

THE 2025 EUAN

DEI SURVEY

REPORT



**From Data to
Change: Diversity,
Equity & Inclusion
Across EU
Agencies**

*Making every voice count,
because **your voice matters!***

Prepared by

EUROJUST

Table of Contents

- Introduction to the report.....2
- How the results are presented.....3
- General Questions (results).....4
- Gender (results).....5
- Sexual Orientation (results).....6
- Race and Ethnicity (results).....7
- Disability (results).....8
- Maternity, Parental and Paternity leave (results).....9
- Mental Health (results).....10
- Neurodiversity (results).....11
- Generation and Age (results).....12
- Beliefs and Religion (results).....13
- Geography (results).....14
- What to do with the results - *in every agency*.....15
- Practical Action Plan (prioritized based on results).....16
- Category-specific actions.....17
 - Gender.....18
 - Sexual Orientation.....18
 - Race and Ethnicity.....18
 - Disability.....19
 - Maternity, Parental and Paternity leave.....19
 - Mental Health.....19
 - Neurodiversity.....20
 - Generation and Age.....20
 - Beliefs and Religion.....20
 - Geography.....20
- Conclusions.....21

Introduction to the report

The EUAN Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Survey is our second common, evidence-based pulse on how inclusion is working across agencies—not just in policy, but in everyday experience. Its purpose is simple: give leaders and teams a shared, comparable view of **what's going well**, where people are **struggling**, and which fixes will have the **biggest impact**. By putting numbers next to topics we often discuss anecdotally, the survey turns good intentions into a practical **to-do list**.

It was designed collaboratively with HR/DEI professionals, staff representatives, and members of the EUAN DEI Working Group, and was open to all staff across functions and grades. The survey combined multiple-choice items (to quantify climate, incidents and process signals) with open-text (to capture nuance and ideas). Responses were anonymous and reported in aggregate; no raw, personally identifying data is shared. Methodologically, we kept it lightweight and comparable: single-choice questions are shown as a share of respondents to that item; multi-selects are shown as total mentions to reveal what comes up most often; open-text was coded into themes. We treated results as directional, not diagnostic: the numbers show where to look, and the comments help explain why.

This report gives every agency a clear **starting point** and a **common language**. Leaders can see, at a glance, where culture is strong (e.g., comfort and inclusivity) and where practice lags (e.g., reporting clarity, promotion transparency, everyday civility). Managers can translate the data into concrete behaviours. HR can align policies and training to the highest-leverage gaps. And staff can see that their feedback **shapes decisions**.

How the results are presented

*The pages that follow are organized one category per page. Each page opens with a **short overall summary** that captures the headline signal for that category (what's working, where practice is uneven, and the most material risks). Beneath that you'll find a **key data panel**: the most relevant metrics for the category shown as clear percentages. Single-choice results are displayed as a share of respondents to that question; multi-select items are shown as share of mentions to reflect what comes up most often.*

*Each page closes **with insights** based on the open questions—a concise synthesis of what people wrote in their own words. We cluster recurring themes (e.g., process friction, everyday civility, manager capability) and surface typical situations so teams can see how issues show up in practice. Use these three blocks together: the overall summary to orient, the key data to quantify, and the open-text to explain the “why.” This structure is designed to be actionable—each category page links naturally to the corresponding items in the Practical Action Plan sections so readers can move from **signal** → **cause** → **next step**.*



GENERAL QUESTIONS.

Summary of the results

The overall sentiment is cautiously positive but uneven in execution: most staff know what DEI is and over half feel they can be themselves at work, yet only a minority see DEI as clearly embedded in day-to-day priorities and managerial behavior. Awareness of what's actually being done is middling, training exposure is patchy, and confidence in raising issues is split. The big message: intent exists, but people want tighter follow-through, clearer ownership, and regular, simple updates on actions and outcomes.

The key data

Familiar with DEI?

Yes 62.6% • Somewhat 31.4% • No 6.0%

Can bring authentic self to work (without fear of repercussions)?

Yes 56.8% • Somewhat 29.4% • No 13.8%

Is the Agency/JU a diverse, equitable & inclusive workplace?

Yes 44.5% • Somewhat 39.9% • No 15.6%

Should DEI be among Agency/JU priorities?

Yes 58.0% • Somewhat 28.7% • No 13.3%

Is promoting DEI actually among current Agency/JU priorities?

Somewhat 39.3% • Yes 34.4% • No 26.3%

Enough DEI/equal-opportunities training offered?

Yes 39.9% • Somewhat 34.3% • No 25.8%

Have you taken DEI training since joining?

No 54.8% • Yes 45.2%

Comfortable raising DEI-related issues?

Yes 43.6% • Somewhat 32.2% • No 24.2%

Do managers/leads promote DEI in teams?

Somewhat 40.2% • Yes 31.3% • No 28.5%

Are DEI principles reflected in managers' actions/behaviours?

Somewhat 43.1% • Yes 30.2% • No 26.7%

Aware of your Agency/JU's DEI actions?

Somewhat 40.9% • Yes 35.4% • No 23.7%

Aware of EUAN DI Working Group actions?

No 64.5% • Yes 35.5%

Summary of the responses to open questions

Respondents used the general open question to describe a workplace that aspires to inclusion but wobbles in day-to-day execution. The most cited gaps were manager capability and accountability (handling offhand remarks, backing reporting routes, rewarding inclusive behaviour), and fair, transparent talent processes (clearer criteria, consistent panels, usable feedback after decisions). People also called out everyday civility—microaggressions, jokes, subtle exclusion—as well as process friction around where to report, who responds, and what happens next. Several noted that training is too conceptual or infrequent, and that limited time/resources make it hard to embed good intentions. What they want is simple, visible follow-through. Suggestions cluster around a one-page reporting guide (channels, confidentiality, anti-retaliation, response timelines), short manager micro-skills refreshers (inclusive meetings, bias-aware feedback, bystander actions), and lightweight guardrails in recruitment/promotion (structured questions, diverse panels, short “why/why not” feedback).

GENDER.

Summary of the results

The culture trends supportive, but practice is inconsistent. A notable minority report experiencing or witnessing gender-based issues, and fewer than half say gender-inclusive language is reliably used. Many don't see strong, visible pathways for under-represented genders into leadership, and a non-trivial group believes gender has affected advancement. The culture is directionally supportive but not yet consistent in practice. A notable minority report discrimination, confidence in inclusive language is mixed, and only a third clearly see concrete leadership-pipeline initiatives.

The key data

Inclusive of gender identity/expression

51.8% Yes • 32.5% Somewhat • 15.7% No

Experienced gender discrimination

23.0% Yes • Witnessed: 32.0% Yes

Belief that the Agency/JU supports gender equality

50.7% Yes • 38.2% Somewhat • 11.0% No.

Gender-inclusive language ensured

37.8% Yes • 41.5% Somewhat • 20.8% No

Initiatives to encourage under-represented genders into leadership

34.0% Yes • 36.7% Somewhat • 29.3% No.

Has gender affected advancement

23.3% Yes • 18.9% Somewhat • 57.8% No.

Summary of the responses to open questions

Respondents describe uneven everyday practice: language slips, jokes, and offhand comments that cumulatively signal who “belongs.” Several accounts point to evaluation and promotion moments where criteria feel opaque and sponsorship networks matter more than stated rubrics, especially for women and non-binary staff. Caring responsibilities surface frequently—people want flexibility without being seen as “less committed.”

A second thread is leadership visibility. Where managers intervene on microaggressions, set meeting norms, and champion balanced shortlists, the climate improves; where they “let it slide,” people self-censor. Calls for clearer reporting, leave-neutral language in performance processes, and role-modeling by senior men around parental leave are common.

SEXUAL ORIENTATION.

Summary of the results

Signals are broadly positive: most respondents experience an inclusive climate and a majority feel comfortable being open, with relatively low reports of negative impact on advancement. That said, incidents still occur and a meaningful minority remain hesitant to discuss orientation at work. The priority here is to sustain a good baseline while ensuring clear reporting, visible allyship, and swift handling of the incidents that do arise.

The key data

Comfortable discussing orientation at work

Yes 59.2% • No/Other 40.8%

Inclusive of different orientations

Yes 70.1% • No/Other 29.9%

Orientation affected advancement

Yes 3.8% • No/Other 96.2%

Witnessed SO-based discrimination/favouritism

Yes 12.6% • No/Other 87.4%

Experienced SO-based discrimination/favouritism

Yes 5.7% • No/Other 94.3%

Summary of the responses to open questions

Most narratives describe supportive colleagues, but a subset still conceal orientation with clients or senior stakeholders to “avoid making it a thing.” Incidents tend to be subtle—assumptions about partners, heteronormative jokes, or social events that presume couples of a certain kind.

People ask for steady, low-key ally signals (normalizing neutral partner language) and swift, quiet correction when jokes land badly. Several request guidance for managers on handling third-party incidents (vendors/visitors) and confidentiality around disclosures.

RACE & ETHNICITY.

Summary of the results

The majority view the workplace as inclusive and would recommend it to someone from their background, and most are comfortable discussing race and ethnicity. Concerns persist around fairness and transparency in progression, with a smaller but material share believing background can affect advancement. Action should centre on process clarity—structured assessments, diverse panels, and feedback loops—to keep trust high.

The key data

Inclusive workplace

Yes 57.2% • Somewhat 31.7% • No 11.1%

Comfortable discussing race/ethnicity

Yes 71.0% • No/Other 29.0%

Advancement affected by race/ethnicity

Yes 9.4% • Somewhat 11.1% • No/Other 79.5%

Would recommend to someone from same background

Yes 84.9% • No/Other 15.1%

Summary of the responses to open questions

Open comments highlight ambiguity and bias in selection/promotion more than overt hostility. Examples include “culture fit” feedback without specifics and accent or nationality bias in perceived credibility. Some recount exhausting “explainer” roles—being asked to speak for a whole region or educate colleagues during tense news cycles.

Respondents want structured interviews, clearer feedback loops, and diverse panels. They also suggest practical norms: pronounce-name prompts, rotating “representation work,” and manager coaching for cross-cultural communication.

DISABILITY.

Summary of the results

Accessibility is “mostly there,” but gaps concentrate in the built environment and information/communication pathways; attitudinal and systemic barriers also surface. Only about half say facilities and resources are fully accessible, and very few have used dependant-support measures even among those who need them—suggesting awareness or access hurdles. A practical focus on physical fixes, communication standards, and a simple accommodations pathway would pay off quickly.

The key data

Accessible facilities/resources for everyone

Yes 48.6% • Somewhat 38.8% • No/Other 12.6%

Barriers to job mobility due to disability

Yes 3.1% • No/Other 96.9%

Has dependant with a disability

Yes 10.4% • No/Other 89.6%

Benefited from dependant-support measures

Yes 2.6% • No/Other 97.4%

Barrier types (multi-select; share of mentions):

None 428

Architectural/physical 326

Info/communication 174

Organisational/systemic 172

Technological 157

Attitudinal 150

Summary of the responses to open questions

The strongest theme is practical friction: doors, signage, height/space constraints, quiet areas, and captioning/meeting etiquette (pace, turn-taking, sharing materials in advance). Several mention bureaucracy around accommodations—unsure where to start, what’s “reasonable,” and how requests affect reputation.

Preferred fixes are concrete: a single accommodations intake with timelines, quick wins for the built environment, default captioning and accessible templates, plus a no-explanation norm for using aids (headphones, breaks, cameras off).

MATERNITY, PARENTAL AND PATERNITY LEAVE

Summary of the results

There is striking consensus for parity-oriented paternity rights and the belief that equivalent terms would improve inclusion. A smaller yet meaningful group perceives career penalties linked to taking leave. Agencies should codify parity, normalize uptake (especially for men), and hard-wire “leave-neutral” language and checks into performance and promotion processes.

The key data

Introduce paternity leave as a right

Yes 93.5% • No/Other 6.5%

Equivalent-terms paternity leave improves inclusion

Yes 78.6% • No/Other 21.4%

Parental leave harmed advancement

Yes 7.4% • No/Other 92.6%

Maternity leave harmed advancement

Yes 9.4% • No/Other 90.6%

Summary of the responses to open questions

Comments centre on career impact and team dynamics. People value supportive managers but worry about subtle penalties: fewer stretch assignments, assumptions about travel/availability, or skepticism about flexible schedules. Partners (especially fathers) say they want to take meaningful leave without stigma.

Requests focus on parity and predictability: a clear paternity/parental policy, coverage plans that don't burden peers, and explicit “leave-neutral” criteria in evaluations. Storytelling from senior leaders who used leave is repeatedly cited as culture-shifting.

MENTAL HEALTH.

Summary of the results

This is a weak spot: comfort discussing mental health is low, perceived openness is limited, and reports of witnessing issues are non-trivial. Many don't know where to go for support or aren't confident asking for MH sick leave. The quickest gains are clear signposting to services, manager micro-skills (how to talk about workload/adjustments), and visible senior messages that reduce stigma and make help-seeking safe.

The key data

Comfort talking MH with colleagues

Yes 29.8% • Somewhat 36.9% • No 33.3%

Comfort discussing workload/adjustments with manager

Yes 41.5% • No/Other 58.5%

Experienced MH discrimination

Yes 13.6% • No/Other 86.4%

Witnessed MH discrimination

Yes 28.4% • No/Other 71.6%

Policies adequate

Yes 23.1% • No/Unsure 76.9%

Know where/how to get support

Yes 41.6% • No/Other 58.4%

Comfort requesting MH sick leave

Yes 33.4% • No/Other 66.6%

Organization is open about MH

Yes 30.0% • No/Other 70.0%

Summary of the responses to open questions

This is the most candid set of narratives. Many describe high workload, deadline pressure, and reluctance to flag issues for fear of being seen as less resilient. Some tried to use support channels but found them unclear or clinical, with little follow-up. Small managerial behaviors—asking about capacity, normalizing boundaries—matter outsizedly.

Employees want plain-English signposting, low-friction adjustments (focus time, flexible deadlines), and manager micro-skills for check-ins and tough conversations. Several advocate de-stigmatizing sick leave for MH and sharing anonymized “what worked” cases.

NEURODIVERSITY.

Summary of the results

Awareness is decent, but disclosure comfort, perceived organisational value, and practical support are all low; training exposure is minimal and stigma still occurs. The path forward is foundational: Neurodiversity 101 for all, a manager toolkit for adjustments (sensory, communication, focus time), lighter-weight disclosure and accommodations, and sharing of successful cases to normalize supports.

The key data

Familiar with neurodiversity

Yes 50.8% • No/Other 49.2%

Comfort disclosing ND

Yes 13.2% • No/Other 86.8%

Organisation values ND

Yes 16.0% • No/Other 84.0%

Adequate ND support

Yes 12.4% • No/Other 87.6%

Observed positive ND inclusion examples

Yes 17.4% • No/Other 82.6%

Training to work effectively with ND colleagues

Yes 6.9% • No/Other 93.1%

Witnessed ND stigma

Yes 15.6% • No/Other 84.4%

Experienced ND stigma

Yes 6.7% • No/Other 93.3%

Summary of the responses to open questions

Contributors describe trial-and-error self-advocacy: figuring out lighting, noise, written vs. verbal instructions. Fear of being labeled makes people avoid formal disclosure; some recount positive experiences when a manager co-designed simple adjustments (agenda-first meetings, alternative feedback formats).

What they want: Neurodiversity 101 for everyone, a menu of common adjustments, and confidential, low-stakes pathways to request them. Celebrating small wins (a quiet room, a standardized "how I work best" profile) signals that neurodivergent colleagues are expected, not exceptional.

GENERATION & AGE.

Summary of the results

A sizable minority perceive age-related bias and report related incidents; inclusive teaming across generations is only “halfway there.” People want fair, transparent criteria that don’t default to tenure or “time served,” plus better role-mixing and knowledge transfer in teams. Standardising age-fair processes and highlighting mixed-age project wins can strengthen trust.

The key data

Advancement affected by age/generation

Yes 21.1% • Somewhat 21.4% • No/Other 57.5%

Experienced generational discrimination

Yes 22.5% • No/Other 77.5%

Witnessed generational discrimination

Yes 27.5% • No/Other 72.5%

Intergenerational teams embraced

Yes 39.5% • Somewhat 41.9% • No/Other 18.6%

Inclusive across generations

Yes 47.9% • No/Other 52.1%

Summary of the responses to open questions

Two stories run in parallel. Older staff mention tech-stereotyping and fewer stretch roles; younger staff report experience gatekeeping (“come back in a few years”) and limited voice in decisions. Both groups dislike jokes about age and assumptions about work style.

Suggestions include mixed-age project teams, role rotation/mentoring both ways, and age-fair criteria that emphasize demonstrable skills over tenure. Leaders calling out ageist remarks in the moment is seen as a quick, high-signal fix.

BELIEFS & RELIGION.

Summary of the results

The climate is generally respectful and inclusive, with over half comfortable discussing beliefs and a majority seeing values respected; incidents are relatively low but present. Practical accommodations (e.g., holiday adjustments) exist for many but not all. The emphasis should be on formal, simple accommodation procedures, manager guidance for everyday scenarios, and continued vigilance on respect.

The key data

Inclusive toward different beliefs

Yes 61.9% • No/Other 38.1%

Comfort discussing beliefs at work

Yes 54.9% • No/Other 45.1%

Respects & values beliefs

Yes 62.0% • No/Other 38.0%

Experienced discrimination

Yes 5.3% • No/Other 94.7%

Witnessed discrimination

Yes 8.4% • No/Other 91.6%

Holiday adjustments allowed

Yes 56.0% • No/Other 44.0%

Summary of the responses to open questions

Most remarks describe respectful teams, with friction at scheduling and food (meeting times overlapping religious observance; events with limited options). A few recount awkwardness around questions of faith or colleagues debating beliefs in ways that feel personal.

People ask for simple accommodation norms (calendar awareness, prayer/quiet spaces, potluck/event guidance) and a short manager note on handling belief-related tensions—focus on impact and inclusion, not adjudicating beliefs.

GEOGRAPHY.

Summary of the results

Mobility is high, but expat support and visibility of geographic-balance efforts lag; just over half feel regions are valued equally, and publication of nationality/recruitment data is uneven. Agencies can improve the expat experience (onboarding, local systems, partner support) and build trust by publishing basic composition and inflow data, alongside clear measures to broaden representation across regions

The key data

Relocated for role

Yes 73.6% • No/Other 26.4%

Feel supported as an expat

Yes 29.9% • Somewhat 34.0% • No/Other 36.1%

Values/supports all regions equally

Yes 52.1% • No/Other 47.9%

Publishes managers' nationality data

Yes 33.0% • No/Other 67.0%

Publishes recruitment data

Yes 46.8% • No/Other 53.2%

Measures for geographic balance

Yes 21.1% • No/Other 78.9%

Summary of the responses to open questions

Expat narratives highlight onboarding to local systems (registration, health, schools), language barriers, and partner employment. Some feel peripheral to decision hubs or perceive prestige differences among nationalities. Transparency about geographic balance and access to opportunities varies by unit.

Employees want a practical relocation/expat package, language support, and clearer data and actions on geographic representation. Rotations, cross-site projects, and publishing team composition/inflow stats are seen as trust-building.

What to do with the results *-in every agency*

- Share back a **short summary** to all staff (“what we heard, what we’re doing next”)
- **Pick 3 priorities** per agency (e.g., reporting clarity, manager capability, accessibility fixes). Name owners and 90-day milestones.
- Embed in the **management cycle**: add one inclusion goal to manager objectives; brief team leads on simple, day-to-day actions.
- **Fix the basics fast**: tidy job ads and promotion rubrics, publish reporting pathways, publish a paternity/parental-leave Q&A, update template language.
- Measure and learn together: **track a small KPI** set quarterly (e.g., “can raise issues safely,” “management promotes DEI,” one category metric), and run a light pulse again in 6–12 months.
- **Share wins** across agencies: create a simple cross-agency learning loop—what worked, templates, and case examples.
- Finally, a sober note on limits: surveys don’t change culture—**actions do**. This one gives us the map; the value comes from using it consistently, communicating progress, and celebrating visible improvements people can feel in their day-to-day work.

Practical action plan (*prioritized based on results*)

1-Make DEI visible as a true priority

58.0% say DEI should be a priority vs 34.4% see it as one. Publish a DEI roadmap with timelines, owners, and quarterly progress updates.

2-Manager capability & accountability

Only ~31% say management promotes DEI and ~30% see it in actions. Launch manager micro-skills (bias interrupters, inclusive feedback, handling DEI concerns) and tie to performance goals.

3-Zero-tolerance plus culture boosters

20.5% hear offensive jokes. Refresh the code of conduct, simplify reporting paths, and run bystander & civility workshops.

4-Targeted focus areas (from staff)

Disability, Age/Generation, Gender, Mental Health, Geography. Build 5 sprint workstreams with metrics (e.g., accessibility fixes, age-inclusive mobility, gender equity in leadership pipeline, MH resources, expat onboarding/support).

5-Neurodiversity & Mental Health

Low comfort and low support scores—introduce ND awareness training, job-design/adjustments guidance, and a clear MH support finder; train managers on workload accommodations.

6-Recruitment & progression transparency

Publish recruitment and promotion data (target dates), standardize structured interviews, and bias checks at shortlist and panel stages.

7-Geographic balance

Only 21.1% see measures in place and 29.9% expats feel supported—create an Expat Support Package (housing, local systems, language support, partner support) and set geographic representation goals for pipelines.

8-Paternity leave

Strong support (93.5% Yes). Communicate policy status and access steps; normalize uptake with leader endorsements and stories.

9-Communication on what exists

Raise awareness of EUAN WG actions (35.5% aware) and local actions (35.4% aware) via intranet, lunch-and-learns, and a quarterly DEI digest.

Category-specific actions

In the next section, we turn **insight into action**. Drawing on both the quantitative data and the open-text voices behind it, we outline general, practical actions and then actions tailored for each category—from quick fixes to scalable practices—that agencies can adapt to their context. Each set of suggestions is designed to be specific enough to move now (clear steps, example outputs, suggested owners and simple KPIs) yet flexible enough to fit different sizes, mandates and maturity levels.

Use these as **inspiration** and a **starting kit**: pick what resonates, localise the language, and make it yours—so every agency can convert survey findings into visible, confidence-building progress.



Category-specific actions

Gender

- Publish a gender-inclusive language guide
- Update templates and onboarding packs.
- Add a brief anti-microaggressions norm to team meetings (“call-in, not call-out”)
- Launch a leadership-pipeline pilot for under-represented genders (sponsorship + transparent criteria)
- Add bias checks at shortlist and decision sign-off for promotions.
- Track and share gender representation in pools/shortlists and progression
- KPIs: % who see gender-inclusive language in use; perceived fairness of advancement; under-represented gender share in shortlists

Sexual orientation

- Issue partner-inclusive language guidance for communication and events.
- Nominate visible ally contacts in each department.
- Train managers on handling third-party incidents and confidentiality.
- Refresh reporting routes with examples and anti-retaliation language.
- Support an LGBTQIA+ ERG with an annual plan and executive sponsor.
- KPIs: % comfortable discussing orientation; incidents reported/resolved; awareness of ally contacts.

Race & ethnicity

- Adopt structured interview question banks and scoring rubrics.
- Add name-pronunciation prompts to HRIS/signatures.
- Require diverse panels; tie “culture fit” to explicit, job-relevant criteria.
- Provide short post-decision feedback notes to internal candidates.
- Publish high-level recruitment and promotion stats with narrative and next actions.
- KPIs: % roles using structured interviews/panels; candidate feedback coverage; perceived fairness of progression.

Disability & accessibility

- Launch a single accommodations intake (form + SLA + contact); enable meeting captions by default.
- Deliver quick-win physical fixes (signage, doors, equipment height/space).
- Publish an accommodations playbook (typical adjustments, examples, timelines).
- Standardize accessible document/presentation templates.
- Complete a phased built-environment audit and track remediation.
- KPIs: time to accommodation decision; % meetings with captions; # physical/IT fixes delivered.

Maternity / parental / paternity

- Publish clear parity communications and FAQs for paternity/parental rights and coverage planning.
- Embed leave-neutral language in promotion/performance policies.
- Run manager clinics on coverage plans and reintegration (return interviews, phased ramp).
- Monitor uptake and post-leave career outcomes; share trends.
- KPIs: paternity/parental leave uptake; perceived leave-neutrality; post-leave progression parity.

Mental health

- Share a one-page MH support map (contacts, steps, confidentiality).
- Enable self-service adjustments (focus time, flexible deadlines).
- Train managers on check-ins, workload negotiation, and stigma-reducing language.
- Normalize MH sick leave via leadership messages and policy clarifiers.
- Add inclusion/MH items to manager objectives and upward feedback.
- KPIs: % who know where to get support; comfort requesting MH leave; reported stigma incidents.

Neurodiversity

- Provide ND 101 for all and a menu of common adjustments (sensory, comms formats, work routines).
- Equip managers with interview/meeting adaptations, “how I work best” profiles, and buddy options.
- Create a confidential, low-stakes disclosure pathway (no diagnosis required).
- Share anonymized success cases and track uptake of adjustments.
- KPIs: % trained; % comfortable disclosing; # accommodations granted; perceived ND support.

Generation & age

- Introduce age-fair criteria emphasizing demonstrated skills over tenure; remove tenure proxies.
- Pilot mixed-age project teams and two-way mentoring.
- Add bias checks for age-coded language in evaluations.
- Recognize mixed-age project wins in internal comms.
- KPIs: perceived age fairness; cross-age teaming rate; incidents of ageist remarks.

Beliefs & religion

- Publish simple accommodation norms (holidays, fasting, prayer/quiet spaces) and calendar guidance.
- Provide manager scenarios for scheduling around observance, respectful dialogue, and handling tensions.
- Ensure quiet/prayer spaces where feasible and include options in event catering templates.
- KPIs: successful accommodation requests; comfort discussing beliefs; related incident rate.

Geography (nationality/expat)

- Offer an expat support package (registration, health, schools, language, partner support).
- Provide language support (courses or stipends) where relevant.
- Pilot cross-site rotations and remote project roles to broaden access.
- KPIs: expat support satisfaction; visibility of geo-balance data; equitable access to opportunities across sites.

Conclusions

*Diversity, equity and inclusion are not “nice to have” in EU Agencies—they’re **mission-critical**. Our work serves 450 million people and depends on public trust, cross-border collaboration and the best talent Europe can offer. When **every colleague** can contribute fully—regardless of gender, orientation, disability, age, belief or nationality—we make better decisions, innovate faster, spot risks earlier and uphold the values we’re here to protect. DEI turns **difference into capability**: clear processes that feel fair, teams where every voice matters, managers who model respect, and workplaces that remove barriers instead of creating them.*

*This survey gives us a **shared map**; the value now comes from acting on it—fixing the basics, communicating progress, and celebrating visible improvements. If we build cultures where people thrive, our Agencies will deliver stronger outcomes for citizens and the rule of law across the Union.*

