

## Annex: Country-Specific Priority Actions / 別紙：国別優先アクション

*Note; This Annex provides country-specific priority actions for reference, reflecting contextual considerations discussed during the program.*

### Country / Actor

Japan

### Context / constraint

- While youth interest in politics is widespread, they are unable to translate their personal values and issues into political will. This is due to structural issues, such as a lack of the manner of connecting their own problems with structural issues and the widespread belief in personal responsibility, which exacerbates this;
- In Japan, many individuals have not fully developed political agency, as political discussion remains a social taboo, and this widespread reluctance to engage in political dialogue contributes directly to political polarization.

### Priority action

- We aim to establish a safe space for dialogue, and we argue that achieving this goal requires the provision of civic education, which provide individuals with the skills and knowledge necessary for constructive, respectful, and inclusive political discussion.

### Pilot idea (6–12 months)

- Lobbying the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology to revise the curriculum guidelines.
- Collaborate with civic education groups to launch joint initiatives.
- Provide a trial version of the civic education program for private schools. The target schools will primarily be existing partner schools, with approximately 10 schools planned, including those with SDGs or social issues school clubs.
- Promote existing student-led initiatives within schools.
- Break down the journey to political will, research the obstacles at each step, and consider more specific actions.
- Political agency develops through stages. First, individuals recognize that seemingly non-political issues, such as personal values and daily life, are political. Second, they form opinions on issues on the public agenda, supported by civic education, active political neutrality, exposure to party positions, and mock voting within social studies curricula in formal educational settings.

---

### Country / Actor

Korea

### Context / constraint

- While young Koreans strongly support democracy and value social participation, they lack practical spaces to experience political efficacy in everyday life. This disconnect is exacerbated by rising political polarization, which has diminished constructive dialogue both online and on-site.

### Priority action

- We urge all stakeholders to actively support community-based initiatives that support young people to build socio-political agency and strengthen an environment where they can thrive as active citizens.
- We must launch and activate public forums across all levels that move beyond polarized debates, offering young people immersive and creative spaces to explore diverse perspectives and broaden their mutual understanding.

- We specifically call on major political parties and the government to commit to strengthening the representation of young people and women within key decision-making tables.

**Pilot idea (6–12 months)**

- Create small-scale civic deliberation labs in places young people already inhabit, linking daily life issues to collective decision-making.
  - Launch a community-based fellowship for democratic action; Identify and train young local actors to design and implement democracy-in-practice initiatives, piloting the fellowship across five cities nationwide.
  - Connect youth-led discussions to concrete policy outputs through a structured process that translates collective insights into formal recommendations.
  - Track and publicly report shifts in young people’s sense of political agency to demonstrate impact beyond participation numbers.
- 

**Country / Actor**

Indonesia

**Context / constraint**

- Youth action repertoires are broad and civic learning beyond school is relatively strong, but translating participation into perceivable policy influence remains a shared challenge.

**Priority action**

- Institutionalize youth influence inside policymaking (not just consultation).
- Recognize informal and digital participation among the youth as legitimate civic input.
- Priorities inclusion of marginalized youth voices.

**Pilot idea (6–12 months)**

- Create mandatory Youth Policy Impact Statements for national and local regulations—requiring ministries and local governments to explain how youth input was used or why it was rejected.
  - Allow digital petitions, policy crowdsourcing, and social media deliberation to be formally submitted into legislative and executive review processes.
  - Guarantee representation of rural youth, disabled youth, working class and informal sector youth. This matters because without equity, youth participation reproduces inequality.
- 

**Country / Actor**

Thailand

**Context / constraint**

- Despite their active political engagement, Thai youth lack access to participatory civic learning and safe deliberative spaces. This environment risks holding back their activism and leading to long-term withdrawal from political participation.

**Priority action**

- We call on the youth to embrace intellectual rigor: lead with evidence, value lived experience, and truly understand an argument before challenging it.
- We recommend that the youth-focused civil society organizations curate inclusive and diverse spaces where clashing viewpoints coexist.

- We recommend that educational institutions train teachers in facilitating productive dissent, helping students view conflicting perspectives as critical data points for deeper deliberation.
- We recommend that policymakers review and amend restrictive laws that penalize political expression to reduce the fear of prosecution.

### **Pilot idea (6–12 months)**

- Partner with educational institutions to develop a training program with sessions for 20–30 teachers. In this hands-on setting, teachers learn a set of practical methods to calm conflicts and turn student disagreements into useful learning opportunities.
- Partner with youth organizations to find important issues young people disagree about, then bring together small groups of young people with different views for guided discussions with deliberative practices.
- Partner with potential policymakers to embed youth conversations into policy-making process.

---

### **Country / Actor**

India

### **Context / constraint**

- In India, young people are increasingly active in civic and political life, but many opportunities to discuss public issues remain informal or short-term; differences in access to information, social hierarchies, and concerns about speaking openly can make it difficult to have balanced, inclusive deliberation where diverse youth feel comfortable sharing their views.

### **Priority action**

- In India, we aim to create youth deliberation spaces where young people can discuss public issues constructively and confidently, supported by clear guidelines that encourage respectful dialogue and inclusion.
- We recommend that education ministries and state governments institutionalize regular youth–policy dialogues at school, municipal, Social Media Platforms and state levels.
- We call on political leaders, education authorities, and media organizations to recognize these forums as legitimate channels for youth voice and to provide timely, transparent feedback (and also incentives, if possible, to encourage participation) on the recommendations emerging from them.

### **Pilot idea (6–12 months)**

- Establish state-level “Youth Civic Dialogue Circles” in 2–3 districts, where diverse young people meet quarterly (including online) to deliberate on one concrete issue (for example, employment, digital safety, or local environment) and submit concise recommendations to the relevant authorities, who respond within a set timeframe.
- Maintain a public tracker showing which youth proposals are being taken up, adapted, or not pursued, with short explanations.