EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Brussels, 30.10.2026
SWD(2026) 829 final

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

CITIZENS' REPORT ON THE EUROPEAN CITIZENS' PANEL ON PREPAREDNESS

Accompanying the document

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION

Guidelines on Population Preparedness under the EU Preparedness Union Strategy

{C(2026) 8250 final} - {SWD(2026) 825 final} - {SWD(2026) 826 final} -
{SWD(2026) 827 final} - {SWD(2026) 828 final}

CITIZENS' REPORT ON THE EUROPEAN CITIZENS' PANEL ON PREPAREDNESS

Table of Contents

CITIZENS' REPORT ON THE EUROPEAN CITIZENS' PANEL ON PREPAREDNESS 1
1. Introduction 2
2. Citizens' Report on the European Citizens Panel on Preparedness 2
2.1. European Citizens' panel 3
2.2. The Citizens' panel recommendations 3
2.3. Citizens' Engagement Platform 5
3. Follow up on recommendations 5
Topic 1: Communication 6
Topic 2: Information integrity 7
Topic 3: Inclusion 8
Topic 4: Self-sufficiency 8
Topic 5: Engagement 9
ANNEX 1: Final recommendations from the European Citizens' Panel on Preparedness 11
Topic 1: Communication 11
Topic 2: Information integrity 14
Topic 3: Inclusion 16
Topic 5: Engagement 21
Topic 6: Education 25

1. Introduction

This Staff Working Document (SWD) describes the process and achievements of the Citizens' Panel organised from March to May 2026 by the European Commission.

This SWD accompanies the Commission Communication on Guidelines on Population Preparedness under the EU Preparedness Union Strategy (C(2026) 8250), as well as the implementing non-binding guidance related to the EU Preparedness Union Strategy of 26 March 2025[1]:

i) Action 27 on risk communication (SWD(2026) 825);

ii) Action 28 on reaching a population self-sufficiency of a minimum of 72 hours (SWD (2026)826);

iii) Action 29 on preparedness in school education curricula and training of educational staff, with more detailed guidance for guidelines for educators and for policymakers (SWD (2026)827);

iv) Action 33 on disability inclusive emergency preparedness and first response training (SWD (2026)828).

The Commission Guidelines and the implementing guidance took into account the recommendations of the Panel, as described under section 3.

Annex 1 provides the final 20 recommendations put forward by the participants of the Citizens' Panel.

2. Citizens' Report on the European Citizens Panel on Preparedness

Following up on the final recommendations of the Conference on the Future of Europe, in its Communication "Putting Vision into Concrete Action" (of 17 June 2022), the Commission committed to enabling citizens' panels to deliberate and make recommendations ahead of certain key policy proposals.

The Commission decided to organise a European Citizens' Panel in relation to the EU Preparedness Union Strategy, focusing on issues related to population preparedness.

The **European Citizens' Panel on Preparedness was organised in March to May 2026 by the European Commission. Under the auspices of Hadja Lahbib, Commissioner for Equality, Preparedness and Crisis Management, it was supported by several Commission services:** European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO), Directorates General for Communication (COMM), Education, Youth, Sport and Culture (EAC), Health & Food Safety (SANTE), the Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Authority (HERA) and the Joint Research Centre (JRC).

Participants looked at **how to strengthen population preparedness across the European Union** (EU). In particular, the following two questions were considered:

1. *How can all European citizens be engaged, empowered and better prepared for crises?*

[1] Communication JOIN(2025) 130.

2. *How do we ensure that the actions and initiatives of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy are inclusive, effective, and respond to the needs of all citizens?*

2.1.European Citizens' panel

A total of **143 citizens** from all EU countries took part in the citizens panel, over three weekends in March, April and May 2026. The participants reflected the EU's diversity in terms of age, gender, socio-economic background, education and geography (nationality and urban/rural residency), as well as attitude towards the EU (negative, positive or neutral image).

Participants **were supported** by professional moderators and facilitators, Commission experts and a Knowledge Committee including external experts. Simultaneous interpretation was also ensured.

The panel consisted of three weekends combining **plenary sessions** where relevant preparedness actions were presented and discussed by the European Commission, as well as experts, with **working groups**, where citizens discussed the topics in more depth, and worked towards building consensus ahead of their final recommendations.

In session one, participants learned about preparedness efforts at local, national, and European levels in order to **develop a common understanding of population preparedness.**

In session two, participants worked on their **suggestions and innovative solutions** on how to enhance preparedness in their communities and beyond.

In **session three**, participants refined and finalised their proposals, before submitting their **final recommendations,** addressed to the European Commission. The recommendations were voted on and adopted at the end of the final session (see table at the end of this document).

2.2.The Citizens' panel recommendations

The panel allowed participants to share their experiences, ideas, and perspectives on preparedness, contributing valuable input for the implementation of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy. Through structured discussions, participants explored initiatives like citizens' risk awareness, risk communication, and education strategies, aimed at strengthening preparedness across the continent.

Citizens formulated recommendations on how the EU can enhance Europe's preparedness. They considered a broad range of preparedness-related issues, including strengthening preparedness in the education sector, improving early warning systems and risk and crisis communication, supporting volunteering and local engagement, enhancing self-sufficiency and resilience, countering misinformation and disinformation, and ensuring more inclusive support for groups in situations of vulnerability and persons with disabilities.

The final recommendations (in annex 1, also available via the Citizens' Panel on Preparedness - Citizens' Engagement Platform) focused on six themes:

1. Communication,
2. Information integrity (misinformation and disinformation),

3. Inclusion,
4. Self-sufficiency,
5. Engagement, and
6. Education.

Participants presented the final recommendations to the European Commission, adopting **20 recommendations** in total. The recommendations are well drafted, concrete and show insight and understanding of the topic.

On **communication**, participants called for clear, transparent, and accessible risk and crisis communication across the EU. Whilst recognising that this is a Member States' competency, they recommended that EU and Member States should ensure that public warnings are harmonised across Member States. Recommendations also highlighted the need for risk communication to be multi-channel to ensure that it reaches as many citizens as possible, in diverse contexts. Suggestions for local on-site information centres, as well as a centralised EU crisis preparedness mechanism were also recommended.

Concerns about **information integrity** were raised throughout the panel, with participants highlighting the need to address misinformation through stronger verification systems and training on critical thinking.

A strong focus was placed on **inclusion,** with calls for tailored measures to support vulnerable groups, including the use of harmonised language for crises across the EU, and symbol, sound and colour systems. Citizens recommended that assistance should be provided to enable citizens in situations of vulnerability to access 72-hour kits and preparedness measures.

Citizens recommended measures to foster greater **self-sufficiency** in the EU; including on energy, food supplies and infrastructure. Regarding the 72-hour preparedness kits, participants called for greater consistency on both communication and implementation.

The area of **engagement** came out strongly in the recommendations; including the need to strengthen volunteer networks, improve local coordination structures and boost recognition incentives for volunteers. Citizens recommended a **European Preparedness Week** to boost engagement and awareness of preparedness. Local citizens' panels were also flagged as an important tool in boosting citizen engagement on preparedness.

On education, participants stressed the importance of embedding preparedness **in the education sector**; integrating preparedness into **lifelong learning,** starting from an early age – both within and outside educational institutions –and supported by practical, engaging methods.

Across all themes, the recommendations underline the importance of **adequate funding, stronger coordination between governance levels, and innovative approaches** to embed a culture of preparedness in everyday life.

Across these areas, participants called for a **shift from a predominantly top-down approach to a more collaborative model**, where citizens are empowered to play an active role in preparedness efforts. This echoes the whole-of-society approach of the Commission Preparedness Union Strategy, and its aims to foster a culture of resilience through the engagement of all members of society.

2.3. Citizens' Engagement Platform

In parallel, as part of the co-creation process, a multilingual online consultation was held on the dedicated Citizens' Engagement Platform, which ran between 19 January and 30 June 2026. 426 citizen contributions and comments on preparedness were received. The online participatory process enabled citizens to contribute a broad range of ideas and proposals that helped inform the Panel's deliberations and enriched the wider discussion on strengthening preparedness across Europe.

A report presents an analysis of the online contributions received, identifying the main priorities and proposals put forward by citizens. In the contributions received, a strong emphasis was placed on equipping citizens with practical skills through education, training and awareness-raising, while strengthening community resilience, local preparedness and cooperation between citizens, authorities and civil society. Participants also called for stronger governance and coordination across local, national and European levels, alongside greater EU cooperation in addressing cross-border and geopolitical challenges. Many contributions also highlighted the need to reinforce the resilience of critical systems, including digital infrastructure, energy systems and public health. Participants stressed the importance of reliable and accessible crisis communication, effective alert systems and trusted public information. Other recurring priorities included climate adaptation and disaster preparedness, household and material preparedness, economic resilience and stronger European security and defence cooperation.

Overall, citizens' online contributions envision preparedness as a shared responsibility requiring coordinated action by individuals, communities, governments and the European Union. Their proposals underline the importance of investing in prevention, strengthening cooperation across sectors and governance levels and building resilient societies capable of responding effectively to a wide range of future crises.

3. Follow up on recommendations

The Commission took careful note of the concerns and suggestions of the Citizens' Panel, which have provided renewed impetus for its work on preparedness.

As a first step, many of the recommendations informed the drafting of the Commission Guidelines on Population Preparedness under the EU Preparedness Union Strategy as well as the implementing non-binding guidance related to the EU Preparedness Union Strategy of 26 March 2025.

Some of the Commission and technical experts that supported the thematic discussions during the Panel were also involved in the drafting and coordination of the guidance, which helped to ensure that citizen feedback and recommendations were taken into account.

Finally, it is important to note that many of the recommendations from the citizens also strongly align with the conclusions of the work by experts from the European Commission and the Member States.

The citizens' recommendations can be broadly divided into two types:

1) Recommendations on actions such as an EU Preparedness Day or the guidelines to reach a population self-sufficiency of minimum 72 hours, which the Commission had already proposed under the EU Preparedness Union Strategy in 2025. In this case, the recommendations provide increased momentum for the Commission to implement the action together with Member States, as well as additional angles and suggestions to be included.

2) New recommendations, for actions not currently in the Strategy (such as Local Citizens Panels for preparedness) which however could complement/enrich activities planned by the Commission (e.g. in the Staff Working Document on risk communication).

Topic 1: Communication

With regard to **communication**, citizens recommended to provide to the population clear communication guidance for how to prepare and respond to a crisis, in language that is accessible to all - including vulnerable groups - and which is consistent across the EU.

The guidance developed on increasing awareness about risks and threats (action 27 of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy) will help to ensure that the EU provides a common framework for risk communication. It includes suggestions on how to use a wide variety of channels to communicate which are accessible to all, including social media and apps, as well as non-digital channels including radio (which is often used in a crisis, particularly when electricity is not available) and in-person communication, such as paper leaflets delivered door to door. This responds to the recommendation that a **multichannel risk communication strategy should be used to help reduce gaps in communication and to ensure guidance is accessible to all**.

Citizens' recommendations pointed to the need for a **harmonised public warning system across the EU.** The introduction of the **Galileo Emergency Warning Satellite Service, or EWSS**, before or after a disaster occurs, will support EU Member States in public warning by providing additional means for dissemination of the messages (via satellite) in order to reach a wider audience, especially when telecommunication lines are down. This new service will allow Member States to provide direct warnings to citizens.

The **EU's new Digital Wallets** could be one of the tools used to share the alerts, **helping to ensure consistency in the use of tools across EU countries**. This should serve as a **repository where citizens can quickly access essential information** to ensure their effective protection when travelling across the Union, and which can reach all end-users concerned, independent of their place or Member State of residence while meeting the highest level of data security. This reflects one of the recommendations towards establishing a centralised EU crisis preparedness information mechanism.

The **Union prevention, preparedness and response plan for health crises** promotes effective and coordinated response to cross-border threats to health in the EU/EEA through a "whole-of-society" approach (Action 20 of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy). To operationalise the recommendation for a "coordinated, multichannel approach to crisis preparedness communication", the European Commission will increase awareness of the plan for health crises among key groups across the society, including healthcare professionals and civil society organisations. The Commission will also consider the role of EU institutions and agencies, Member States and other relevant partners in its upcoming simulation exercises testing this plan, including how they work together to make decisions and coordinate their response.

Regarding medical countermeasures, the Commission will continue to keep close and open engagement with the Civil Society Forum, a sub-group of the Health Emergency Preparedness and Response (HERA) Advisory Forum. The Civil Society Forum helps ensure that the Commission receives regular input from and hears the views and opinions of civil society organisations, including patients, consumers and healthcare professionals. These inputs focus on all aspects of the management of medical countermeasures, including crisis preparedness and response and training of healthcare professionals.

Topic 2: Information integrity

Citizens called for further support on **countering misinformation and disinformation**, for example 'in helping citizens to identify and assess misinformation' and 'in conducting their own fact-checking by having access to practical mechanisms and tools that allow them to verify the source of information independently' (recommendation 2.3).

The Commission is strengthening its support to fact-checkers through the European Network of Fact-checkers, with a particular focus on crisis situation through a Fact-Checking Emergency Response Capacity for crisis surges. It is also boosting its support to information integrity researchers, through the Common Research Support Framework.

The **recommendation on the need to help young people engage with critical thinking in education** is partly covered by the guidance on preparedness education (Staff Working Document under Action 29 of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy), which include a suggestion for training on awareness on how misinformation spreads during a crisis affecting school children, for example. In addition, the Commission updated the Guidelines for teachers on tackling disinformation and promoting digital literacy in March 2026 to equip students already at school with the skills and competences to critically address GenAI disinformation and the impact of social media platforms and influencers.

The Staff Working Document on risk communication also include a toolkit on how to handle misinformation and disinformation during a crisis, including on how to work with civil society groups to promote media literacy.

As stressed in the **European Democracy Shield** Communication, jointly adopted by the Commission and the High Representative adopted jointly in November 2025, **addressing foreign information manipulation and interference (FIMI) is a top priority** for the European Union as it actively contributes to building societal resilience and preparedness.

Digital and media literacy is a key pillar of the Democracy Shield. The Commission considers a strong link between media literacy and preparedness a priority for EU support for media literacy initiatives. The Commission advocates for a "whole-of-society" approach and aims at reaching people of all ages and socioeconomic background, especially people beyond education and training settings. This answers recommendation 2.1 (to 'advance critical thinking in education').

In addition, the Commission supports the mandate of the European Digital Media Observatory (EDMO) to develop new independent monitoring and analytical capabilities in particular around crisis situations. The observatory and its 15 regional hubs use its network and local knowledge of information to detect, analyse, and expose disinformation campaigns in Europe.

In parallel, the European Commission is **strengthening its strategic communication and stepping up its efforts to build resilience**, including through media and digital literacy and community building. These combined efforts respond to the recommendation on supporting information integrity—particularly Recommendations 2.2. and 2.3.

A set of recommendations will be developed to fight mis- and disinformation in health emergencies in the context of medical countermeasures by collaborating with online platforms, enhancing digital health literacy programmes and implement fact-checking mechanisms.

Topic 3: Inclusion

The Commission took note of the citizens' views on the importance of inclusion, building on their recommendation on the **'need to establish a harmonised language for crises across EU countries and ensure that everyone (regardless of their language, access to information etc) has access to this information'**.

The Commission Guidelines on Population Preparedness and the Staff Working Document on disability inclusive preparedness therefore include detailed preparedness advice, which aims to help to empower persons with disabilities to become **active actors in their own preparedness and resilience.** It also provides practical knowledge and tools to help persons with disabilities better understand and anticipate risks, identify their specific preparedness needs, and take an active role in planning for emergencies and communicating those needs to responders.

A specific subset of the Staff Working Document on disability inclusive preparedness targets first responders and equips them with the knowledge and practical tools needed to understand and appropriately respond to the different situations they may encounter when assisting a person with a disability. This reinforces the whole-of-society approach of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy, by recognising that effective preparedness requires the meaningful participation and empowerment of all members of society.

The citizens' recommendation on the need for **universal and unified design to deliver information related to crisis** is also relevant for health crises: this recommendation will help the European Commission to prioritise the dissemination, implementation and updates of the Union prevention, preparedness and response plan for health crises in a manner that is inclusive for all.

Moreover, **vulnerable groups** were mentioned as needing specific consideration in the recent Health Security Committee opinion on heatwaves.

Topic 4: Self-sufficiency

The Commission has taken good note of the **citizens' recommendation for a 72-hour emergency kit** (to help populations remain self-sufficient for the first three days or 72 hours after a crisis). The Commission Guidelines on Population Preparedness and the Staff Working Document on self-sufficiency (Action 28 of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy) respond to this recommendation.

Following the recommendation to ensure that the EU should ensure that assistance is offered for citizens who may struggle to access resources for self-sufficiency, the Commission services will carry out a study to look at preparedness amongst **low-income groups**. The results of this will be available next year.

On the recommendation to improve coordination while having local sovereignty in place, the legal framework on serious cross-border threats to health – embedded in the Regulation (EU) 2022/2371 on serious cross-border threats to health – aims to ensure that national and EU-wide prevention, preparedness and response plans work seamlessly together from the regional to national to EU level. While implementing Action 20 of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy, the Commission will consider emphasising the testing of cross-border collaboration between regional level authorities during the upcoming simulation exercises. Moreover, the possibilities to strengthen the aspects related to cross-border interregional collaboration will be assessed in the updates of the Union plan.

Topic 5: Engagement

On **engagement**, the Commission took note of the **recommendation to strengthen volunteer work**.

The European Solidarity Corps offers cross-border volunteering activities and is identified as a key instrument for building a culture of preparedness. Through Action 30 of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy, preparedness is now a formal priority within EU youth funding from 2026.

The Staff Working Document on preparedness education for schools (Action 29 of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy), could also help to promote preparedness and volunteering, for example, through activities with local organisations and emergency responders.

The Commission took note the citizens' **recommendation to hold an annual European Preparedness Week.** The EU proposed in the Strategy itself to hold an annual EU Preparedness Day, to raise awareness of the importance of preparedness.

While implementing Action 20 of the EU Preparedness Union Strategy (the Union prevention, preparedness and response plan for health crises), the Commission will consider the possibility of involving different actors in line with the 'whole-of-society' approach in its upcoming simulation testing exercises. For the next update of the Union plan, recommendations from the Citizens' Panel will be used to strengthen the aspects on citizens' roles and responsibilities in health crisis preparedness at EU level.

Topic 6: Education

Regarding **education**, and the citizens' **recommendation on the need for lifelong preparedness education starting from preschool age,** the Commission concurs with the direction recommended by the Panel. In the Commission Guidelines and the Staff Working Document on preparedness education for pre-primary and primary schools, as well for staff working in education, an approach was developed to ensure that preparedness is embedded into children's everyday routine and learning at school.

A thematic page with resources for teachers on crisis education and preparedness on the European School Education Platform was created.

The choice was made to begin with guidance addressing pre-primary and primary education, in order to help establish the foundations of lifelong preparedness. During this period, children develop key routines and foundational competencies that support safety, continuity, and

recovery. Schools can become sites for building resilience that extend beyond the school itself, among families and communities.

Furthermore, the recommendations also suggest some **areas for possible future action** by the Commission. These include further action in the area of volunteering, where the Commission is considering possible additional future measures.

For some of the other recommendations that have not yet been implemented, their feasibility is currently being assessed.

The Commission is planning to hold a feedback event to inform participants of the citizens panel about the follow-up to their recommendations in more detail.

Citizens' recommendations will also be presented at the 2026 European Civil Protection Forum (3-4 November), where population preparedness will be a key theme. These recommendations will continue to inform policymakers and practitioners in the further development of population preparedness action.

Preparedness should become part of our everyday culture. The EU Citizens' Panel on Preparedness has provided a valuable and welcome opportunity to directly involve citizens in preparedness and the implementation of preparedness actions - a step towards building a safer, more confident Europe, where everyone knows what to do when a crisis hits.

ANNEX 1: Final recommendations from the European Citizens' Panel on Preparedness

Disclaimer: The views presented in this report are not the views of the European Commission but of the citizens who participated in the panel. It cannot in any circumstances be regarded as the official position of the Commission or its services.

Topic 1: Communication

Recommendation 1.1: Accessible Differentiated Multi-Channel Warning Systems

Observation:

There are differences between the warning systems in the member states. These can affect the citizens receiving information, especially as there may be cross-border emergencies/crises. When the information is not given in a useful language, using channels that allow different citizens to get information (such as people with disabilities), or if the information given is not adequate for the concrete situation, is not helpful.

Assessment:

Even though the EU can only support the member states in some respects regarding warning systems, there is the need for coordination, especially as there may be crises that are cross-border and involve more than one member state. Learning from existing member states' warning systems can be useful, such as Austria's civil protection app and the self-broadcast system in several member states.

It is important that attention be put to the language used, the content, and the format of the warning system. Easy to understand signals could be useful in this objective. The warning system should also be responsive to the type of emergencies/crises and different groups of citizens (for example, people with disabilities). Additionally, some tools could help to ensure that citizens are informed even when there is no electricity.

Recommendation:

The EU and the member states should work to develop a warning system that is harmonised within the member states. They could learn from good practices on existing warning systems of the member states. This warning system should include information that is clear and easy to understand using colour codes (considering the risk, the areas affected, and if it is a recommendation or is mandatory). The content should also include the emergencies/crises that it is related to (for example, blackouts, earthquakes, fires, floods, and drones); the affected area; and instructions on what to do. It should also consider adjusting the information to the necessities of people with disabilities.

The warning system should be presented in different channels to reach as many citizens as possible. On the one hand, it should consider channels like mobile phone applications, social media platforms, SMS on the mobile phone, and national TV and radio. On the other hand, channels not related to digital technologies should also be included, such as sirens, megaphones, paper information and local resources that may vary from member state to member state. To make it possible that warning systems are available even when there is no electricity, tools such as generators or solar-powered power banks should be provided to local communities by governments with financial support from the EU.

Recommendation 1.2: A coordinated, multichannel approach to crisis preparedness communication

Observation:

Despite the availability of crisis preparedness information, it does not reach the population effectively. The challenge is not a lack of content, but a lack of targeted and well-designed delivery. Different groups are reached by different channels, and without a holistic approach, large segments of the population risk being left behind.

Three gaps are visible. First, current delivery mechanisms, such as postal leaflets, are unreliable and inconsistent across member states. Second, receiving information is not the same as acting on it; awareness alone does not change behaviour. Third, communication tends to be one-directional, with limited feedback loops to assess whether messages are landing. Apathy among the public remains a significant barrier.

Assessment:

Effective crisis communication requires more than making information available, it demands active citizen engagement. We assess that a passive communication strategy is insufficient. However, reaching disengaged populations is a genuine challenge, and shifting attitudes requires sustained effort, the right incentives, and culturally relevant messaging.

This points to a core tension: while EU-level coordination ensures consistency, the EU is not homogeneous, and centralised messaging risks feeling irrelevant to citizens in different national contexts. We therefore assess that standardisation, and localisation must go hand in hand, the EU should provide a common framework, but local authorities must own the delivery.

Recommendation:

The EU should direct member states to develop and communicate national advice on citizens' personal responsibilities in preparing for future crises. As a concrete measure, each member state should distribute a brochure to all households with practical guidance on how to cope independently for at least 72 hours in the event of a crisis.

While the directive comes from EU level, communication should be shaped and delivered by local authorities, ensuring messages feel trusted, relevant, and culturally appropriate.

Before a crisis, delivery should follow a bimodal, multichannel strategy covering risk communication: Before a crisis, member states should implement three complementary channels:

1. Door-to-door outreach targeting vulnerable groups such as the elderly and people with disability
2. A locally delivered, EU-coordinated media system spanning TV, radio, and social media
3. Paper-based communications left on people's doors or by mail.

Recommendation 1.3: Establishing and improving local on-site knowledge centres (distribution/information centres)

Observation:

There seems to be a need for more on-site centres where people can obtain information about crisis management. These centres may already exist in some cases, but information about them appears to be lacking. For example, there is little knowledge about the training activities they may offer. At the same time, we expect that in many EU Member States such centres do not yet exist, at least not in practice.

There are already other information centres in place on topics such as sustainability or within local town halls, which could serve as examples or points of integration. There also appears to be a general lack of transparency regarding how organisations deal with crises. During peacetime, or when crises feel far away, citizens are often unaware that crisis management structures and preparations are already in place. At the same time, considerable expert knowledge already exists and could be used more effectively in this context.

Assessment:

Knowledge centres are essential for bringing information closer to citizens in an accessible and approachable way, delivered by trusted people from their own communities. They also make it possible to support hard-to-reach groups, including people with disabilities and others who may face barriers in accessing information and assistance. In addition, knowledge centres play an important role in strengthening self-reliance. Their value extends beyond times of crisis, as they are equally supportive in the periods before and after a crisis. They provide reliable places where people can turn for guidance, support, and assistance whenever needed.

Recommendation:

We recommend that the European Union provides dedicated funding and support over different funding programmes for local multifunctional knowledge centres that serve as accessible and trusted community hubs for crisis preparedness, information-sharing, and public support.

These centres could distribute educational materials and preparedness kits, operate as walk-in information points, and provide practical simulations and exercises for different types of crises. They should also actively engage with communities through outreach activities, such as cooperation with local associations and door-to-door information campaigns. Regular rehearsals and awareness activities should form part of their role.

Implementation should reflect local contexts. In rural areas, existing public spaces such as municipal buildings or healthcare waiting rooms could serve this function, while urban areas may benefit from dedicated centres with broader accessibility.

Experts should support the centres to ensure reliable information is available during emergencies, while coordinators could receive guidance from relevant specialists. In addition, the centres should promote the use of digital applications for crisis information and alerts where such tools are available.

Recommendation 1.4: EU Crisis Preparedness Information Mechanism

Observation:

During previous crises, citizens were often exposed to fragmented or decentralised information coming from multiple EU, national, regional, and local authorities. Information was not always presented through a single trusted reference point, and guidance frequently lacked clear sourcing, references, or transparency regarding the evidence and authorities underpinning recommendations. This contributed to confusion, inconsistent interpretation of measures across Member States, and reduced public trust in crisis communication and emergency guidance.

Assessment:

Future crises will require stronger coordination to overcome the fragmentation, inconsistency, and mistrust experienced in previous emergencies. A centralized EU crisis preparedness information mechanism/tool could improve the accessibility, consistency, and transparency of crisis communication by providing citizens with a single trusted access point for reliable, verified, and up-to-date information, including when travelling within the EU. Clear identification of responsible authorities and sources would further strengthen public trust.

Recommendation:

We recommend that the EU should establish a centralised crisis preparedness information mechanism/tool providing Member States and citizens with reliable, verified, and up-to-date information during emergencies and crises. The mechanism/tool should function as a single repository where citizens can quickly access essential information and understand how authorities reached their conclusions, including the level of justification relevant to their country or region, as well as when travelling abroad within the EU.

The mechanism/tool should include dedicated sections, enabling citizens to select their current location and access official guidance related to emergencies such as natural disasters, public health crises, or security threats etc. In the event of an emergency or crisis, citizens should be able to quickly access verified information, including safety instructions, emergency contacts, alerts, and practical guidance, through a single trusted access point.

To strengthen trust and accessibility, information should be clearly sourced from verified public authorities and emergency services, ensuring transparency, consistency, and coordination across Member States. All information should be centralised at the EU level and included in clear sources, references, and identification of the responsible authorities or organisations providing the information.

Topic 2: Information integrity

Recommendation 2.1: Advance critical thinking in education

Observation:

More opportunities need to exist for people to learn about critical thinking, disinformation, and being resilient. Resilience in the context of education refers to the ability of an individual to engage critically with the information presented. The local level is vital in this

endeavour (Preparedness Day in Denmark for example).

Assessment:

Different target groups require different avenues of engaging with the topics of critical thinking and preparedness. Different age groups are at different points in their lives, and a strategic approach is necessary to make sure that they are included. Children, teens and students can engage with such content in schools and universities, adults could benefit from trainings at the workplace, and senior citizens could enjoy the help of civil society organisations at the local levels (municipality for example).

Recommendation:

Identification of trustworthy sources is crucial in crisis. There are incentives needed for seniors, pensioners, etc., and they should benefit from the opportunity to upgrade their skills when it comes to critical thinking. Activities of an educational nature should be based on participation. Training should take place at local level, perhaps together with civil society organisations and state actors. Schools, universities are the primary places where this is relevant. Regular and continuous efforts are required to make sure that preparedness remains a relevant topic.

Recommendation 2.2: Tackling disinformation/false information to be prepared

Observation:

In the context of preparedness, disinformation and misinformation add a layer of chaos which has the potential to spiral and create continuous panic. As such, actors who propagate these types of information should be held accountable, for example by being banned for a period of time from the platforms used to spread their messages.

Assessment:

Social Media platforms should be held accountable for breaches of existing regulations like the Digital Services Act.

Recommendation:

Fighting against disinformation is a vital state function. The EU facilitates this in the member states, for best practices, to learn from each other, and to ensure that breaches are sanctioned. Big tech platforms are held accountable for breaches of existing regulations like the Digital Services Act. Citizens are also identifying false information on the platforms.

Recommendation 2.3: Strengthening transparency and Fact-Checking verification

Observation:

Citizens increasingly struggle to assess the reliability and credibility of online information sources, particularly in digital environments where Al-generated content, misinformation, and manipulated media are rapidly expanding.

Assessment:

The absence of clear and harmonised transparency indicators across platforms makes it difficult for citizens to identify trustworthy publishers, companies, official representatives, authorities, and understand the origin of information, and independently verify content.

Recommendation:

We recommend that the EU should support and strengthen mechanisms that help citizens identify and assess misinformation through transparent systems integrated into existing digital services. Such a fact-checking mechanism should rely on free, independent and trustworthy organisations. However, there is a clear need to improve the visibility and accessibility of existing fact-checking organisations, ensuring citizens are aware of and can easily find these resources.

Citizens should be supported in conducting their own factchecking by having access to practical mechanisms/tools that allow them to verify the source of information independently.

Topic 3: Inclusion

Recommendation 3.1: Standardised and universal visual and auditory signal identification

Observation:

The need to establish a harmonised language for crises across EU countries and ensure that everyone (regardless of their language, access to information etc) has access to this information.

Assessment:

An awareness exercise improves the sense of security. If I am abroad, I want to feel like I have a full understanding of what to do, where to look, and where to go in case of need. Citizens should be able to look at a symbol in any European city and be able to recognise what does it corresponds to.

Recommendation:

The Citizen's Panel recommends that the European Union establishes and encourages all member states to adopt a transversal and horizontal European symbol system to signal points of interest in case of crisis. To ensure the full inclusion of all categories (people with disabilities, older people, people with low income etc...), this language should integrate the use of pictograms, a color-coding system, and a sound system. Citizens should be instructed with clear guidelines to detect this language.

Recommendation 3.2: Universal and unified design to deliver information related to crisis

Observation:

There is a high percentage of individuals considered as 'vulnerable', that have higher chances

of suffering bigger consequences to a crisis. We must encourage the Commission to make sure that all individuals feel supported and have the right quality and amount of information they need to react to crisis.

Assessment:

Having a universal EU framework on how information is delivered would contribute to making sure that all individuals feel included and have equal opportunities in reacting to crises. As a society, we are moving towards a stronger awareness around the gap that exists in the way individuals made vulnerable can access information.

Recommendation:

In the delivery of information, the Citizens' Panel highlights the need to develop a unified EU framework that can be adapted into more tailored local approaches enacted by local authorities. The strategy should aim to ensure the effective dissemination of information to people with disabilities and their support networks, enabling them to prepare adequately for and respond to different types of crises. It should also ensure that the general population is informed about the specific measures they can adopt to support all people in the event of a crisis.

Recommendation 3.3: Engagement of Local Organizations in the Coordination of Distribution of 72h Kits for Vulnerable Individuals

Observation:

Considering that 72-hour kits are implemented and popularised differently across the EU, insufficient involvement of local actors is evident in some regions. There is limited understanding of who the vulnerable individuals in our societies are, what support they need and how to reach them in times of crisis.

Citizens often lack knowledge of who would support them in accessing 72-hour kits and what assistance is offered.

Assessment:

Certain citizens may be prevented from acquiring a kit due to financial vulnerability, age, or disabilities. When a crisis arises, it is important that these kits are offered to vulnerable groups across the EU. Collaboration with local organisations and communities should be encouraged in order to identify individuals who are unable to acquire a kit themselves. In a crisis, local organisations can cater to different vulnerable groups in their community.

National organisations (e.g. organisations representing people with disabilities) should provide general guidelines for the specific needs of certain groups.

Recommendation:

The EU should ensure that the 72-hour kit is readily available to financially and health-vulnerable citizens and should offer the kit directly to those in need when a crisis arises.

The EU should support local initiatives that identify vulnerable individuals in their

communities and provide them with support and kits in both financial and legal matters. These initiatives should encourage regional authorities to use their local knowledge to assist households facing difficulties organising their 72-hour kits.

These initiatives should involve local authorities, as well as civil society organisations such as non-governmental organisations, civil society associations, churches and other voluntary groups, to bridge the gap between different stakeholders and build public trust.

Topic 4: Self-sufficiency

Recommendation 4.1: Autonomous energy production and storage in the European Union

Observation:

The EU remains highly dependent on third countries for energy supplies. In times of crisis, this dependency can lead to rising prices, supply shortages (e.g. Strait of Hormuz), and increased economic and geopolitical vulnerability. There are already EU funded programs for photovoltaics that can be implemented locally/ individually.

Assessment:

This dependency is a significant challenge for the European Union. Reliance on external actors for essential resources such as energy services weakens the EU's resilience, strategic independence, and capacity to respond effectively to crises. The panel believes that strengthening European autonomy is essential to ensure stability, affordability, security, and long-term sustainability for EU citizens.

Recommendation:

The EU should focus on energy autonomy from third countries e.g. autonomy from Russian/US gas and oil from the Middle East. Partnerships should always focus on the EU's political interests e.g. currently, partnerships with Canada and Australia on energy matters seem beneficial following the example of Mercosur on agricultural products. This autonomy can be achieved by diversifying its sources through investments in solar panels on public buildings and wind turbines. In order to make these investments efficient, the EU should register the current energy needs/shortages in the Member States as well as document production costs and market prices so that there is transparency and price gouging is eliminated. Apart from the production of energy, storage of energy is also crucial. For this reason, the EU should fund research for energy storage. However, it is important to become equally independent for the rare earth materials needed for the production of e.g. batteries. Otherwise, we move dependence from one sector to another. Moreover, in order to achieve smarter energy grids, the EU should take initiative to reduce bureaucracy on private energy investments.

Recommendation 4.2: Prioritising food supplies from within the EU

Observation:

Locally produced goods are often more expensive than imported alternatives, even when citizens would prefer to support regional products and local producers. This can discourage sustainable consumption and weaken local production systems.

Assessment:

The Panel considers that the current market situation does not sufficiently support local and national production within EU Member States. Dependence on large-scale external supply chains can reduce economic resilience and undermine local industries, agriculture, and small producers. Affordable access to regional products and stronger local production systems can contribute to sustainability, food security, and economic stability.

Recommendation:

The EU should strengthen food sovereignty and better support local producers. The Panel calls for regulation that gives EU products a fair competitive footing by ensuring the efficient, practical implementation of the 'Protected Designation of Origin' designation on agricultural products, preventing imported goods from undercutting domestic/EU producers. This should be paired by promoting incentivising the shortening of supply chains because if there are less middlemen there are less chances that the margin of prices increases. Moreover, the EU should have lower VAT and lower administrative burdens for small local producers.

Recommendation 4.3: Development of a safe digital EU infrastructure

Observation:

The European Union remains highly dependent on third countries for critical digital infrastructure and technologies. This includes reliance on foreign banking and payment systems, cloud services, social media platforms, and emerging artificial intelligence technologies, particularly from the United States and China. In times of geopolitical tension or crisis, such dependency can increase economic vulnerability, weaken strategic autonomy, and expose sensitive European/personal data to external risks.

Assessment:

The EU's dependence on non-European digital infrastructure poses significant risks to privacy and security. There is a concern that personal and strategic data handled by foreign digital companies may be misused, transferred, or accessed without sufficient legal safeguards for European citizens. While the EU has established strong data protection standards through its regulatory framework, including strict privacy and data protection rules, these protections may be difficult to enforce effectively when data and digital services are controlled by companies based outside the EU. The Panel believes that strengthening the EU's digital capacities is essential to ensure trust and transparency in the digital environment.

Recommendation:

The EU should significantly increase funding for research and development in digital infrastructure and emerging technologies. Priority should be given to the creation and expansion of EU-based digital systems, including cloud infrastructure, artificial intelligence technologies, payment systems, communication platforms, and social media networks. The Panel also recommends supporting European companies in developing secure and competitive digital solutions that comply fully with EU data protection and cybersecurity standards.

Recommendation 4.4: EU-wide Guidelines on 72h Kits' Components

Observation:

The implementation of the 72-hour kits varies greatly across the EU. In some member states, the kit is practically invisible, while in others, it has been clearly implemented and awareness of it has been raised.

Citizens have a limited understanding of the necessity and components of such a survival kit due to a lack of education and guidance in this area.

Assessment:

Implementation and communication of the 72-hour emergency kit is insufficient across the EU and action is needed. The significant differences between member states lead to confusion regarding the role of the kits and their place in a broader preparedness strategy. It is unclear whether citizens or the state is responsible for securing basic needs in acute crises. Links to general communication efforts on preparedness and educational systems, where children could engage with the kits, are also lacking.

Recommendation:

In times of crisis, the 72-hour emergency kit should ensure basic survival, cater to individual basic needs, and respond to local threats for 72 hours. The kit should be clearly communicated as a part of a larger preparedness strategy.

The EU should establish a prioritised standard categorisation of kit contents, providing broad guidelines for Member States and local authorities in this area. These categories should be consistent across Member States, although the specific contents may differ. First and foremost, the contents of the kit should be defined by the need to ensure basic survival, such as access to water. Secondly, the kit should address individual survival needs, like medicine, followed by the regional threat landscape.

Survival should be defined as access to water, food and heat. It should encourage citizens to be informed and prepared for individual survival. Lastly, the contents of the kit should be defined through collaboration with local crisis responders in light of local threats.

Recommendation 4.5: Improving coordination while having local sovereignty in place

Observation:

Regions and municipalities are essential in crisis management; they have their own network structures, with organisations already possessing specific knowledge, for example knowing where people with specific needs or disabilities live and what their needs are. In many cases, crisis information is currently also communicated top-down, but the essence lies in rapid local action, and improvements in coordination may be needed.

Coordination between organisations already exists to a certain extent, but it is not always comprehensive. There appears to be a coordination gap between local networks and organisations on the one hand and authorities on the other. Depending on the country or region, crisis management actions may be carried out either by public authorities or by NGOs.

There is already some knowledge available on how local networks function and how these best practices operate. However, there are significant differences between countries, and even within countries themselves, in terms of how systems and responsibilities are organised. This should be clearly taken into account. Local trusted coordinators, such as mayors, play a major role in crisis management.

Assessment:

It is important to address the coordination gap in order to strengthen local action and improve cooperation among all relevant organisations, while making the best possible use of top-down information and guidance. Achieving this on an EU-wide scale is challenging due to the significant differences between regions. Therefore, a decentralised approach with strong local adaptation is essential.

Recommendation:

We recommend that the EU issues a directive establishing organisational principles for stronger local crisis coordination. This should improve both vertical coordination between national, regional, and local levels of government, and horizontal coordination among different public authorities and organisations.

The directive should support local authorities through targeted funding, guidance, and information-sharing, while building on existing local networks, governance structures, and trusted communication channels. At the same time, it should preserve local autonomy, allowing communities the flexibility to respond according to their specific national and regional contexts.

While strengthening the local level is essential, the EU should also facilitate effective cross-border coordination to ensure coherent responses to crises that extend beyond national boundaries.

Topic 5: Engagement

Recommendation 5.1: Strengthening volunteer work

Observation:

In times of crisis, volunteers are essential for supporting communities and emergency responses, as they are often the first people on the ground in times of a crisis. However, effective crisis response also requires trained professionals and coordinators who can organise, guide, and support volunteers. Local communities need well-organised networks consisting of volunteers, municipalities, civil society organisations, and emergency responders such as firefighters and the Red Cross.

Many citizens are willing to help during crises, but there are insufficient opportunities to engage in volunteering beforehand, and they are not properly publicised. The process of becoming a volunteer is often unclear or overly complicated. Time constraints related to work and family responsibilities also discourage participation.

Schools, municipalities, and local organisations currently do not promote volunteering and preparedness equally across all regions and age groups. At the same time, volunteers often lack recognition, practical support, and incentives for their contribution.

Assessment:

There is a need for a more accessible, coordinated, and long-term approach to volunteer recruitment and retention across the EU. Citizens should be encouraged to register as volunteers in advance through simple and accessible procedures managed by local non-governmental organisations or authorities. Pre-registration would also improve preparedness, coordination, and insurance coverage during crises.

Volunteering should be promoted as a long-term civic contribution rather than only an emergency response. Municipalities and local organisations play an important role in building trusted community networks that can respond quickly in times of crisis.

Family, work obligations and financial barriers currently limit participation in volunteering. These barriers should be kept as low as possible.

Schools, public and private organisations should play an important role in promoting preparedness and volunteering among citizens (and especially young people) through practical activities and cooperation with local emergency organisations.

EU-wide recognition of volunteers is essential for sustaining long-term engagement and motivation.

Recommendation:

We recommend that the European Commission strengthens logistical and financial support for volunteer organisations, preparedness training, and voluntary emergency responders, including firefighters and local civil society organisations. To implement this, we recommend using an EU fund.

We recommend that the European Commission encourage Member States to introduce practical support measures for volunteers in times of crisis, including insurance coverage, reimbursement of travel and food costs, and flexible working arrangements.

We recommend promoting volunteering, preparedness training and practical cooperation with local emergency organisations more widely using a multi-channel approach involving social media, public

spaces, and public authorities. However, information and awareness-raising alone are insufficient. We also recommend bringing organisations and citizens together. For instance, local organisations could visit schools and other public and private organisations to share insights on volunteering and crisis preparedness. This could encourage more people to get involved.

We recommend that the European Commission establishes common EU-level recognition mechanisms for volunteers. These could include an EU volunteer card offering discounts and tax advantages, as well as credit points (ECTS) for students in the University and certificates acknowledging contributions to volunteering across Member States.

Recommendation 5.2: European Preparedness Week

Observation:

Preparedness education and crisis-related information are often delivered through theoretical approaches that may limit engagement and practical understanding. Existing preparedness activities are not always adapted to different age groups, local environmental risks, or the needs of vulnerable groups. At the same time, preparedness initiatives are frequently fragmented and disconnected from local communities, existing organisations, and practical learning environments. Additionally, crisis communication for children is often not adapted to their level of understanding. There is no dedicated EU-wide initiative to actively engage citizens in crisis awareness and preparedness.

Assessment:

A community-based Preparedness Day/Week could strengthen practical preparedness skills, improve awareness of crisis response mechanisms, and encourage cooperation between educational institutions, local authorities, civil society organisations, experts, and communities. Interactive and experiential approaches to preparedness education may contribute to greater engagement and retention of knowledge, particularly among children and young people. Adapting preparedness activities to regional risks and local realities could also improve their relevance and effectiveness.

Recommendation:

Introduce a European Preparedness Week that is held annually. The EU should provide a broad overarching framework for it which is to be developed further and adapted by Member States at the national level.

Emphasize on communication and marketing to engage the public and media, complemented with merchandise elements, additional to traditional ways of sharing information. The Commissioners should participate in these campaigns. Prior to such Week (based on existing good practice), pilot projects should be carried out in schools to test approaches. Ensure reusing the outcomes for a broader implementation during the Preparedness Week.

Organize competitions that actively involve both children and parents or caregivers. Additionally, invite professionals to educational institutions to present their experiences in crisis management. During the Preparedness Week, activities should begin with age-appropriate exercises designed for preschool children and expand into initiatives tailored to needs of different age and vulnerable groups.

Recommendation 5.3: Local Citizens' Panels for Crisis Preparedness

Observation:

Very few people are getting involved in crisis preparedness, since many see crisis preparedness as distant from them. People don't believe a crisis will really happen until it actually happens. A lot of people do want to contribute but they don't know how. Many people are not aware of the crises we will be facing. People also don't see clear roles or clear results of getting involved. This leads to people being sceptical about getting involved in crisis preparedness.

We observe that in some of our countries some parts of the population have a lack of trust towards authorities, such as politicians or municipal officials. At the same time, we also recognise that in many cases there is often a lot more trust towards local authorities than national authorities due to proximity.

Assessment:

It is important that citizen engagement mechanisms have a concrete impact. This will help establish trust in authorities and these forms of citizen engagement. Clear structure and purpose for citizen engagement is needed for it to work properly.

Recommendation:

Organise local citizens' panels on crisis preparedness. Local citizens' panels should be regular with a purpose to prepare for or evaluate crisis management. There will also be the possibility of calling for an extraordinary assembly during an ongoing crisis. Each panel should have a specific topic.

Methodology for the panel can be adapted to the local context. The representativeness of the panel should be ensured so that it includes the whole society without discrimination. The panel should mirror the diversity of the society. Random selection can be used to ensure the representativeness, but also other methods can be considered.

Make sure the panel serves the general interest and commits to the principles of inclusion, transparency, shared respect, equality and respect of fundamental rights. Make sure that no actor involved in the panel would benefit financially from it.

The panel is co-organised with local authorities with local associations and organisations involved with the topic of the panel. The associations also serve as field expertise along with other experts on the topics.

The panel has an advisory mandate. Their recommendations will be received by local authorities who will follow-up in a transparent manner on how the recommendations are implemented. If the recommendations are not implemented, the authorities have to explain the reason why.

We recommend wide-spread communication and media engagement to involve a wider part of the society with crisis preparedness and with the implementation of the recommendations. There should be support of local EU networks behind the communication efforts. Panel members will be given a mandate to act as ambassadors for the work of the panel to raise awareness.

Ensure that engagement in the panel is relevant to the daily life realities and not too academic in terms of language and concepts. It is Important to remember that citizen engagement should also be a source of fun and a social activity.

Topic 6: Education

Recommendation 6.1: Lifelong preparedness education starting from preschool age

Observation:

Across many EU countries education is theory-based and fragmented by subject in the curriculum. The regular curriculum lacks a basis for prevention, psychological preparedness, and resilience. Discussions around preparedness often fail to sufficiently address gender-related perspectives and lack activities tailored to both young adults, older people and persons with disabilities. People also lack training and practical activities on how to assist and support persons with disabilities during crisis and emergency situations.

Assessment:

Children lack practical skills related to risks to their safety in situations of crisis. Child-centred methods of education have a better chance to strengthen resources in an engaging, motivating way, turning school into a 'living lab' where children can explore and build their skills and competencies. After children leave school, opportunities to further develop preparedness skills can continue in other, specific local environments, such as workplaces etc.

Recommendation:

Crisis and preparedness education should start from preschool age (around 4 years old) through age-appropriate and engaging methods such as games, play-based learning, simulations, storytelling, and immersive activities. Initial activities should use non-digital approaches, while progressively integrating digital tools from age 6 onwards, adapted to children's level of understanding.

Preparedness education should take place both within and outside educational institutions, involving educational staff, parents or caregivers. Introduce a short, weekly preparedness lesson into regular school curricula. Develop activities in cooperation with local community and civil society actors such as the Red Cross and other NGOs and include first aid exercises, preparedness contests, peer-support initiatives. Apply recognition systems such as certificates or badges to encourage participation and long-term engagement.

Pay particular attention to inclusive preparedness practices, including awareness of mobility aids, compensatory tools, and support measures for persons with physical, psychological, and/or learning disabilities.

Promote clear and age-appropriate information, considering children's emotional reactions to emergencies, while ensuring access to appropriate psychological support and resilience-building measures.

Recommendation 6.2: Fair and Sustainable Funding for Emergency Preparedness Education

Observation:

There are currently significant inequalities between schools and between different regions in terms of resources and capacity to implement emergency preparedness education

programmes. In addition, the integration of these programmes into education systems remains uneven and insufficiently funded.

Assessment:

Effective emergency preparedness is an essential component of the resilience of citizens and societies. Without adequate and equitable funding, some populations risk being excluded from these fundamental forms of learning, thereby reinforcing social and territorial inequalities. Investing early and continuously in these programmes also helps build a shared culture of preparedness and civic responsibility.

Recommendation:

Citizens recommend securing dedicated and sustainable funding for crisis preparedness education, with strict controls to ensure funds are used effectively and for their intended purpose, with safety nets to ensure compliance. Spending must prioritise lifelong, age-appropriate and socially diverse training - created by experts - tailored to member states' own national risks and accessible to all in a straightforward manner. Allocation of funding should be proportionate to population and crisis exposure in harmony with European solidarity and equal treatment, while allowing for both local and European adaptation. Preparedness education should be recognised as a strategic investment and financed through defence budgets, reflecting the close link between population preparedness and overall European security. Clear accountability, predefined spending plans and collaborative expert inputs must ensure all funding is tracked, targeted and results driven.

Voting results

The citizens voted their support for each recommendation on a scale from 1 (low support) to 6 (high support). Additionally, the option to actively select "abstain from vote" was given to them. This table displays the average level of support for each recommendation.

No.	Title	Average (1-6):
1.1	Accessible Differentiated Multi-Channel Warning Systems	5.0
1.2	A coordinated, multichannel approach to crisis preparedness communication	4.6
1.3	Establishing and improving local on-site knowledge centres (distribution/information centres)	4.8
1.4	EU Crisis Preparedness Information Mechanism	4.9
2.1	Advance critical thinking in education	4.5
2.2	Tackling disinformation/false information to be prepared	4.7
2.3	Strengthening transparency and Fact-Checking verification	4.5
3.1	Standardised and universal visual and auditory signal identification	5.1
3.2	Universal and unified design to deliver information related to crisis	4.8
3.3	Engagement of Local Organizations in the Coordination of Distribution of 72h Kits for Vulnerable Individuals	4.7
4.1	Autonomous energy production and storage in the EU	4.9
4.2	Prioritising food supplies from within the EU	5.0
4.3	Development of a safe digital EU infrastructure	4.9
4.4	EU-wide Guidelines on 72h Kits' Components	4.6
4.5	Improving coordination while having local sovereignty in place	4.7
5.1	Strengthening volunteer work	5.0
5.2	European Preparedness Week	4.1
5.3	Local Citizens' Panels for Crisis Preparedness	4.9
6.1	Lifelong preparedness education starting from preschool age	5.1
6.2	Fair and Sustainable Funding for Emergency Preparedness Education	5.1