolonise its use.

Strategic partnerships are another feature of both sets of proposals. The High AI/Voluntourism scenario envisages partnerships with educational and government institutions that can supply expertise and, presumably, funding.

The Low AI/Voluntourism and the Natural Disasters/Funding scenarios envisage partnerships with local experts (e.g. emergency relief agencies) as well as community leaders and first responders, but also with government bodies. In other words, these two scenarios are grounded in grassroots empowerment, community resilience and adaptability. In this way they are likely to be more inclusive, but less driven by technology.

## **2.3 REFLECTION**

At the end of the day, Helene was asked to share her observations about the outcomes of the day's panel inputs and group discussions. Her reflections and questions were as follows:

- CCIVS is resilient, has long-standing experience and represents a set of values that are supportive of the struggle for equity, human rights and social justice (to name a few). In this regard it is distinctly different from the large IVS sending organisations run on behalf of Northern governments [e.g. France Volontaires, Weltwaerts, VSO (as it was previously), Peace Corps (USA) and Australia's Volunteer Program (AVP)] or run by foundations such as the Singapore International Foundation, etc..

- But is there a risk that CCIVS is inwardly-focused within its historical paradigm? If so, could this risk it being isolated or marginalised, making it difficult to explore new partnerships and opportunities that might help the organisation retain its resilience and support its drive for influence and innovation in the IVS sector?
- How does the DNA of IVS - anti-racism, relational development, non-formal learning - translate into programming in an increasingly insecure global environment wracked by growing nationalism, conflict, dispossession, youth alienation, technology-driven communication, shrinking civil society space, etc?
- What does this imply for the relationship between reciprocity and mutual learning between CCIVS' European base and members in other parts of the world? Can this be sustained, and if so how?

In discussion, participants emphasised that CCIVS empowers its members as a political and activist network, not a technical one. The organisation needs to diversify its funding and look for resources outside the EU to adapt and use new methods of communication. Sustaining the network with diverse partnerships and members around the world is acknowledged to be exhausting, but CCIVS has demonstrated remarkable flexibility and resilience. Fragmentation was identified as undermining collective effort, and the importance of working together as a network was strongly affirmed. The International Music Council was noted as a like-minded organisation with shared values and advocacy strategies.



**DAY 3 – 9 APRIL**

**STRATEGY  
DEVELOPMENT -  
BRIDGING PRESENT  
& FUTURE**

**The objective of Day 3 was to set strategic priorities linking current realities with future IVS challenges.**



**3.1 DEFINING KEY PRIORITIES FOR IVS ADVOCACY**

This session started by reflecting on the 5 Advocacy Asks as captured in the matrix below and groups considered these in relation to the question: **Where should IVS focus?**

	Advocacy Area	Core Message	Key Asks
1	Recognition of International Voluntary Service	IVS is crucial for peace, resilience, and sustainable development.	Policy frameworks, skill certification, integration into national agendas
2	Cross border opportunities in International Voluntary Service	Fair mobility access for global volunteer participation.	Transparent visa info, official training, embassy access
3	Climate Action Through International Voluntary Service	Community-led climate action for ecological resilience.	Funding for climate projects, alignment with UN environmental frameworks
4	Equitable Funding for International Voluntary Service Projects	Inclusive funding mechanisms prioritises community-led projects.	Decolonise decision-making, global exchanges, simplified funding and reporting requirements
5	Human Rights and Justice in International Voluntary Service	Safe, discrimination-free, and inclusive IVS participation for all, addressing gender-based violence and ensuring support for youth in conflict and post-conflict areas.	Policies for safety, security in conflict zones, prevention of gender-based violence, equal access, and protection for marginalised communities.

In discussion, a number of suggestions were made about the issues that have become increasingly pressing in the environment in which IVS functions. These include concerns about mental health, the vulnerability of young people searching for jobs, the question of ethics in the increased use of AI, the erosion of freedom of expression (which could perhaps be included under the human rights Ask), war, geopolitical conflicts, as well as natural disasters. If these could be prioritised and added into the Advocacy Asks it would be easier to write policy papers to better prepare ourselves and come up with better solutions.

It was also suggested that in terms of **formal recognition**, CCIVS should ideally be recognised in various regions and that perhaps the EC members from different regions could represent each region more actively. It wasn't clear, however, whether this could be achieved in all regions.

It was noted that the 5th Ask, about human rights, is a catch-all category that needs to be refined because in its present form it is too wide.

In the afternoon, participants were divided into three groups, each allocated one of the following three IVS priorities to explore in relation to the Five Advocacy Asks:

- Natural disasters
- Funding barriers
- AI and voluntourism

The groups were asked to reflect on these priorities against the Five Advocacy Asks and to examine them through the lens of the scenario planning exercises done on Day 2, using a high-impact versus low-impact framework. The outcomes are captured in the table below.

### THREE PRIORITIES IN RELATION TO THE FIVE ADVOCACY ASKS AND FUTURES SCENARIOS

Asks	Kind of response	Roles
<b>NATURAL DISASTERS</b>		
<b>Recognition</b>	Recognition of the skills of volunteers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impacts of the volunteer work in the natural disaster response</li> <li>• The separation of the first response and long-term post-disaster support i.e. reconstruction, ecosystem restoration</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-border Opportunities</b>	Fast-track natural disaster volunteer visa	Active approach
<b>Climate action</b>	Community-led climate action for ecological resilience	Environmental restoration
<b>Equitable funding</b>	Solidarity funds for natural disaster response	Regenerative funding
<b>Human rights &amp; justice</b>	Coordination with multiple organisations to ensure discrimination-free natural disaster response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting basic needs in natural disaster area</li> <li>• Advocating the impacts of the natural disaster on other areas e.g. gender-based violence.</li> </ul>

Asks	Kind of response	Roles
<b>FUNDING BARRIERS</b>		
<b>Recognition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Official recognition from other national &amp; international bodies</li> <li>• Identify which bodies are we going to apply from youth &amp; education depts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific role in work of youth work action</li> <li>• Ease or alleviate funding challenges</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-border Opportunities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Free access to cross-border volunteering operation &amp; mobilities</li> <li>• Subsidies from national govts for volunteer activities</li> </ul>	Give visibility for regional cross-border funding opportunities (regional collaboration)
<b>Climate action</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research based, professional proposal submission</li> <li>• Climate education: getting young people active in education, schools, academic for communities</li> </ul>	Ability to fully implement climate action projects
<b>Equitable funding</b>	Development agencies should match in terms of capacity & implementation to IVS movements	Look for other funding (ethical to IVS) e.g. BRICS, G7, ASEAN, UN, UNESCO, AU
<b>Human rights &amp; justice</b>	Operational challenges in terms of implementation projects in IVS	Look for funding from human rights organisations & associations working on social justice
<b>ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE</b>		
<b>Recognition</b>	Local, national & international recognition needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy for recognition of voluntourism as just business</li> <li>• 'Expose' their vs our practices</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-border Opportunities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visa issues affecting our mobility</li> <li>• Local &amp; international support when it comes to visa issues</li> </ul>	More awareness on this matter e.g. caravan camp, music, voices for change
<b>Climate action</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voluntourism camp to develop policy papers related to climate action</li> <li>• Voluntourism camp for research to establish the position we have about the impact of AI on climate action</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nice Climate Institute with the participation of university students</li> <li>• Multi-disciplinary approach from social science, environmental &amp; political studies, development studies etc using AI tools</li> </ul>
<b>Equitable funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voluntourism camp to develop a system to find funding from all over the world using AI to automatically send the info to the organisation involved</li> <li>• Use AI system to find diverse sources of funding (law &amp; regulation)</li> </ul>	Nice Financial Institute with the participation of university students specialised in resource mobilisation, financial management, IT, law.
<b>AI</b>	Impact of AI in sending the information about IVS	Come up with data that would be uploaded to support our cause.



At the end of the morning session, research-based insights were presented on structural barriers to IVS recognition, including:

### **Structural barriers to IVS recognition**

- Recognition of volunteering is facilitated by an environment that values and supports different types of volunteering – organised, less formalised, community-based, cross-border and transnational, among others
- Too often volunteer organisations are seen as the delivery mechanisms for specific outcomes e.g. achieving the SDGs, rather than volunteers being involved in civic engagement and advocacy for a host of local, national, regional or global concerns
- Barrier: diminishing value and support for civic spaces: In the present context the extent to which civil society space is shrinking represents a major barrier to the recognition and support of IVS, but at this time the need for volunteering for solidarity and locally-driven development has never been greater
- There is a need for inclusive policies to support local volunteerism with a special focus on vulnerable groups
- Build incentives for participation whilst providing protection and safety guarantees for volunteers
- Lack of recognition for the value of volunteering and the contribution of volunteers remains an issue that requires a strong advocacy response. Eg. while the Volunteer Groups Alliance brings together 80 organisations and networks, this is focused on influencing UN member states. There is scope for volunteering networks to engage in a wider advocacy strategy with the aim of securing greater awareness of IVS to encourage increased investment in this field
- CCIVS offers volunteers the opportunity to participate in sustainable development driven by community needs and ownership. The key here is that reciprocal partnerships between international organisations and local communities are the foundation for solidarity and progress and create opportunities for mutual learning between IVs and local partner organisations
- The persistent difficulty of achieving reciprocity in travel of volunteers from the Global South to the Global North and other countries represents an ongoing constraint for IVS
- Is there a risk of CCIVS being isolated? The drive for partnerships with universities and other institutions to build the knowledge base around IVS and locally-led programmes is an important factor in creating greater awareness of its work

**DAY 4 – 10 APRIL**

**IVS ADVOCACY &  
POLICY  
IMPLEMENTATION**


## The objective of Day 4 was to strengthen IVS's policy impact through advocacy & partnerships.



### 4.1 ADVOCACY TRAINING

This session introduced participants to how the International Music Council (IMC) leverages its 'Five Music Rights' framework as a tool for advocacy and engagement in international policy-making spaces such as UNESCO and the UN. Founded by UNESCO, the IMC is the largest global network dedicated to promoting music rights. Through strategic use of this framework, IMC advocates for music access, education, creation, performance, and fair remuneration for artists, remaining inclusive across musical genres and free from religious, ideological, or political bias.

Advocacy actions highlighted included monitoring policy developments, submitting statements, participating in consultations, replying to surveys, and collaborating with partners across cultural sectors. IMC targets a wide range of international organisations including UNESCO, UNDP, WIPO, ILO, UNFCCC, and regional bodies such as the EU, AU, and ASEAN. Public mobilisation efforts prioritise local events, partnerships with like-minded groups, online engagement, and media outreach. The IMC also celebrates advocacy through initiatives such as the Music Rights Awards, which recognise projects that advance music rights. Examples from diverse international contexts demonstrated the transformative power of music in contexts of resilience, peace, and mental health.



Discussions during the session touched on complex issues, such as whether music that incites hate can be penalised under the rights framework, with a consensus leaning toward positive reinforcement rather than censorship.

Ultimately, the IMC is positioned as a value-driven, networked organisation that actively implements and supports actions adhering to its music rights principles. Its mission is clear: to foster a world where everyone can access, create, and express themselves through music, with artists' rights fully respected and protected.

## 4.1.1 Applying IMC approach to Advocacy Asks

Participants were divided into smaller groups, each considering the following three questions in relation to a specific IVS Advocacy Ask:

- How do the 5 Music Rights relate to the 5 IVS Advocacy Asks?
- What lessons can IVS take from the IMCs approach to lobbying and policy engagement?
- What are the key UNESCO, UN and EU spaces that IVS should be present in?

The outcomes of those discussions were as follows:

### ***Advocacy Ask 1 - Recognition***

- Operating with other accredited organisations and forming 'strategic alliances' which will aid IVS in obtaining recognition
- Inclusivity, Participation, Accessibility
- To raise awareness on recognition of IVS using ethical and alternative media platforms

### ***Advocacy Ask 2 - Cross-border Opportunities***

- Accessibility for all people to get equal opportunities
- Intercultural learning, adaptation and understanding each other's culture
- Educating the embassies, especially the visa issuing authorities. through workshops, training, etc.
- Strategic Plan related to IVS Advocacy
- Regional Economic Group representation from IVS
- Strategic collaborations with development partners related to advocacy
- Send annual reports to embassies and immigration offices within our countries of operation

### ***Advocacy Ask 3 - Climate Action***

- African Union volunteer linkage platform (NAVO), Volunteer groups Alliance (UN-SDGS), NGO UNESCO liaison committee, UNESCO Youth Climate Action Network (in-progress), IAVE/IVCO (Forum), ASEF, COE, Youth Forum Jeunesse (YFJ)
- Possibility – UNESCO: 2005 convention, education, culture - WHC, IVS Movements (CCIVS umbrella - networks - ICYE, SCI, IBO, ALLIANCE) and sister networks - NVDA, NAVO

### ***Advocacy Ask 4 - Equitable Funding***

- Connection to the 5 Music Rights (recognition), base for funding
- Inspiration from work with international institutions, participations, platforms

### ***Advocacy Ask 5 - Human Rights & Justice***

- 5 Music Rights relations: Recognition
- To expand Advocacy works beyond Europe (ASEAN, ECOWAS, SADC)
- To the National delegations
- UNESCO & spaces - UNV, UNFP, UNDP etc...

## Key takeaways from the morning session were as follows:

- Participants acknowledged that while challenges are known, the focus must now shift toward concrete actions and solutions
- Some frustration was expressed regarding the difficulty of changing systemic problems, especially in areas like climate action
- Education is a cross-cutting theme and should be prioritised across all advocacy strategies
- Participants identified similar obstacles, emphasising the need to harmonise actions while respecting different contexts
- There is a need to establish a stronger, more coherent CCIVS identity to enhance global recognition and internal cohesion

### 4.1.2 Identifying Recognition and Funding stakeholders

Working in groups again, participants were asked to identify the stakeholders that needed to be engaged in relation to Advocacy Ask 1 – Recognition, and Advocacy Ask 4 – Equitable Funding, and to mention them by name as far as possible. Participants identified international, national and local stakeholders, as is shown in these lists. An analysis of the lists shows a number of interesting trends in the Recognition and the Funding stakeholders suggested by the groups.

#### Recognition stakeholder trends

##### **There is a strong reliance on public institutions.**

Government ministries (Youth, Foreign Affairs, Culture) and municipal bodies are central to volunteer recognition, highlighting a top-down structure

**Youth-focused regional and international Bodies.** Many regional and international recognition actors are youth-centered, tying volunteerism closely to youth empowerment initiatives

##### **Collaborative and network-based recognition.**

Recognition involves collaboration among NGOs, UN platforms, and advisory councils, emphasizing partnership-based acknowledgment

##### **Practical barriers to recognition highlighted.**

Visa and passport issues are prominent, indicating mobility as a practical challenge for volunteer recognition across borders



**Lack of private sector engagement.** The private sector plays little to no role in formal volunteer recognition, unlike its strong role in funding activities.

**Education sector as a key local actor.** Universities and schools are essential in recognising volunteer contributions, promoting volunteering from an early age.

## Funding stakeholder trends

### Funding Stakeholder Trends



#### **Institutional Dominance Internationally**

Heavy reliance on government/multilateral agencies



#### **Diversified Funding Nationally and Locally**

Mix of government, private sector, individuals



#### **Growing Role of Corporate and Private Donors**

Especially at local and national levels



#### **Increasing Grassroots Engagement**

Shift to community-driven and smaller sources



#### **North-South Asymmetry Persists**

Limited South-South funding visibility

**Heavy reliance on public and multilateral institutions.** At the international and regional levels, stakeholders are mainly UN agencies, government development agencies, multilateral funds, and embassies. Funding and partnerships are shaped largely by formal, institutional sources with limited private sector engagement

**Greater diversification at local and national levels.** Local and national lists show a more varied funding landscape that blends public, private, and individual support sources. There is a clear shift towards pluralistic funding models, combining governmental support, corporate sponsorship, private donors, crowdfunding, and foundations

**Rise of private sector and corporate actors.** Corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives and private philanthropy are increasingly important at the national and local levels, with organisations like Infosys Fund, TATA Trusts, and local companies playing major roles

**Emerging grassroots and community-oriented approaches.** There is stronger recognition of grassroots and community-driven funding sources, including local authorities, municipalities, local hosts, and individual donors. This reflects a shift towards more community-based resource mobilisation

**Limited South-South and regional South collaboration.** Despite the presence of some regional bodies (e.g., ASEAN, AU), Global South-led funding remains limited compared to Global North sources. This reveals continued asymmetries in funding power and influence



## Insights from Recognition and Funding stakeholder trends

### Comparison between the Recognition and Funding stakeholders



Stakeholders	Recognition	Funding
<b>International</b>	Strong focus on volunteering and youth engagement platforms (UNV, FORUM, ILO, Red Cross)	Strong focus on funding bodies (UN agencies, Embassies, Development Foundations)
<b>Regional</b>	Regional volunteer collaboration bodies (ECOWAS, CAN/ MERCOSUR, SADC Youth Divisions)	Regional funding and project agencies (EU, AU, ASEAN, Regional Foundations)
<b>National</b>	Volunteer recognition structures (National Volunteer Councils, Ministries of Youth)	Ministries (Youth, Development, EU Affairs) and private sector donors (TATA, Infosys)
<b>Local</b>	Universities, municipalities, volunteer platforms for recognition and validation	County governments, private donors, local companies, individuals for funding
	Strong focus on volunteering and youth engagement platforms (UNV, FORUM, ILO, Red Cross)	Strong focus on funding bodies (UN agencies, Embassies, Development Foundations)

**When we compare the two lists of stakeholders, the comparison suggests that the stakeholders are likely to play different roles in IVS:**

- **International institutions** serve dual functions: International organisations (UN, EU bodies, ASEF) appear both as funders and recognisers of volunteerism
- **Regional focus:** Funding vs coordination: Regional bodies fund projects (EU, AU), but also coordinate volunteer programmes (ECOWAS, CAN/MERCOSUR)
- **National government ministries are central:** Ministries manage both funding and volunteer recognition, but focus differently – development vs youth support
- **Strong local-level engagement:** Both lists of stakeholders highlight local engagement through municipalities, universities, community centers, and local NGOs
- **Private section has a funding role, not a recognition role:** According to these lists Corporates are major funders, but are less active in volunteer recognition structures

## 4.2 STRENGTHENING THE IVS POLICY ROLE

This session involved participants in a policy debate entitled ‘IVS in Global Frameworks’, structured around a scenario of an international meeting to discuss IVS recognition. Participants were divided into three groups representing IVS practitioners advocating for recognition, government policymakers setting volunteering policies, and funders and donors deciding where to allocate resources.

### 4.2.1 Summary of the debate

During the pitch session, representatives from IVS organisations presented their case to policy makers and funders, seeking greater recognition for the educational and societal value of their volunteer programmes. They emphasised that IVS initiatives provide hands-on, transformative learning experiences for young people and contribute significantly to local and global issues such as environmental restoration, cultural heritage preservation, and peace-building. IVS practitioners argued that their work complements formal education and develops skills that are not typically gained through traditional university systems.

The policy makers responded with scepticism about the measurable local impact and raised concerns about accreditation, cultural sensitivities, and the capacity for integrating short-term volunteer work into recognised education systems. They highlighted the challenges of formally accrediting non-formal education experiences and stressed the importance of respecting local cultures when hosting international volunteers. IVS representatives proposed solutions such as linking volunteer experiences to university credits and demonstrating the positive cultural exchange benefits.

The funders outlined their priority areas — human rights, climate change, gender equality, peace, and digital innovation — and confirmed interest provided that IVS activities could be clearly mapped to these themes. They emphasised the need for IVS to present streamlined proposals, including specific outcomes, concrete data, timelines, budgets, and examples of successful projects. Feedback from other participants reinforced the importance of precise, targeted messaging, recommending that IVS organisations refine their advocacy to match the priorities and capacities of different funding bodies and policy audiences.

Overall, while the IVS representatives made a passionate and value-driven case, the session revealed the critical need for stronger evidence, clearer objectives, and tailored communication strategies to secure both recognition and financial support.

### 4.3 FUTURE SCENARIOS FOR IVS POLICY & FUNDING

In this session participants worked in five groups to produce their dream scenarios in answer to this question: **What if IVS had a strong policy role?** What needs to be done and what is our journey?

Once again the force field analysis methodology was used to identify driving forces and barriers/restraining forces.

#### **Driving forces (support stronger role)**

Several strong driving forces support IVS in achieving a greater role in policy-making. These include synergy with other organizations and networks, shifting towards more liberal perspectives, and shared values across diverse organisations. Personal motivation and strong organisational identity (based on history and experience) are critical strengths. IVS benefits from a coordinated network, international reach, and sector expertise, as well as recognition from influential bodies like the EU, UNESCO, UNV, and UNHCR. Support from embassies and funding bodies further bolsters their position. Key themes include decolonisation efforts, strategic collaboration and partnerships, social media presence, and a commitment to global solidarity, youth mobility, structured operations, grassroots engagement, and the promotion of value-based guidelines and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Innovative projects, harmonised networks, impact measurement, and the ability to leverage a large, engaged membership are vital contributors to strengthening IVS's policy influence.

#### **Restraining forces (limit stronger role)**

IVS faces notable restraining forces that hinder its policy influence. These include persistent colonial thinking, prejudice towards informal education, a broad and sometimes unfocused strategic approach, and intense competition within the civil society sector. Political shifts towards populism and far-right ideologies can clash with IVS values, as can internal challenges such as negative personal attitudes. Financial limitations, language barriers, and the diversity of contexts further complicate advocacy efforts. A lack of expertise in advocacy, inconsistent access to opportunities, and weak mapping of stakeholders and resources also present obstacles. External factors such as restrictive laws on mobility, national and local government barriers, natural disasters, pandemics, and shifting donor priorities exacerbate the challenges. Internally, fragmented communication, a lack of a common evaluation system, and insufficient funding for promising ideas hinder progress. To succeed, IVS must navigate these complex dynamics while reinforcing its strengths.



## Stakeholders mentioned

- Council of Europe
- European Youth Forum
- EU (European Union)
- Red Cross
- Amnesty International
- Doctors Without Borders
- Human in Need
- Social Media platforms: TikTok, LinkedIn
- UNESCO
- UNV (United Nations Volunteers)
- UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees)
- Universities: Northumbria, Ben Lowe, IMREDD
- French National Commission for UNESCO (Patrick)
- EYF (European Youth Foundation)

**Reviewing these points during the plenary, participants added the following insights:**

### Driving forces

- Global network reach: IVS organisations have extensive, diverse international networks with access to grassroots communities
- High-quality capacity building: Professional trainers and over 100 educational resources strengthen local capacities
- Persistence and vision: IVS organisations show resilience and clarity in engagement with policymakers and funders
- Potential for stronger marketing and promotion: With enhanced resources, IVS can amplify visibility and influence

### Restraining forces

- Low salary competitiveness: Difficulty retaining skilled personnel compared to the private sector
- Lack of statistical evidence: Proposals often lack robust, concrete data to convince stakeholders
- Generalised recognition requests: Vague advocacy goals weaken the strength of funding and policy requests
- Misalignment with audiences: Targeting the wrong institutions (e.g., ministries) dilutes advocacy impact



## 4.4 TRANSLATING ADVOCACY ASKS INTO TANGIBLE ACTIONS

Following these processes, participants reflected on the need to translate IVS Advocacy Asks into tangible actions at local, national, and international levels. They discussed how to connect broader policy goals to specific, achievable local actions. They emphasised mapping stakeholders, decision-makers, allies, and influencers critical to achieving intended outcomes.

**A strong recommendation emerged to design small, practice-oriented local projects as a test bed for broader campaigns, using clear outcomes and specific actions that can be replicated and scaled up later.**

A major theme was the difficulty in effectively communicating the value and uniqueness of IVS projects to external audiences. Participants noted that IVS must distinguish itself from general volunteering apps or voluntourism.

**There was a call for stronger storytelling, clearer messaging, and use of diverse media (e.g., videos, campaigns) to engage young people and older generations alike.**

**Participants stressed that effective communication strategies should highlight the critical thinking, intercultural learning, and social impact elements that make IVS projects distinct and valuable.**

The group also debated **the terminology** used to describe advocacy efforts. The term 'asks' was seen as potentially too weak or unclear. Alternatives such as 'rights' or 'policy demands' were proposed to more powerfully convey the movement's objectives. There was recognition that **while the current Advocacy Asks are grounded in values and real issues, they vary in nature — some represent end goals (e.g., recognition), others means (e.g., cross-border mobility), and thus require refined framing.** Participants agreed on the need to **prioritise certain advocacy areas for action**, recognising the capacity limitations of both organisations and the wider IVS network.

Lastly, the session emphasised the **importance of rooting advocacy in strong data collection, shared methodologies, and practical action plans.** Ideas such as regional ambassadors for advocacy, coordinated communication strategies, and creating platforms to share best practices were proposed. Participants also highlighted the need for careful branding and positioning of IVS advocacy efforts to **differentiate IVS values from other types of international volunteering.** Overall, there was a positive sense of progress, and a commitment to refining the advocacy framework in preparation for future organisational milestones.

In light of the day's learnings, discussions and insights gained, the 5 Advocacy Asks were reworked and are being finalised in a separate document. Going forward they will be known as the **Volunteer Rights in International Voluntary Service (IVS): A Policy Framework for Recognition, Protection, and Equity**

**DAY 5 – 11 APRIL**

**WRAP-UP &  
NEXT STEPS**



The objective of the last day was to finalise IVS's advocacy strategy and discuss next steps.



5.1 REVIEWING ADVOCACY OUTCOMES & DEFINING FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

The final day focused on consolidating the week's work. In three interest groups, participants reviewed and discussed the revised Advocacy Proposals.

It was clarified that key activities required for finalising the revised Advocacy Proposals include integrating feedback from the impact measurement discussions, the songwriting training session, and the local actions related to advocacy work. The goal is to ensure that the document captures all elements accurately and is ready for review and approval at the partners' meeting in October.

It was emphasised that the finalised document must be prepared and shared by early November to allow time for review and validation by all networks ahead of their General Assemblies and for presentation to the Symposium.

5.2 EVALUATION

After the tea-break participants reflected individually on the highlights from the GRM, and shared these in three groups. The comments are available below.

5.2.1 Individual reflections, grouped by theme

Advocacy and strategy

- Strategic process, strategic advocacy
- Going back to advocacy analysis work.
- Employ new tools in IVS movement and develop new strategies
- Strategic plan - approach everything
- Strategic plan linked to advocacy
- IVS advocacy process (proposed)
- Need to reposition the role of IVS for gaining recognition
- Still wondering about asks: optimistic or realistic
- Understanding new strategic objectives



## Impact and measurement

- Value of local actions for IVS
- Learning around advocacy and community trends
- Strengthen impact measurement methods
- SWOT analysis of IVS and challenges.

## Diversity and inclusion

- Different perspective on diversity
- Intersectional and intergenerational aspects
- Diversity in IVS attracts new people
- Encourage inclusive process

## Organisational environment and process

- Brain cell relocation!
- The week was useful - fruitful
- Role IVS plays at national level
- Importance of collective work in the IVS space
- Good working environment
- Have fun while working

## Communication and engagement

- Praise for process - strategic, participative, rich.
- Talk to contributors
- TikTok for content creation
- Move more into digital spaces without losing core values
- Participative approach
- Heart - moderation!
- Appreciate the power of secrets

## Learning and sharing

- Grateful for quiet and profound inputs - different viewpoint
- Gain insights into history of IVS and individual perspectives
- Learning from other realities, especially Global South and North.

## Vision and reflection


- Common vision - unity
- All trends interlinked
- Evolution of timeline of IVS!
- Feeling of evolving together
- Need to be self-critical



## 5.2.2 WRITTEN EVALUATION RESULTS

Participants also completed a written evaluation which was analysed by Bogdan Imre. Below is a summary of the key findings.

### Satisfaction with logistics




The survey results indicate a mixed level of satisfaction among participants regarding various logistical aspects of the event. Satisfaction with accommodation logistics received an average rating of 3.48 out of 5, suggesting that while it was generally acceptable, there is room for improvement. Food arrangements were rated lower, with an average of 3.19, indicating that this area may need significant attention to enhance participant experience. In contrast, the information package provided to participants was well-received, achieving a high average score of 4.43, reflecting its effectiveness in meeting attendees' needs. Additionally, communication prior to the GRM was rated even higher, with an impressive average of 4.48, highlighting the importance of clear and timely information in fostering participant satisfaction.

## Usefulness



The contributions to the discussions were generally perceived as highly useful by participants, as reflected in their ratings. Day 1's focus on "Looking to the Past" received an average score of 4.38 out of 5, indicating strong engagement with historical insights. The "Experts Round Table" on Day 2 was rated even higher, with an average of 4.48, showcasing the value participants found in the contributions from the panel members. However, the "Looking to the Future" session on the same day received a slightly lower average of 3.95, suggesting room for improvement in future forward-looking discussions. Day 4's session on "Advocacy & Policy" drew a solid average of 4.00, while Day 5's "Next Steps" also achieved a strong 4.38, reinforcing the overall positive reception of the contributions throughout the event.



## Favourite part of the programme

The most frequently mentioned programme elements that offered participants the possibilities to learn and discuss about the future of IVS and Voices for Change were the sessions that focused on the Advocacy Proposals (7 mentions) and Future and Foresight (6 mentions).




## Least favourite part of the programme

Participants indicated Day 4 or a few sessions on Day 4 as their least favourite parts of the GRM meeting.

## Online Panel

How interesting/useful did you find the contributions to the discussion on Shaping the Future of IVS – Policy, Advocacy, Social & Climate Justice made by the experts panel?




More than 75% of participants considered all interventions to be highly relevant, while every participant found them at least relevant.

## Facilitation

Participants expressed a high level of satisfaction with the overall facilitation, achieving an average rating of 4.52 out of 5.

How would you rate the overall facilitation of the GRM?

21 responses




## Key takeaways about the future of IVS

The meeting highlighted the need for IVS to adopt new tools and techniques in advocacy, particularly in preparation for the International Year of Volunteering for Sustainable Development (IYVSD) in 2026. Participants acknowledged that IVS is a unique movement with a promising future, but emphasised the importance of building resilience to navigate external challenges. The discussion underscored the necessity of analysing historical and emerging trends to develop adaptive strategies, while also recognising the value of a multicultural context that enriches the movement with diverse insights. The panel discussion outcomes pointed to the need for a strategic approach that shifts without diluting the IVS vision, alongside a call for greater synergy within the movement.

Additionally, the meeting addressed the importance of gaining recognition from higher-level institutions and the need to rebrand the network to highlight its unique attributes. Participants expressed optimism about the future of IVS, particularly with the potential use of AI in advocacy efforts. A collective approach was deemed essential for making meaningful changes, with an emphasis on understanding the realities of different member organisations and maintaining a global perspective. The value of a democratic and inclusive decision-making process was also highlighted, along with the need for clearer IVS identity to enhance recognition and development within the movement. Overall, collaboration and information exchange were identified as critical for the growth and effectiveness of IVS on a global scale.

## Overall satisfaction

Overall satisfaction levels among participants were high, with 9 individuals rating their experience a 4 and 12 individuals giving a perfect score of 5 on a scale of 0 to 5.



### 5.3 CLOSING OBSERVATIONS

At the close of the meeting, the external facilitator offered the following reflections on the GRM, drawing on her perspective as a researcher and practitioner from South Africa.


CCIVS can be a driving force for decolonising IVS. This is evidenced in the clarity of its cross-cutting values: decolonisation underpins all it does; the commitment to intersectional justice; and its passion for community-led and volunteer-driven change.

The meeting demonstrated how CCIVS is mobilising against structural constraints on funding and volunteer mobility, and articulating the real vulnerability confronting volunteers in regard to the insecure futures facing young people, the prevalence of mental health issues, and the need for safety and protection.

The suggestion was made that CCIVS could be very influential if it were to join the IVY26 call for greater recognition of and investment in volunteering. The GRM also underlined the competitive environment in which CCIVS functions, and the importance of finding ways to work with a wider range of partners in the transnational volunteering space as a strategy to widen support for its values and increase its resource base.

Looking at the historical timeline of CCIVS, there was a sense of excitement about the archival work being done and anticipation for the next period of renewal – 2026 and beyond.

Thanks were extended to all participants for the learning opportunity afforded by the GRM and wishes expressed for success in taking the next steps.





MUSIC AND VOLUNTEERING  
FOR A DECOLONIAL AND SOCIAL JUSTICE AGENDA



Co-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.

**Author: Helene Perold**  
**May 2025**

Designed by : Yazan Madieh, Vicky Lovelock

CC BY-NC-ND



### Would you like to support financially the CCIVS?

CCIVS relies on the kind support of its donors, if you wish to support CCIVS please consider making a donation through PayPal on our website, by cheque to the address below (France only) or by bank transfer/deposit:

Account Holder: CCIVS

Account Number: FR76 30003 03301 00037270135 41

Name of Bank: Société Générale

Address: Paris Fontenoy

SWIFT code of bank: SOGEFRPP

### Published in July 2025

by the Coordinating Committee of  
International Voluntary Service (CCIVS)

UNESCO House

1 Rue Miollis, 75015, Paris, France

secretariat@ccivs.org

www.ccivs.org

| FACEBOOK /SECRETARIATCCIVS | INSTAGRAM @CCIVSVOLUNTEER |  
TWITTER @CCIVS\_VOLUNTEER | LINKEDIN CCIVS-VOLUNTEER