

SUPPLEMENT ARTICLE

Youth engagement in research and policy: The CO-CREATE framework to optimize power balance and mitigate risks of conflicts of interest

Samantha Nesrallah¹  | Knut-Inge Klepp²  | Isabelle Budin-Ljøsne³  |
Aleksandra Luszczynska⁴ | Hannah Brinsden⁵ | Harry Rutter⁶ | Elin Bergstrøm⁷ |
Sudhvir Singh⁸ | Marianna Debelian¹ | Claire Bouillon¹  |
Margrete Bjørge Katanasho⁹

¹EAT, Oslo, Norway

²Division of Mental and Physical Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway

³Division of Climate and Environmental Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway

⁴CARE-BEH Center for Applied Research on Health Behavior and Health, SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Wroclaw, Poland

⁵World Obesity Federation, London, UK

⁶Department of Social and Policy Sciences, University of Bath, Bath, UK

⁷Centre for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

⁸Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

⁹Landsrådet for Norges barne- og Ungdomsorganisasjoner, Oslo, Norway

Correspondence

Knut-Inge Klepp, Division of Mental and Physical Health, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Marcus Thranes Gate 6, Oslo 0473, Norway.

Email: knut-inge.klepp@fhi.no

Funding information

European Union, Grant/Award Number: 774210

[Correction added on 28 January 2023, after first online publication: The spelling of the name of the author Hannah Brinsden was corrected.]

Summary

Including youth in the co-creation of policies that affect them has proven to be particularly impactful in public health. Using youth participatory action research methods, the CO-CREATE project engages European youth 16–18 years old in the co-creation of obesity prevention policies. To discuss the feasibility and implications of the policy, youth are invited to engage in an intergenerational dialogue. Given the youth–adult dynamic and policy discussion, conflicts of interests (COIs) can arise and impact the quality of the dialogue. COI frameworks are a tool that can help identify, mitigate, and address COIs. This paper presents a novel framework to mitigate COIs in intergenerational policy dialogues, with a focus on power imbalance. Following a series of youth consultations, interviews, and examination of existing frameworks, our findings suggest that safe, participatory, and empowering dialogues can take place if appropriate measures are integrated into all phases of a dialogue. The selection of stakeholders, use of accessible language, and youth moderation are all factors that can impact COI risks. Measures that promote mutual empowerment, such as equal representation of youth and adults, were deemed important. This framework provides a roadmap to ensure that youth participation in the formulation of policies is safe and empowering.

KEYWORDS

conflicts of interest, overweight and obesity, policy, youth participation

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2023 The Authors. *Obesity Reviews* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of World Obesity Federation.

1 | BACKGROUND

Today's generation of youth are facing unprecedented threats to their health and well-being, including the climate crisis, COVID-19, an increasingly obesogenic environment, and rising cost of food and goods, among other things. The decisions made by politicians and people in power today will have a ripple effect on generations to come. Including youth in the co-creation of policies and programs that affect them is not a novel concept, but is becoming increasingly important. This is reinforced by the European Commission who have designated 2022 the European Year of Youth, with "inclusion" as a central pillar of the initiative.¹ Youth participation can be defined as "efforts by young people to organise around issues of their choice, by adults to involve young people in community agencies, and by youth and adults to join together in inter-generational partnerships".² Youth participation also exists across a spectrum, with manipulation and tokenism being at the bottom of the scale, corresponding to the lowest degree and quality of participation, and child-initiated initiatives, which share decision making with adults, being at the high end.³ For the purpose of this paper, youth are defined as persons between the ages of 15 and 24, in accordance with the definition used by UNICEF.⁴ Formal processes for youth participation in health policy have begun to emerge through youth parliaments, advisory boards, and other mechanisms, but are not standard practice. In fact, in 2020, only eight of the 53 countries in the WHO European region reported involving young people in all development stages of a child and adolescent health strategy.^{5,6}

1.1 | Historical relevance

In 1989, the United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commission adopted the UN Convention the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), a global commitment to child rights. Among other things, this legal framework cemented children and young people's roles as individuals, with their own thoughts and opinions. The Convention also reinforced governments' and parents' role in ensuring that children have access to information, that their views and opinions are respected and taken seriously, and that they have access to education, nutritious foods, clean water, and a high standard of health.⁷ Although the age for formal democratic participation (i.e., voting) does not begin until 18 years old in many countries, Articles 12 and 13 of the UNCRC provide legal backing to children's right to participate through freedom of expression, to be heard in all matters affecting them, and to have their views taken seriously.⁸ A multitude of case studies exist showing children exercising this right and demonstrating their ability to be agents of change, influence political action, and create healthier societies.⁹⁻¹¹ One of the most impactful social movements, Fridays for Future, have mobilized 18 million strikers in over 230 countries between 2018 and 2022, increasing attention and action to the climate agenda.¹² Ultimately, governments and decision makers need to respect children and young people's right to be included in the development,

implementation and evaluation of policies, research, and interventions that impact them.

1.2 | Youth participation in public health: Benefits and case studies

Public health is an area where the co-design of research, interventions, and policies with young people can be particularly impactful. Young people have a unique understanding of their own needs and the challenges they and their peers face to live healthier lives. As a result, they can contribute to the development of better-informed programs, policies, and services.¹³ Evidence would suggest that when co-creation approaches are used in health research, the likelihood of developing more effective interventions that target health and well-being issues among youth is also increased.¹⁴ However, in order to enable young people to succeed in this engagement, they must be provided with adequate training, technical support, time, and funds.¹⁵ If these things are in place, young people also stand to gain substantive benefits from this form of engagement, including through skill development, enhanced knowledge, self-perception as a citizen, and active contribution to their communities.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Youth participation also increases the sense of ownership of policies and initiatives, which can contribute to more successful policy outcomes.⁵

In the field of mental health research, youth engagement has shown to increase efficiency of decision making and trustworthiness of findings, while leaving young people feeling respected, empowered, and with greater knowledge of mental health and research.¹⁹ In the field of sexual and reproductive health rights and solutions, evidence has shown that young people's engagement as advocates contributes to the impact and power of political and social movements in this field.⁸ Although successful case studies exist in various public health sectors, there are few examples of youth participation initiatives in the development and implementation of obesity prevention policies.^{13,16,20}

The CO-CREATE project aims to address this issue by engaging youth 16-18 years old across five European countries in the co-design of policies that promote healthier food and physical activity environments, with the ultimate goal of reducing the prevalence of overweight and obesity.²¹ Using principles of Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR), youth are involved in all aspects of the project and policy development phases, creating a greater sense of empowerment and ownership.²² An overview of the literature on YPAR and its application in CO-CREATE can be found in Broer et al, "Recruiting and engaging adolescents in creating overweight and obesity prevention policies: the CO-CREATE project, 2022". Central to the policy development cycle is the public consultation and stakeholder engagement phase. In an effort to simulate real-world policy-making and to enable youth to develop evidence-based and feasible policy ideas, young people were invited to engage in policy Dialogue Forums.²³ These Dialogue Forums were designed to convene youth, policymakers, business representatives, and other relevant stakeholders to discuss and refine young people's policy ideas. Over the

course of 2 h, a moderator guided participants through a series of activities designed to identify actions to advance the policy and support implementation efforts. The Dialogue Forums were held in both physical and digital venues, to accommodate for COVID-19 limitations, with corresponding tools designed to facilitate either a physical or digital convening. In line with the project's co-creation methodology, young people were given the opportunity to lead the planning, execution, and moderation of the Dialogue Forums, and were actively involved in the development and design of the tool itself.

1.3 | Barriers and risks to youth participation

Although venues such as the Dialogue Forum provide young people with an opportunity to exercise their leadership and express their views on societal issues, evidence would suggest that youth-adult interactions are subject to select risks. First, on the basis of age, youth face unique risks such as lack of civic engagement opportunities, lack of information on and voice in decision-making processes, income poverty, transitional development period, and other mental health risk factors (antisocial peers, bullying, etc.).⁵ These risks have the ability to impact young people's autonomy and ability to participate in civic processes. Second, on the basis of power, when engaging in dialogue with youth, adults can inadvertently exert their power and influence to shift overall consensus, and youth can be coerced into expressing views that go against their wishes or beliefs. As a result, youth may leave feeling exploited or unable to express their views.^{19,24} The quality of involvement of youth is also subject to manipulation and tokenism, unless efforts are made to ensure that meaningful engagement takes place and there is adequate follow-up afterward.²⁵

However, opportunities to shift this power dynamic do exist. Youth participatory action research would suggest that "the more authentic" the effort is to give children and youth a voice, the more the balance of power shifts away from adult researchers.²⁶ Efforts in YPAR, such as CO-CREATE, must ensure that (1) youth are recognized as a heterogeneous group that face different risks and opportunities, (2) measures are taken to promote the highest quality of youth participation (youth-initiated, shared decisions with adults), and (3) measures to safeguard young people are balanced with measures to facilitate youth empowerment and ownership, to ensure the latter is not undermined. If these three things are not in place, the participation risks being tokenistic, and increasing the potential for conflicts of interest (COIs) to be introduced, such as a power imbalance.

1.4 | Defining COIs

As a concept that exists in many fields, there is no single or universally agreed-upon definition of COI. For the purpose of this paper, COIs can be defined as "a set of circumstances that creates a risk that an individual's ability to act in a role or apply judgement is, or could be, impaired or influenced by a secondary interest."²⁷ A set of circumstances could include a meeting, entering into a

partnership, providing advice or guidance, participating in a policy dialogue, conducting research, or a number of other activities. Secondary interests, the influencing factor, can include professional advancement, financial gain, desire for recognition, personal bias (bias based on personal trait such as ageism, gender bias, racism, etc.), and favors for friends, family, or colleagues.²⁸ In the simplest of terms, COIs happen when an individual's interests (financial, personal, or professional) could compromise their ability to make decisions, judgement, or actions.²⁹

In the context of public policy, COIs can arise when policymakers or politicians' private interests influence their public duty, when they prioritize political support over strong evidence, have hidden financial relationships, or have dual roles (i.e., outside employment, shares in a select company, etc.).^{17,30,31} When examining the field of public health, case studies on tobacco control, breast milk substitutes, and nutrition all illustrate the negative public health impacts when COIs arise and are not managed.^{32,33} Private sector funding of nutrition research is an example where substantial bias can be introduced and misleading conclusions drawn, which in turn can impact consumer behavior and policies. This has been demonstrated in industry studies on the health effects of sugar-sweetened beverages and artificial sweeteners.^{34,35} In another example, a soda tax proposal was rejected in the city of Philadelphia, shortly after the American Beverage Association donated \$10 million to the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia to support childhood obesity prevention initiatives.³² These examples illustrate how conflicting financial interests have the potential to impact policy and research.

In the planning and delivery of nutrition programs, a WHO technical consultation also identified a number of COI risks, including the potential for industry-oriented or funded philanthropic organizations to influence policy priorities, lobbying efforts, private sector reframing of the issue (such as shifting blame from institutions to individuals), and private sector sponsorship in schools.³⁶ Although corporate actors have a role to play in informing feasibility of implementation, cost, and providing business intelligence, tensions may arise between profit and public health goals. Therefore, efforts must be made to safeguard the Dialogue Forum from the risks presented by all stakeholder groups.

In the CO-CREATE Dialogue Forums, there are two key areas that can be subject to COIs: (1) the discussion of the public health policy idea and (2) meaningful youth participation. As discussed above, the policy idea can be influenced or reframed by the stakeholders engaging in the Dialogue Forum, based on preexisting biases or conflicts. To mitigate these risks, careful selection and diversity of stakeholders are required, to include participants who can help build on the policy's evidence base, inform its feasibility, and discuss the implications of the policy from different sectors. As for youth participation, some of the COI risks that can be introduced include power imbalance, tokenistic involvement, and lack of follow-up and accountability. To mitigate these, measures need to be integrated into the Dialogue Forum process to optimize power balance across all participants and ensure young people feel both safeguarded and empowered in the dialogue and their interactions with stakeholders. As a research project, the

CO-CREATE partners also have an ethical duty to protect youth from undue influence and pressure from stakeholders.³⁷

1.5 | COI frameworks

In order to identify, mitigate, and address COIs and their associated risks, many institutions put in place COI frameworks. COI frameworks provide guidance on what constitutes a risk, how to prevent or address it, who should be involved, and what procedures to follow if they do happen. They can exist as institutional policies to guide research ethics, to inform public-private partnerships, and a multitude of other arenas. To better understand the current landscape of COI frameworks, we examined frameworks relevant to youth participation, public health policy, or a combination of the two. On youth participation, the frameworks that emerged often applied to organizations who have a mandate to work with youth and who, as a result, have a safeguarding policy for their interaction with young people.^{38–42} Although the Oxfam framework aims to balance youth protection and empowerment, a value similar to CO-CREATE, the measures are specific to the organizational activities conducted, which limits their broader applicability.⁴³ The Wellbeing Health & Youth Engagement Framework is one of few frameworks we found that sits at the intersection of health research/policy and youth participation.⁴⁴ This framework identified relevant prompting questions and guidance on ethical practice in engaging youth in this field, though the scope was limited to three value areas, mutual trust and accountability, equity and responsiveness, and diversity and inclusion. The tool was also limited in providing practical tools to address ethical risks. In public health policy, WHO's framework offers a clear step-by-step tool to assess COIs in nutrition policy and programs, but does not consider the implications of youth participation in these processes.⁴⁵ Although the frameworks provide guidance that consider the ethical risks of youth participation and public health policy development, there is a gap in the literature when it comes to COI frameworks that guide youth engagement in public health policy processes, particularly the public engagement and dialogue phase.

1.6 | Purpose

This paper aims to address this gap and present a COI framework to guide young people's participation in policy processes and intergenerational dialogue with stakeholders, with a particular focus on addressing power imbalances. This framework was specifically developed and applied in the context of obesity prevention policy development and the CO-CREATE project. The framework itself consists of three distinct, but interlinked elements: (1) principles of engagement for participants, (2) anticipated risks and suggested mitigation measures, and (3) practical tools to manage and address conflicts. We outline the development process of the framework, present the framework itself, and examine its application in the CO-CREATE project, as well as its broader applicability.

2 | METHODS AND RESULTS

From March 2019 to January 2020, the following research and consultation-related activities were conducted to inform the development of the COI framework to guide youth participation in policy processes and intergenerational dialogues with stakeholders: (1) ideation with youth and understanding youth participation, (2) examine existing COI and youth participation frameworks, and (3) additional consultation with youth organizations and CO-CREATE partners. The following section describes these three approaches taken to develop the framework.

2.1 | Ideation with youth and understanding youth participation

In spring 2019, a series of youth consultation and ideation activities were conducted in an effort to understand how youth and youth organizations engage in policy processes, multi-stakeholder dialogues, and civic engagement. The activities specifically aimed to address the following two questions: (1) what makes multi-stakeholder dialogues meaningful to youth and (2) what is typically not considered when multi-stakeholder dialogues with youth are designed. Through a six-week exploratory research phase, a combination of 35 semi-structured interviews and three workshops was conducted. The interviews were held with a range of stakeholders, largely across Norway, including non-organized youth, youth organizations, policymakers, politicians, nongovernmental organizations, CO-CREATE partners, one business leader, and one teacher. The interview questions were structured to probe both functional aspects of multi-stakeholder, intergenerational dialogue (i.e., views on youth participation, experience with youth-led dialogues), and the human experience of participants in such dialogues (i.e., personal motivations and experiences). Interviews were documented in writing, and a qualitative thematic content analysis was conducted to identify recurring themes in the interview responses. Quotes were extracted from the interviews and clustered into these themes, based on the inclusion of keywords such as “safe, preparation, patronise, and action.” In total, 23 themes, known as the key insights on meaningful youth participation (Appendix B), were identified through this process. The 23 key insights were presented in an ideation workshop with youth and to CO-CREATE partners in an online meeting in spring 2019 to solicit feedback.

2.1.1 | Youth views on participation

These 23 insights, reflecting youth views on participation and engagement in policy dialogues, included: (1) policymakers do not take us seriously, but neither do our teachers nor our parents, (2) knowing that I am not alone makes it easier to put myself out there, (3) it is hard to talk real beyond slogans, and (4) we are invited, but not heard. These insights suggest that power imbalances and superficial engagement can serve as real barriers to meaningful participation. For

example, insight 3 refers to the use of technical language by stakeholders and experts, which can limit young people's desire to contribute to the discussion and create a fear of asking questions and general disengagement. Insights 2 and 4 also refer to the fact that youth rarely felt seen and respected as a heterogeneous and diverse group with different interests, opinions, and objectives. As recalled by a Norwegian youth, "when we met with the Minister, there were only grown-ups talking. We were five youth organisations and no one got to speak. Seeing youth as equal is a good place to start."

The setting in which youth and adults meet can also impact the dialogue, and the power dynamics, as stated by a Norwegian youth: "if adults want to include youth in their work, then they have to meet them in a completely informal, unconventional way. Ideally, it should be the adults who break their routines to meet youth, not the other way around." The insights and overall ideation process with youth were central to understanding young people's experiences and challenges in being engaged in policy dialogues and processes. This ideation process was the first step to better understanding how youth view and engage in participation initiatives, as well as risks that would need to be addressed in the COI framework.

2.2 | Examine existing COI frameworks for youth participation and public health policy

In fall 2019, in an effort to better understand the literature on COI frameworks, we examined existing frameworks that relate to safeguarding or mitigating COIs in the fields of youth participation and public health policy. This included literature from academic sources, gray literature, multilateral agencies, and government guidelines. The key words used included "youth participation" AND/OR "child participation" AND/OR "conflicts of interest" AND/OR "safeguard (ing)" AND/OR "youth in policy" AND/OR "public health policy" AND/OR "model" and "framework". Google, PubMed, and Google Scholar were primarily used as research databases. An assessment was made of relevant and evidence-based measures that could be integrated into the CO-CREATE framework. Measures were assessed for their relevance to youth participation and/or public health policy, the degree of protection versus empowerment, and applicability to the CO-CREATE project and Dialogue Forums, and replicability across different country contexts, given the five participating countries in the project. The results and relevant frameworks are presented in Appendix A, with an overview presented in the COI framework background section of this paper.

2.3 | Consultations with youth organizations and CO-CREATE partners

The CO-CREATE consortium was also consulted throughout the development of the COI framework to reflect the research and policy expertise of the partners. In 2019, an initial draft was developed by EAT, the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM),

and the Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPH) and refined by other members of the consortium. In November 2019, a draft framework was presented to NIPH and LSHTM. Based on feedback, a decision was made to further consult youth organizations on their engagement with private sector representatives, as well as to expand the evidence and COI considerations to stakeholders in the civil society and government sectors (beyond private sector).

Based on the findings of the initial consultation, and the risks that corporate actors can present in public health policy development, a six-question survey was developed to assess how youth organizations interact and engage with the private sector (Appendix C). The survey focused on private sector stakeholders to assess relevant risks, opportunities, and considerations of enabling dialogues that bring together youth and business representatives with conflicting interests. In the context of the survey, private sector organizations were defined as for-profit entities, which run independently of the government.

A mix of convenience and selective sampling was used to identify the relevant youth organizations to survey: convenience based on an existing list of youth organizations developed by CO-CREATE project partners and selective based on the desire to ensure representation across the five CO-CREATE countries: Norway, Netherlands, Portugal, Poland, and the United Kingdom. The survey was shared with a total of 16 organizations, who were given a one-week response time. Efforts were made to ensure representation from each CO-CREATE country. Out of the 16 organizations, three respondents completed and returned the survey, one respondent declined to answer, two respondents redirected the survey to other members of their organization (follow-up was conducted, but no response was received), and 10 respondents did not reply. In-person interview requests were also sent to three Norwegian organizations based in Oslo, and of the three, one respondent agreed to an interview to explore their responses in greater depth.

Although the number of survey responses make it hard to generalize findings about youth organizations' interaction with the private sector, some notable results emerged. While all organizations have currently or previously engaged in partnerships with the private sector, certain have more formal screening processes to assess the partnership, and others assess informally on a case-by-case basis. Most commonly, the partnerships result in the provision of in-kind funding, that is, staff resources, material goods, etc. As for the rationale for partnerships, reasons cited included lack of resources, desire to change the food environment, alignment of mission or programmatic priorities, and desire to partner with influential organizations. Ultimately, although there were limited responses to the survey, the results point to the value of conducting stakeholder risks assessments, which has helped inform the COI governance principles.

3 | THE CO-CREATE FRAMEWORK TO OPTIMIZE POWER BALANCE AND MITIGATE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN INTERGENERATIONAL POLICY DIALOGUES

The information gathered by the consultations, outreach, and literature were collectively used to identify and assess the most salient

risks to the Dialogue Forum and appropriate mitigation measures. The CO-CREATE framework to optimize power balance and mitigate COIs in intergenerational policy dialogues is a reflection of all the data gathered and analysis conducted. An overview of the framework is presented in Table 1. The framework is designed to facilitate a safe, participatory, and meaningful dialogue, where youth are empowered, and the scientific integrity of the policy development process is intact. The framework itself consists of three distinct, but interlinked elements: (1) principles of engagement for organizers, (2) anticipated risks to the dialogue and suggested mitigation measures, and (3) practical tools to manage and address COIs. In the context of this project, organizers (including youth) were invited to use the framework during the preparation, execution, and follow-up of the Dialogue Forums.

3.1 | Principles of engagement for organizers

Routed in Article 12 of the UNCRC, and the UN principles for meaningful youth engagement, the following seven principles of engagement were developed to help guide the intergenerational dialogues

TABLE 1 Overview of the CO-CREATE framework to optimize power balance and mitigate conflicts of interest in intergenerational policy dialogues

1. Principles of engagement for organizers	2. Anticipated risks to the dialogue and suggested mitigation measures	3. Practical tools to manage and address COIs
Seven principles of engagement designed to guide organizers to convene a dialogue that is meaningful, participatory, and safe:	Designed to enable organizers to identify potential risks to the policy dialogue and address or eliminate these risks with mitigation measures. Categorized under the following phases of the dialogue:	To support the guidance provided to organizers, the framework includes practical tools to support the mitigation and management of COIs. These include:
1. Respectful	1. Identifying and inviting participants	
2. Inclusive	2. Participant dynamics	
3. Voluntary	3. Creating a safe dialogue	
4. Open and transparent	4. Follow-up	1. Stakeholder risk assessment table
5. Accountable		2. Dialogue Forum tool
6. Safe and sensitive to risk		3. Code of conduct and consent form
7. Empowered		

and define the extent to which the process and discussions are meaningful, participatory, and safe.^{7,39} These principles of engagement are designed for organizers and accompanied by practical guidance on how to put the principle into practice. These principles have been adapted from best practices for meaningful youth engagement and policy co-creation in a multi-stakeholder dialogue setting, as well as youth insights from the ideation workshops. They have also informed the code of conduct (explained below), which is designed to be shared with all participants ahead of the Dialogue Forum and provides ground rules for participation.

- 1. Respectful:** All views must be treated with respect, and efforts should be made to promote mutual understanding amongst the participants. Given the multi-stakeholder and intergenerational nature of the Dialogue Forum, participants will be reminded that one opinion does not take precedence over another irrespective of age, sex, socioeconomic status, level of education, or other relevant factors.

How to put this into practice?

- Share a code of conduct with all participants ahead of the Dialogue Forum, with a particular emphasis on conduct that promotes mutual respect.
- 2. Inclusive:** Participation must be inclusive, avoid existing patterns of discrimination, and encourage opportunities for all relevant stakeholders to be involved, regardless of sex, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, geography, or ethnicity. Specific efforts should also be made to include marginalized groups. It should be noted that youth are not a homogeneous group, and their contributions and insights will vary based on their lived experiences.

How to put this into practice?

- Meet young people where they are and organize Dialogue Forums in or near schools, local community centers, youth clubs, and other areas that reduce barriers to participation.
- Work with grassroots organizations that represent young people from various communities to engage said youth.
- Invite participants from a variety of sectors and at varying levels (local and national-level stakeholders, small-medium sized enterprises, multinational companies, etc.).

- 3. Voluntary:** Participation in the Dialogue Forum must be completely voluntary, and individuals can cease involvement at any stage without consequence.

How to put this into practice?

- Communicate the voluntary nature of the dialogue to all participants at the beginning of the session.
- Provide youth with guidance on how to cease participation in the Dialogue Forum if they wish. This includes appointing a “floater” whose role is to observe the Dialogue Forum and serve as a point of contact for youth.

4. **Open and transparent:** The Dialogue Forum is a space to share, listen, and learn. To promote a participatory and productive dialogue, all participants should have an equal opportunity to voice their opinions and views. Stakeholders should also be transparent about their interests and motivation to participate in the dialogue forum.

How to put this into practice?

- Share clear roles, responsibilities, and expectations with all participants ahead of the dialogue.
 - Provide youth with information about their right to express their views freely and will be encouraged to share their perspectives.
 - Require all stakeholders to sign a consent form which outlines that by agreeing to participate, they consent to putting the primary public health interest of the initiative ahead of any conflicting financial, academic, or personal interests. Stakeholders also consent to abiding by communication and exploitation guidelines regarding their involvement in CO-CREATE to mitigate any misrepresentation of their involvement.
 - Communicate the purpose, process, and anticipated outcomes of the dialogue to all participants involved to increase transparency. Organizers must however be cautious and mitigate unrealistic expectations of the outcomes and impact of the forum.
5. **Accountable:** A commitment to follow-up and evaluation is essential from both the organizers and participants. Follow-up action is a great way of showing how meaningful the engagement was and which decisions were taken because of it. All participants are entitled to be provided with clear feedback on how their participation has influenced outcomes.

How to put this into practice?

- Share outcomes of the dialogue with all participants through a summary report.
 - Encourage all participants to follow-up on actions and commitments made at the Dialogue Forum, published online.
 - Give participants the opportunity to provide clear feedback on the Dialogue Forum process through an evaluation survey.
 - Wherever possible, give youth the opportunity to participate in follow-up processes or activities, specifically related to advancing their policy ideas.
6. **Safe and sensitive to risk:** In certain situations, expression of views may involve risks. Adult stakeholders have a responsibility to take every precaution necessary to minimize the risk to youth of violence, exploitation, or any other negative consequence of their participation.

How to put this into practice?

- Inform youth of their right to be protected from harm, right to withdraw, and know where to go for help if needed.
- Clearly communicate safety measures that adult participants must abide by, such as not being alone with a young person in a room or closed space.

7. **Empowered:** All participants should feel that their participation was meaningful and that they could affect the structure, process, and outcomes of a dialogue. Participants should feel empowered to take action as a result of the forum.

How to put this into practice?

- Provide youth with the opportunity and capacity building training to act as moderators of the discussion.
- Encourage participants to take action and collaborate after the Dialogue Forum.

3.2 | Anticipated risks to the dialogue and suggested mitigation measures

This component of the framework is designed to enable organizers to identify potential risks to the policy dialogue and address or eliminate these risks with mitigation measures. The risks are categorized thematically according to the following: (1) identifying and inviting participants, (2) participant dynamics, (3) creating a safe dialogue, and (4) follow-up. Select tools mentioned in the mitigation measures are explained in section three of the framework, “practical tools to manage and address conflicts.”

Table 2 proposes mitigation measures for identified risks, sharing examples directly from the CO-CREATE project, which can be adapted to other projects or initiatives engaging youth and stakeholders.

3.3 | Practical tools to manage and address conflicts

In support of the guidance provided to organizers in parts one and two of the framework, this final part provides practical tools to support the mitigation and management of COIs.

1. Stakeholder risk assessment table

The stakeholder risk assessment table (Table 3) was developed to facilitate the identification and invitation of stakeholders to the Dialogue Forum by organizers and youth. Stakeholders are categorized by low, medium, and high risk to participating in the intergenerational dialogue. This assessment is based, in part, on their alignment or organization's alignment with the public health goal of the initiative. Although stakeholders with strong alignment to the initiative can still present a high degree of risk, a growing body of evidence would suggest that commercial interests introduce a strong financial conflict, which can be difficult to mitigate. Organizers are encouraged to promote the inclusion of low- and medium-risk stakeholders or to balance high-risks stakeholders with low and medium. The following table has been adapted from the World Obesity Federation's Financial Relationship Policy, specifically their risk assessment of proposed engagement, as well the

TABLE 2 Part two of the CO-CREATE framework: risks identified and suggested mitigation measures for the policy dialogues

Risks	Proposed mitigation measures
<p>Identifying and inviting participants</p> <p>Poor alignment between the public health goals of the dialogue and those of a specific stakeholder or stakeholder group</p> <p>Lack of information or understanding of the risks of including a stakeholder or stakeholder group</p> <p>Overrepresentation of a select stakeholder group who can influence the policy or discussion toward a certain narrative</p>	<p>Develop and implement a stakeholder risk assessment table (see below) that allows Dialogue Forum organizers to identify which stakeholders present a low, medium, and high risk to participating. High-risk stakeholders are discouraged from being invited. If they remain to be invited, there must be a balanced representation of stakeholders from other sectors</p> <p>Develop a code of conduct and consent form (Appendix D), which requires participants to provide consent and agree to the following as a condition of participation: "I understand that this is a public health initiative, and agree that my contributions will not reflect any conflicting financial, academic, or personal interests"</p> <p>Ensure diversity of participants to avoid overrepresentation of any one stakeholder group and promote the inclusions of less powerful and visible actors</p>
<p>Participant dynamics</p> <p>Unequal power dynamic between youth and adult stakeholders</p> <p>Domination of a stakeholder position or agenda, resulting in a shifted narrative of the issue, watered down or redirected policy idea, or strengthened position of the more dominant actors at the expense of vulnerable actors such as youth who may be less inclined or able to share their views</p>	<p>Ensure balanced representation (1:1 ratio) of youth and adult stakeholders. This reduces the risk of overrepresentation from a stakeholder group or position, reduces the risk of tokenistic involvement (one youth invited and expected to represent "youth perspective"), and also recognizes the plurality of youth voices</p> <p>Promote capacity building and empowerment of youth by providing them with the opportunity and training to moderate the Dialogue Forum and by simplifying the role of moderation (providing moderation cards, tips, and tricks)</p> <p>Encourage all participants to avoid the use of technical or complex language, which could limit everyone's understanding, or serve as a barrier to participation</p> <p>Ensure all background materials are provided in accessible language</p> <p>Ensure diversity of participants to avoid overrepresentation of any one stakeholder group and promote the inclusions of less powerful and visible actors</p> <p>Empower youth to moderate the dialogue</p>
<p>Creating a safe dialogue</p> <p>Risk of physical, verbal, or emotional harm to youth during their participation in the Dialogue Forum</p>	<p>Include a "do no harm" principle in the code of conduct</p> <p>Provide youth with a clear exit strategy in case they wish to cease participation and information about where they can seek support</p>
<p>Follow-up</p> <p>Superficial stakeholder involvement in the dialogue as a way to promote corporate social responsibility and establish relationships/contact with youth</p> <p>Stakeholder misrepresentation of their involvement in a youth participation or public health initiative</p>	<p>Establish measures to ensure that organizers and/or youth are able to control the narrative when it comes to publicity and determine the extent to which stakeholder participation may be publicized, if at all. Such measures include:</p> <p>Introduce the following statements/commitments in the code of conduct and consent form to support editorial control: (a) "I am not permitted to make public statements about my involvement in the Dialogue Forum (including on social media, online, or otherwise) without the explicit approval of participants and organizers" and (b) "I understand that the organizers retains sole editorial control over/management of the outputs of the Dialogue Forum, e.g. policy ideas and ideas for their implementation, and how there are used in dissemination materials." Participants are required to sign the code of conduct and provide consent. Additional consideration will be given when considering appropriate branding and publicity measures and guidance</p> <p>Publish summaries of the dialogues, as well as the actions and commitments made by youth and stakeholders online</p>

TABLE 3 Stakeholder risk assessment table categorizing prospective participants as low, medium, and high risk to the Dialogue Forum

Risk	Sector
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food manufacturers, as well as their councils and federations, with interest in promoting products such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Snack foods, confectionary products, breakfast cereals, chips, cookies, cakes, desserts and other high sodium, saturated fat, and sugar-related commodities Fast-food restaurants with more than five outlets
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food manufacturers, as well as their councils and federations, with interest in promoting products such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whole, unprocessed, or limited processed foods such as fruit and vegetable products, meat, fish, and dairy products Farmers Food retailers and convenience store operators Sporting goods manufacturers Fast-food restaurants with less than five outlets Marketing, public relations, and media companies Civil society organizations who receive more than 20% of their funding by high-risk stakeholders
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policymakers Public authorities and government agencies Civil society organizations who receive less than 20% of their funding by high-risk stakeholders Health organizations Education and research institutions

WHO Tool to Safeguard Against Conflicts of Interest in Nutrition Policies and Programmes.^{45,46}

2. Dialogue Forum tool

Central to the Dialogue Forum is the tool designed to facilitate the discussion. The tool is a five-step canvas that invites six participants to connect with each other, discuss an idea, and collaborate on actions. It exists in both physical and digital format and is available at no-cost to increase accessibility. Throughout the Dialogue Forum, participants populate the blank canvas with text, drawings, and post-its, which allows them to see the evolution of the conversation, as well as be reminded of the contributions of others. This in turn can produce a more informed discussion and concrete outcomes.

The tool was informed by the 23 insights, and developed in parallel to the COI framework, to integrate relevant COI measures into the design of the tool, materials, and five-step process. Such measures include:

- **Moderation:** By breaking down the dialogue into a series of predefined steps and developing instructional moderator cards, the moderation is standardized and simplified. This means any person, regardless of age, and expertise can be a moderator. In the

Dialogue Forums, youth are given the opportunity and necessary training to moderate the session. They are also provided with guidance on how to address various situations that may arise (Appendix E).

- **Introduction:** Participants are invited to introduce themselves using the following sentence: "My name is (x) and during the day I (x) and I like to (x)." Participants are then invited to draw their superpower. The aim of this activity is to focus the introduction on personal traits and preferences, rather than professional titles. The latter can introduce a heightened power dynamic linked to expertise or seniority. Enabling participants to get to know each other on a personal level can help reduce power imbalances. In the spirit of transparency, youth are informed about the stakeholders who will attend ahead of the dialogue. However, this is not the focus during the dialogue itself.
- **Design of the questions and activities:** The questions that guide the five steps are designed to solicit responses about personal experience and insights, not degree of expertise. An example is during Step Two, where participants are invited to answer "why they care about this idea or issue." The design of this and other questions recognizes that participants have varying degrees of expertise on the issue and aims to level the playing field with respect to expertise on the topic.
- **Roundtable nature:** The activities are designed so that each participant is given time to reflect on the question, individually write/draw their contributions, and then do a sharing round with the group. During the sharing round, the moderator is instructed to invite each participant individually. This was designed so that no participant can monopolize the conversation and so that all have an opportunity to contribute to the dialogue.
- **Action and follow-up:** During the last step, participants are invited to identify an action or commitment they can execute after the session to advance the policy. Participants can either execute this action independently or in collaboration with other participants. An information booklet is provided to all participants where they can exchange contact information if they wish. This seeks to promote action and accountability after the Dialogue Forum.

3. Code of conduct and consent form (Appendix D)

The code of conduct sets standards for participant behavior during the Dialogue Forum, and informs them of the values, rules, and ethics of the dialogue. This was largely founded on the principles of engagement listed earlier. Among other things, the accompanying consent form informs participants of what information will be collected, how their contributions and data will be used, and their rights. To optimize power imbalance and minimize risks to the dialogue, the following statements were included in the consent form:

- I understand I am not permitted to make public statements about my involvement in the Dialogue Forum (including on social media, online, or otherwise) without the explicit approval of CO-CREATE partners.

- I understand that CO-CREATE retains sole editorial control over/management of the outputs of the Dialogue Forum, that is, policy ideas and ideas for their implementation, and how there are used in dissemination materials.
- I understand that CO-CREATE is an EU obesity prevention initiative and agree that my contributions will not reflect any conflicting financial, academic, or personal interests.

4 | DISCUSSION

The COI framework was designed to address a gap in the literature and provide a roadmap to creating safe, empowering, and meaningful participatory processes for young people engaging in intergenerational dialogues and public health policy processes. Although some components of the framework serve as best practice in COI mitigation, such as principles of engagement, code of conduct, and a stakeholder risk assessment table, new, innovative measures were introduced to improve the quality of participation. First, the Dialogue Forum tool, purposefully designed to address select COI risks, includes integrated measures to optimize power balance and promote youth leadership in the dialogues. Enabling and training young people to moderate intergenerational policy discussions provides new opportunities to optimize power balance in these settings, which have historically included youth in a tokenistic manner and been in adult-driven venues and agendas. Young people also played an active role in informing the framework through interviews, ideation workshops, and consultations. Although the tool was designed for the CO-CREATE project, the free and accessible nature of this tool provides opportunities for youth, and adults seeking to engage youth in a meaningful way, a tried-and-tested methodology for intergenerational dialogue.

4.1 | Reflections and limitations

To promote a high degree of youth participation, a central goal of CO-CREATE was to empower youth and enable them to co-create obesity prevention policy ideas. Though the project was adult-initiated, youth were engaged in decision making and involved in the planning and implementation of various activities, including the Dialogue Forums. Given our understanding of the potential risks to youth with intergenerational dialogues and power imbalances, the desire to promote youth autonomy in decision making was at times challenged by the desire to safeguard young people and the public health policy discussion. Ultimately, the suggested measures and tools in the framework aim to balance empowerment and safeguarding. However, providing young people with further education and training on how to identify, address, and eliminate COIs could create stronger participatory processes.

Throughout the development of the COI framework, efforts were made to safeguard against the most direct and salient COI risks that emerged. However, given that stakeholders were not asked to complete a disclosure form, less direct risks, such as personal relationships,

or undeclared risks were much less safeguarded against. An expansion of the model to consider less explicit conflicts could be beneficial to strengthen safeguarding measures. Asking stakeholders to self-declare risks could also be beneficial in promoting a more transparent dialogue.

Another limitation faced when identifying risks and suggested measures was the low response rate from the youth organization survey. Although youth were consulted in the initial ideation workshops and interviews, additional efforts to engage youth organizations on their engagement with private sector stakeholders was met with few responses. This could be attributed to the one-week turnaround time, which was in place due to internal time constraints. Although efforts were made to extend engagement to both digital surveys and in-person interviews, we know that when youth are not given sufficient time to engage in participatory processes, they risk being tokenistic. In an effort to strengthen the relevance of the COI framework, future consultations with youth should take place.

When examining relevant literature and existing frameworks on COI mitigation in youth participation and public health policy, the specific search terms used could have served as a barrier to identifying additional frameworks. The search terms were selected with a dual purpose: (1) to identify COI mitigation frameworks in the fields of youth participation and public health policy and (2) to determine where frameworks exist at the intersection of participation and public health policy, which is the gap the CO-CREATE framework aimed to fill. Another barrier could include the limited research databases consulted. Additional relevant frameworks could have strengthened the CO-CREATE framework by broadening the scope of risks identified and mitigation measures included. Future iterations of this framework could include a more thorough review of existing frameworks.

In assessing the engagement of different stakeholder groups in the Dialogue Forum, concerns were raised by CO-CREATE partners of the potential impact of engaging private sector representatives in the policy discussion, given their conflicting commercial interests. Recognizing that different stakeholder groups present a different degree of risk and that private sector are a heterogeneous group, measures were put in place to guide the selection of participants, such as the stakeholder risk assessment table. Organizers were also encouraged to include a diverse representation of sectors to avoid overrepresentation of one opinion. With strong COI mitigation measures and a plurality of perspectives, private sector representatives can still contribute to policy discussions through the provision of industry data by informing feasibility and providing implementation considerations.

Finally, when the COVID-19 pandemic hit, the Dialogue Forum shifted from a physical convening to digital meetings. New risks were introduced by the shift to digital mediums and the use of Zoom to facilitate Dialogue Forums, namely, (1) direct message chat function between adult and youth participants, (2) inability to read nonverbal cues if participant cameras were off, and (3) risk of bots of non-invitees of joining and disruption the meetings and others. An adaptation of the COI framework for digital considerations could be beneficial.

4.2 | Conclusion

This paper presents a framework that can help ensure that youth participation in intergenerational policy dialogues is safe, meaningful, and empowering for young people through a series of COI mitigation measures. Measures that optimize power balance, such as equal representation of youth and adult stakeholders and youth moderation, also have the potential to increase the degree and quality of participation. Although the COI framework was developed in the context of the CO-CREATE project, its application extends beyond. Policymakers and researchers alike can use this framework as a basis to facilitate youth participation in policy processes or discussions. The Dialogue Forum tool and other practical tools in the framework provide novel solutions, with integrated COI measures, to facilitate intergenerational dialogue. Future research to test the use of this framework, or an adapted version, in policy processes in different countries, where youth civic engagement differs, as well as with youth beyond the 16–18 age range of the project would be beneficial.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The CO-CREATE project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 774210. The content of this document reflects only the authors' views, and the European Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information it contains. The authors would like to recognize the contribution of all youth participating in the CO-CREATE project as central to the development of the framework.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

ORCID

Samantha Nesrallah  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0890-2175>

Knut-Inge Klepp  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3181-6841>

Isabelle Budin-Ljøsne  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4610-1662>

Claire Bouillon  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0956-2352>

REFERENCES

- European Union. What is the European year of youth? [internet]. European Youth Portal. 2022 [cited 2022 Jul 28]. Available from: https://europa.eu/youth/year-of-youth_en
- Checkoway B. What is youth participation? [internet]. Children and Youth Services Review. Pergamon; 2010 [cited 2022 Jul 24]. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0190740910003270>
- UNICEF. Children's participation from tokenism to citizenship [internet]. 1992 [cited 2022 Nov 30]. Available from: https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/childrens_participation.pdf
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Definition of youth [internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 30]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/youth/fact-sheets/youth-definition.pdf>
- OECD. Evidence-based policy making for youth well-being [Internet]. www.oecd-ilibrary.org. 2017. Available from: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/9789264283923-10-en/index.html?itemld=/content/component/9789264283923-10-en>
- WHO Regional Office for Europe. Tips for policy-makers on child and adolescent participation in policy development [internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Jul 24]. Available from: <https://www.drugsandalcohol.ie/35632/1/WHO-adolescent-policy-maker-tips.pdf>
- United Nations Human Rights: Office of the High Commissioner. Convention on the rights of the child. 2019. 12–39. [cited 2022 Jul 24].
- Lansdown G. Promoting children's participation in democratic decision-making [internet]. UNICEF Innocenti Research. 2001 [cited 2022 Dec 6]. Available from: <https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/insight6.pdf>
- Fridays For Future. Fridays For future [internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 30]. Available from: <https://fridaysforfuture.org/>
- Act4food. Act4Food [internet]. [cited 2022 Nov 30]. Available from: <https://actions4food.org>
- March for our lives. March for our lives [internet]. 2016 [cited 2022 Nov 30]. Available from: <https://marchforourlives.com>
- Strike statistics. Fridays for future [internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Nov 30]. Available from: <https://fridaysforfuture.org/what-we-do/strike-statistics/>
- Cattino J, Babchek A, Battistini E. Young people advancing sexual and reproductive health: toward a new normal [internet]. Youthpower.org. 2019 [cited 2022 Jul 24]. Available from: https://www.youthpower.org/sites/default/files/YouthPower/files/resources/Yield_full-report_June-2019_final.pdf
- Larsson I, Staland-Nyman C, Svedberg P, Nygren JM, Carlsson I-M. Children and young people's participation in developing interventions in health and well-being: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2018;18(1):507. doi:10.1186/s12913-018-3219-2
- Oliveras C, Cluver L, Bernays S, Armstrong A. Nothing about us without RIGHTS—meaningful engagement of children and youth: from research prioritization to clinical trials, implementation science, and policy: from research prioritization to clinical trials, implementation science, and policy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2018;78(1):S27–S31. doi:10.1097/qai.0000000000001746
- Bozlak CT. Engaging youth in policy making to promote health [Internet]. Actforyouthnet. [cited 2022 Jul 24]. Available from: https://actforyouthnet/resources/pm/pm_policy_0914.pdf
- Rahman-Shepherd A, Balasubramaniam P, Gautham M, et al. Conflicts of interest: an invisible force shaping health systems and policies. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2021;9(8):e1055–e1056. Available from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X\(21\)00202-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X(21)00202-3/fulltext)
- Zeldin S, Christens BD, Powers JL. The psychology and practice of youth-adult partnership: bridging generations for youth development and community change. *Am J Community Psychol*. 2013;51(3-4):385–397. doi:10.1007/s10464-012-9558-y
- McCabe E, Amarbayan MM, Rabi S, et al. Youth engagement in mental health research: A systematic review. *Health Expect*. 2022. doi:10.1111/hex.13650
- Frerichs L, Ataga O, Corbie-Smith G, Tessler Lindau S. Child and youth participatory interventions for addressing lifestyle-related childhood obesity: a systematic review. *Obes Rev*. 2016;17(12):1276–1286. doi:10.1111/obr.12468
- Klepp KI, Helleve A, Brinsden H. Overweight and obesity prevention for and with adolescents: the “confronting obesity - co-creating policy with youth project” 2022.
- Ozer EJ. Youth-led participatory action research. In: *Equity and Justice in Developmental Science: Theoretical and Methodological Issues*. Elsevier; 2016:189–207. doi:10.1016/bs.acdb.2015.11.006
- CO-CREATE dialogue forum tool [internet]. EAT 2022 [cited 2022 Jul 29]. Available from: <https://eatforum.org/initiatives/co-create/>

24. International Youth Alliance for Family Planning. Global consensus statement meaningful adolescent & youth engagement [internet]. 2020. Available from: <http://meaningfuleyouthengagement.org>
25. Hart RA. Children's participation: from tokenism to citizenship. *Innocenti Essay*. 1992. no.4.
26. Wyness M. Children's participation and intergenerational dialogue: bringing adults back into the analysis. *Childhood*. 2013;20(4):429-442. doi:10.1177/0907568212459775
27. United Kingdom Medicines & Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency. Managing conflicts of interest consultation document code of practice for the Commission on Human Medicines, the British Pharmacopoeia Commission the Committee on Medical Devices, the United Kingdom Stem Cell Bank Steering Committee, other April expert advisory committees [internet]. 2022 [cited 2022]. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1068405/Consultation_Paper_COI_policy.pdf
28. Lo B, Field MJ, Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Conflict of Interest. *Principles for identifying and assessing conflicts of interest*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press; 2009.
29. University of Central Florida. Understanding conflict of interest [internet]. 2016 [cited 2022]. Available from: <https://compliance.ucf.edu/understanding-conflict-of-interest/#:~:text=What%20is%20a%20Conflict%20of,seriously%20that%20they%20are%20regulated>
30. Managing conflict of interest in the public service: OECD guidelines and country experiences [internet]. OECD. 2003 [cited 2022 Nov 6]. Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/gov/ethics/48994419.pdf>
31. Romain PL. Conflicts of interest in research: looking out for number one means keeping the primary interest front and center. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med*. 2015;8(2):122-127. doi:10.1007/s12178-015-9270-2
32. Bragg MA, Elbel B, Nestle M. Food industry donations to academic programs: a cross-sectional examination of the extent of publicly available data. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(5):1624. doi:10.3390/ijerph17051624
33. The Lancet. The global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition, and climate change: the Lancet commission report [cited 2022 Nov 30]. Available from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(18\)32822-8/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(18)32822-8/fulltext)
34. Bes-Rastrollo M, Schulze MB, Ruiz-Canela M, Martinez-Gonzalez MA. Financial conflicts of interest and reporting bias regarding the association between sugar-sweetened beverages and weight gain: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *PLoS Med*. 2013;10(12):e1001578; discussion e1001578. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001578
35. Mandrioli D, Kearns CE, Bero LA. Relationship between research outcomes and risk of bias, study sponsorship, and author financial conflicts of interest in reviews of the effects of artificially sweetened beverages on weight outcomes: A systematic review of reviews. *PLoS ONE*. 2016;11(9):e0162198. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0162198
36. Addressing and managing conflicts of interest in the planning and delivery of nutrition programmes at country level [internet]. Who.int. 2015 [cited 2022 Jul 29]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/nutrition/publications/COI-report/en/index.html>
37. Graham A, Powell M, Taylor N, Anderson D, Fitzgerald, R. *Ethical research involving children*. Florence: UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti. 2013. [cited 2022 Jul 29].
38. Government of the Netherlands. Meaningful youth participation toolkit [internet]. Youthatheart.nl. 2021 [cited 2022 Jul 29]. Available from: <https://www.youthatheart.nl/meaningful-youth-participation-toolkit>
39. UNESCO. Meaningfully engaging with youth: Guidance and training for UN staff [Internet]. www.un.org. 2019 [cited 2022 Jul 29]. Available from: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/youth/wp-content/uploads/sites/21/2021/05/Meaningfully-engaging-youth-Guidance-training-UN-staff.pdf>
40. European Commission. Youth for a just transition - a toolkit for youth participation in the just transition fund [internet]. europa.eu. 2021 [cited 2022 Jul 29]. Available from: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/guides/2021/youth-for-a-just-transition-a-toolkit-for-youth-participation-in-the-just-transition-fund
41. Save the Children Sweden. Child safeguarding - safe and secure programmes for children [internet]. raddabarnen.se. 2019 [cited 2022 Jul 29]. Available from: https://www.raddabarnen.se/globalassets/dokument/medlem-volontar/tryggare-tillsammans/child-safeguarding-policy_2020.pdf
42. Plan International. Global policy safeguarding children and young people [internet]. plan-international.org. 2017 [cited 2022 Jul 29]. Available from: https://plan-international.org/uploads/2021/12/global-safeguarding_children_and_young_people_global_policy-io-eng-amended_june_2019.docx_0.pdf
43. Oxfam O. One Oxfam youth safeguarding policy [internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Jul 29]. Available from: https://www.oxfam.org.uk/documents/46/OneOxfamYouthSafeguardingPolicy_EN.pdf
44. Swist T, Collin P, Nguyen B, Steinbeck K, Dawson A. Wellbeing health & youth engagement framework. WH&Y Centre of Research Excellence, Australia. 2019. Retrieval from why.org.au/engagementframework
45. WHO. Safeguarding against possible conflicts of interest in nutrition programmes [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 7]. Available from: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/nutritionlibrary/safeguarding-against-possible-conflicts-of-interest-in-nutrition-programmes/nutrition-introductory-paper-1stversion.pdf?sfvrsn=833d5ee_2
46. World Obesity Federation. World Obesity Federation's financial relationship policy [internet]. 2015 [cited 2022 Nov 6]. Available from: https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/wof-files/WOF_Financial_Relationship_Policy_June2015.pdf

How to cite this article: Nesrallah S, Klepp K-I, Budin-Ljøsne I, et al. Youth engagement in research and policy: The CO-CREATE framework to optimize power balance and mitigate risks of conflicts of interest. *Obesity Reviews*. 2023; 24(S1):e13549. doi:10.1111/obr.13549

APPENDIX A. SUMMARY OF COI FRAMEWORKS FOR YOUTH PARTICIPATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH POLICY

Name of the framework	Year of publication and lead org.	Literature type (scientific, gray literature)	Focus of the framework	Relevance to (1) youth participation or (2) obesity/public health policy	Example COI measures	Relevance to CO-CREATE Dialogue Forum	Limitations
Child Safeguarding Policy	2019, Save the Children Sweden	Gray literature	“Policies and procedures that all member countries and Save the Children International are required to introduce to make sure that all the children they are in contact with are respected and that their right to freedom from all forms of intentional or unintentional injury, discrimination, violation, violence, and sexual assault and exploitation in the organisation’s programmes is recognized”	Youth participation	- To undergo introductory training and the mandatory Child Safeguarding training - To ensure, when photographing and videoing children, that the child and parents/caregivers have agreed and that the images are taken with respect -To define, minimize and avoid situations that may expose children to risks	Select measures can be replicated in the context of the Dialogue Forums as COI guidance for participants, such as those focused on freedom of expression, data collection, and social media usage	Policy specific to the organization’s programmes and practices Replicability and adaptability limited for select measures
Safeguarding against possible conflicts of interest in nutrition programmes	2017, WHO	Guidelines	The tool is a step-by-step decision-making process that will support Member States in the process related to conflicts of interest in the area of nutrition	Public health policy	“Analyse the risks and benefits of the proposed engagement based on impacts”	Identification of risks specific to nutrition/public health policy and programs Offers a valuable linear decision making model	No specific youth participation considerations, specific to nutrition policy
Youth safeguarding policy	2020, One Oxfam	Gray literature	This document explains Oxfam’s safeguarding policy position when it comes to working with young people, setting out reasonable measures	Youth participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If research involves young people under 18 years old then – in addition to informed consent from the young people themselves – informed consent of 	Focus on youth empowerment and co- creation. Relevant measures spanning across consent, data, use of images and recordings.	Scope limited to the delivery of Oxfam’s work, no explicit relevance to policy development. A specific toolkit is under development

(Continues)

Name of the framework	Year of publication and lead org.	Literature type (scientific, gray literature)	Focus of the framework	Relevance to (1) youth participation or (2) obesity/public health policy	Example COI measures	Relevance to CO-CREATE Dialogue Forum	Limitations
			Oxfam takes to mitigate reasonably conceivable risks. This policy guides Oxfam staff working with young people and sets the boundaries (minimum standards) of what Oxfam deems necessary to safeguard the well-being of the young people it works with		a parent/guardian must be obtained before the research is conducted. -Even when parents/guardians give their (written) consent, young people must have the right to refuse to take part. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any incentives offered must be carefully selected. Preferential treatment and inappropriate gifts must be avoided. Young people, including those under 18 and their parents/guardians, must receive sufficient information about the nature and aims of the activity, prior to consent being sought 	as per the safeguarding policy.	
Wellbeing Health & Youth Engagement Framework	2019, Australian Government, National Health and Medical Research Council	Grey literature	Presents a set of values and practical questions to prompt responses and decision making that promotes ethical practices of engagement with young people	Youth participation and public health policy	How can young people and their support networks in your research/policy/practice best be supported in the co-design of health research and translation? Are the language, information and data being used in your research/policy/practice	The set of values can help inform the principles of engagement and code of conduct. The prompting questions offer good insight into risk areas	Could be broadened to include other value areas relevant to health research and policy

Name of the framework	Year of publication and lead org.	Literature type (scientific, gray literature)	Focus of the framework	Relevance to (1) youth participation or (2) obesity/public health policy	Example COI measures	Relevance to CO-CREATE Dialogue Forum	Limitations
Global Policy Safeguarding Children and Young People	2017 (review date in 2022), Plan International	Gray literature	To guide and inform engagement of all Plan International staff and associates To ensure they are skilled, confident, understand, and are well supported in meeting their responsibilities to safeguard children and young people from violence and engage positively with them in ways that enhance the achievement of the company's purpose. that procedures are in place to prevent and deal with the actions/behaviour of Staff, Associates, Visitors or us as an organisation that result in violence against a child or young person and/or places them at risk of the same -children and young people we work with are aware of the company's responsibilities to prevent and respond to any harm against	Youth participation	Organisational policies and procedures should include appropriate measures to support and protect children and/or young people when concerns arise. The Organisation should develop the capacity of all who work with and for children and/or young people to appropriately prevent, detect, report and respond to safeguarding concerns and particularly as they pertain to differing gender and other identities.	Provides an example code of conduct, practical tools for safeguarding and considers the importance of youth participation in an ethical and meaningful way	Framework is less relevant to CO-CREATE in that it has a specific focus on violence against children, sexual exploitation (and risks and measures specific to these considerations)

(Continues)

Name of the framework	Year of publication and lead org.	Literature type (scientific, gray literature)	Focus of the framework them arising from actions and behaviours of their Staff, Associates and Visitors, and, the routes for reporting such incidents	Relevance to (1) youth participation or (2) obesity/public health policy	Example COI measures	Relevance to CO-CREATE Dialogue Forum	Limitations
Meaningful Youth Participation Toolkit	Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (date unknown)	Grey literature	To provide inspiration and practical guidance to assist policy makers at Ministry & Embassy level as well as development agencies to work more effectively with and for young people	Youth participation and policy (not public health specifically)	Ensure that youth are well informed about the issue at hand, the purpose of the MYP sessions and the stage in the process in which the participation takes place. Be transparent about what is possible and what is not in terms of the level of engagement Risk of manipulation/tokenism: Mitigated by clearly defining the goal, promise and process/feedback loop The risk of limited diversity: Mitigated by recognizing the importance of diversity and heterogeneity of youth and aiming a minimum level of diversity, as well as by creating a safe and enabling environment	Provides guidance on facilitating youth participation in policy processes and guidance on creating a safe environment. Outlines risks and mitigation measures	Highly relevant for CO-CREATE, only missing public health dimension in the considerations

Name of the framework	Year of publication and lead org.	Literature type (scientific, gray literature)	Focus of the framework	Relevance to (1) youth participation or (2) obesity/public health policy	Example COI measures	Relevance to CO-CREATE Dialogue Forum	Limitations
Meaningfully engaging with youth: Guidance and training for UN staff	2019, UNESCO	Gray literature	To build a common understanding of meaningful youth engagement practices for all UN staff working across the UN's programmes and activities relevant to youth Develop technical capacity of UN staff Enable and prompt meaningful youth engagement	Youth participation	Ensure the physical and emotional security of the youth engaged. Always follow national or organizational safeguarding procedures as well as child protection rights and responsibilities for youth under the age of 18 Value youth capacities and contributions as you value those of adults. Encourage youth to express views and ideas freely	Provides valuable guidance on how to facilitate a participatory and meaningful dialogue and addresses misconceptions of youth participation	Public health focus is not included
					Provide equal opportunities for all, regardless of cultural and social backgrounds, education, religion, gender, disability, sexual orientation, context, political and economic status, or other characteristics		

APPENDIX B. 23 KEY INSIGHTS FROM YOUTH IDEATION WORKSHOPS

1. When they invite us, we are all invited in bulk;
2. the purpose of the invitation is unclear;
3. when we ask obvious questions, pay attention – they can be transformative;
4. we are invited, but not heard;
5. we need to leave the meeting with clear action points, and
6. if there will not be any follow-up, just tell it to my face.
7. Policymakers do not take us seriously, but neither have our teachers nor our parents.
8. Policymakers think we are all the same until they see us disagree.
9. Sharing personal stories is a powerful tool, but it makes us vulnerable.
10. It is very rare to be invited. We usually invite ourselves.
11. Policymakers are better safe than sorry.
12. Involving us might give them more work.
13. We never say “no” even though we risk wasting our very limited resources.
14. We want to level the playing field; therefore we need time to prepare.
15. Do not give us our own kid's table.
16. The little things make us feel valued - like those “informal small minutes” before, during, or after the meeting.
17. When they are surprised by our abilities, they patronize us.
18. It is hard to talk real beyond slogans.
19. We mainly talk, when we want to do things together.
20. Our strength is that we can be professional friends off-court.
21. Informal and personal communication can be more powerful and efficient than the formal routes.
22. Knowing that I am not alone, makes it easier to put myself out there.
23. If we get mad, we do not want to make a fuss. But sometimes that is our only tool.

APPENDIX C. YOUTH CONSULTATION SURVEY

CO-CREATE is an EU research project aiming to reduce overweight and obesity among adolescents by working directly with young people across different European countries to create policies and promote action. As part of this project, EAT will organize multi-stakeholder dialogues where youth, policymakers, and private sector representatives will come together to refine innovative policy solutions developed by youth to improve food and physical activity environments. The dialogues will gather different stakeholders with different interests, and it is critical that they are both a safe and empowering space for all participants.

EAT is looking to assess how youth organizations already engage or enter into partnerships with the private sector. A private sector organization can be defined as a for-profit entity that runs independently of the government.

EAT would welcome your response to the questions below; please provide them on the following page by January 31, 2020. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to e-mail Samantha Nesrallah at samantha@eatforum.org.

Thank you for your participation!

1. Does your organization have any private sector partners? If so, please characterize this partnership (formality of arrangement, terms of agreement/collaboration).
2. Please describe any funding sources that the private sector partner provides (monetary, value-in-kind, etc.).
3. Does your organization have any risk assessment measures or guidance in place to assess collaboration with the private sector?
4. Does your organization have any social media or communications guidelines to provide guidance on the promotion of the partnership or your organization's interaction with the private sector?
5. If your organization does not have any formal partnerships with the private sector, do you engage in conversation with this stakeholder group? If so, does your organization have any guidance on how to engage and meet with this group?
6. Does your organization work toward the same goals as parts of the private sector? If so, please elaborate on these goals.

If you would like to know more about CO-CREATE, please visit the [CO-CREATE website](#).

APPENDIX D. CODE OF CONDUCT AND CONSENT FORM

The Dialogue Forum is meant to be a collaborative, productive, and safe space to share ideas, listen to the perspectives of others, and work together to refine a policy idea and advance action. By agreeing to participate, you agree to abide by the following ground rules of the dialogue:

Listen to each other: The dialogue is a space to share, listen, and learn. Be mindful when another participant is giving his or her point of view; remember that all perspectives are valuable and that everyone has the right to be listened to.

Build on each other's expertise: Before solving the problem, we first need to understand it. To build on each other's expertise and contributions to the discussion, and to show that all perspectives are valuable, we encourage every response to start with a “yes, and” rather than a “no, but.” Every participant comes to the table with different perspectives, backgrounds, and experiences; embrace these differences.

Respect each other: Treat your fellow participants with respect. To promote a respectful space and dialogue, we ask that no phones, tablets, or other screens be used during the discussion.

Be real: The dialogue is meant to be an open and inclusive space; we encourage you to be honest and express what really matters to you.

Do no harm: The forum is a safe space. No form of physical, verbal, or emotional abuse will be tolerated by any participant. Any participant who displays such conduct will be asked to leave the forum.

Come prepared: Read the materials, familiarize yourself with the policy ideas being discussed, and be prepared to share your perspective.

Do not be afraid to ask difficult questions: Why do you see this challenge as an obstacle to introducing this policy? Why are you passionate about this policy? Do not be afraid to ask difficult and thought-provoking questions at the dialogue forum. But remember, no question is too simple or too complex, all will contribute to the discussion.

Do not be afraid to take action: We want you to leave the forum feeling empowered to take action! Do not be afraid to build on

your experiences and relationships built at the forum to create real and meaningful change in your community.

Above all else, have fun!

By participating, you agree to abide by the rules described above and understand that you may be excused as a participant if you violate any of these rules.

APPENDIX E. MODERATOR TIPS AND TRICKS

1. **Get to know everyone on a human level first:** Build relationships before the session and in the breaks.
2. **Encourage different points of view:** Groups may become focused on one common perspective or point of view on a topic. Encourage participants to consider perspectives not represented at the table, or to think about what a contrasting point of view might be. This can result in more dynamic dialogue and inclusive decisions.
3. **It is not your job to know all the answers, but you can ask questions:** When asked a question, do not hesitate to turn the question

Participant Consent Form

1. I understand that my participation in the Dialogue Forum is voluntary, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the Forum without being penalized or disadvantaged in any way
2. I understand that I will not be remunerated for my participation, either directly or in kind
3. I understand that the information disclosed during the Dialogue Forum may be reported by those present, but the source of that information may not be explicitly or implicitly identified
4. I understand I am not permitted to make public statements about my involvement in the Dialogue Forum (including on social media, online, or otherwise) without the explicit approval of CO-CREATE partners
5. I understand that CO-CREATE retains sole editorial control over/management of the outputs of the Dialogue Forum, for example, policy ideas and ideas for their implementation, and how these are used in dissemination materials
6. I understand that:
My written contributions as part of the Dialogue Forum will be collected as data and may be subject to research, including a brief post-Dialogue Forum evaluation survey
My contributions may be written down by note-takers during the Forum
My contributions will not be attributed to me as an individual
Verbatim quotations from the session may be used anonymously in reports and other publications, on the understanding that no information that could identify me or my organization will be presented or published in any reports on the project
7. I understand that all data collected as part of the Dialogue Forum will be anonymized and may be subject to research and future publications under the CO-CREATE project
8. I understand that this project operates under an open data access agreement and that my contributions to the Dialogue Forum may be made available to other researchers on request, but they will not be identifiable or traceable to me
9. Pictures and video recordings may be used to the purpose of documenting the Dialogue Forum process. My consent is given under the condition that video recordings and photos will not be used in a context that is offensive to me as an individual. Furthermore, my consent is given under the condition that video recordings and photos will not be used in new research projects
10. I understand that all data collection practices will comply with the duties and obligations outlined under the General Data Protection Regulation
11. I understand that CO-CREATE is an EU obesity prevention initiative and agree that my contributions will not reflect any conflicting financial, academic, or personal interests
12. I agree to take part in the Dialogue Forum

- around and open the floor for any participant to respond. This gives others the opportunity to share their knowledge and you the chance to learn something new.
4. **Try to connect ideas:** Some participants may share similar thoughts or ideas. Try to connect these thoughts and point out recurring themes to participants.
 5. **Do not be afraid to ask for help:** Taking on the role of moderator can sometimes feel overwhelming. Do not be afraid to ask your fellow participants for help. This can include sharing the role of moderator, asking one person to take notes or to summarize the discussion, and engaging the organizer for additional support.
 6. **Do not be afraid of silence:** It might feel awkward, but silence can be an opportunity for participants to reflect and think of their answers. An easy solution is putting on some background lo-fi music (on low volume) to cut the silence.
 7. **Make time for breaks:** Breaks can serve several purposes, to network with fellow participants, to take a mental and physical break from the discussion, and to reflect on what was discussed. Be sure to integrate a 5- to 10-min break during the Dialogue Forum.