

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Rights Coalitions in Europe



Outcome Document

Florence,
20-22 October 2010

Outcome Document
6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Rights Coalitions in Europe
Florence, 20th – 22nd October 2010

Nigel Cantwell, General Rapporteur
Graphic by ArtiGrafiche



6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Rights Coalitions in Europe

Outcome Document

Florence, 20-22 October 2010

CONTENTS

A. Introduction	3
A.1. Purpose of this report	3
A.2. Background to the meeting	3
A.3. Participation in Florence	3
A.4. General developments since the 2008 meeting	4
A.5. Goals and expectations of the Florence meeting	4
B. Organising coalitions	6
B.1. Characteristics of coalitions	6
B.2. Access to resources	6
C. The role of coalitions in making the most of the CRC in Europe	9
C.1. CRC Reporting	9
C.2. Promoting CRC implementation	10
C.3. Cooperating with ombudsmen	13
D. Working in the European context	15
E. Working with and through regional organisations	16
E.1. European Union	16
E.2. Council of Europe	17
E.3. ChildONEurope	18
E.4. Eurochild	18
E.5. Specialist networks	19
F. Thematic priorities at European level	20
F.1. Violence against children	20
F.2. Child participation	21
By way of conclusion	22
Annexes	24

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs
Children's Rights Coalitions in Europe

20-22 October 2010

Florence, Italy

Istituto degli Innocenti
P.za Santissima Annunziata 12



A. Introduction

A.1. Purpose of this report

This document seeks to pinpoint the major outcomes of the presentations and discussions in Florence that can help shape and orient future efforts by national coalitions. It is not, therefore, designed to be an account of the proceedings of the meeting: its structure diverges significantly from that of the meeting agenda itself, and in no way could it record every element of the presentations¹ made and of the valuable debates and exchanges that took place there.

While attempting to provide useful hard information, this outcome document thus seeks to reflect the most important overall and new messages and issues that coalitions might want and need to take away for consideration in developing their work over the next two years.

A.2. Background to the meeting

Following the entry into force of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the number of national coalitions of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) working for children's rights increased steadily in the Nineties. This growth was largely in response to the opportunity offered for NGOs to submit information to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child when it was to consider the State report of their respective countries. At their initial regional meeting in Berlin in 1998, those in Europe decided to create a periodic forum where they could share their experiences, discuss how they could best promote implementation of the CRC in their countries and at European level, and strategise to maximise cooperation.

This meeting in Florence was the sixth such encounter, following Berlin (1998), Stockholm (1999), Vilnius (2002), Brussels (2005) and Bucharest (2008). It was organised locally by the Italian *Gruppo CRC*, kindly hosted by the *Istituto degli Innocenti*, and owes its overall preparation to an informal steering committee composed of the NGO Group for the CRC (Geneva), Save the Children Italy, Save the Children Romania, Save the Children Sweden and UNICEF PFP Child Rights Advocacy & Education Section.

A.3. Participation in Florence

Delegates from 32 European countries took part, an encouraging rise from the 25 present in Bucharest. Also attending were representatives from ChildONEurope, the Council of Europe, CRIN, Eurochild, the NGO Group for the CRC, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, UNICEF PFP Child Rights Advocacy & Education Section and UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.²

The meeting was especially privileged to benefit from presentations by Marta Santos Pais, the UN Secretary General's Special Representative on Violence Against Children, and two members of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, Luigi Citarella (Italy) and Maria Herczog (Hungary).

¹ Presentations from the meeting are available on-line at: <http://www.gruppocrc.net/articolo-about-us>.

² See full list of participants in Annex III.

A.4. General developments since the 2008 meeting

Several very different elements of the children's rights landscape relevant to national coalitions in Europe have changed in the past two years, including:

- The **Lisbon Treaty** has come into force, which sets the protection of children's rights as one of the objectives of the EU in both its internal and external policies³.
- The initiative for a third **Optional Protocol** to the CRC, to set up an individual complaints mechanism, has moved forward substantially since that time, with agreement on a draft text forecast for 2011⁴.
- The Human Rights Council's **Universal Periodic Review** (UPR) process, which had just been launched at the time of the Bucharest meeting, is now a significant feature on the human rights agenda. The first review cycle will be completed by end 2011, and the second cycle will then begin immediately in 2012. At Bucharest, coalitions had been strongly urged to contribute effectively to the UPR process regarding their respective countries, and this remains the case⁵.
- In terms of the development of global standards, new **Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children** had been approved by the UN General Assembly at the end of 2009, constituting an important move forward in the child protection sphere⁶.

On the NGO front, **CRIN** has taken a significant policy step, having decided to supplement its information-exchange and facilitating roles by a more advocacy-oriented approach.

A negative development, however, is that **Euronet** has ceased functioning. This body had played an active role before and during the Bucharest meeting and had been expected, among several other things, to help develop the linkage between child-focused policies at the EU and the Council of Europe, which would of course have been of particularly significant use to coalitions.

A.5. Goals and expectations of the Florence meeting

From the very start, it was obvious that there had been little or no concerted follow-up to the ideas and recommendations coming out of the Bucharest forum (2008), and no real linkage between the specific outcomes of that encounter and the debates foreseen for Florence.

As the discussions progressed, it became clear that this was due to a number of factors.

To begin with, the key and invaluable role of these coalition forums is generally perceived as being the unique opportunity they provide to participants for exchanging information and experiences face-to-face, rather than a means of setting in train an on-going coordination or information-sharing exercise.

³ http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/index_en.htm.

⁴ Official page of the Open-ended working group: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/OEWG/index.htm>.

⁵ Official page of the Universal Periodic Review: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRMain.aspx>.

⁶ Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children (A/HRC/11/L.13) http://ap.ohchr.org/documents/dpage_e.aspx?si=A/HRC/11/L.13.

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Right Coalitions in Europe - Outcome Document

Thus, no overall coordination responsibilities were assigned at Bucharest, so there was no impetus or strategy for follow-up. Indeed, there was clear consensus among participants in Florence that they would not want to set up a new permanent coordination structure or mechanism for national coalitions. They far preferred the option of examining how to network and act through one or more existing bodies.

In addition, the Bucharest report does not appear, generally, to have been discussed within each coalition, either at the central level or – even less – among member organisations. It seems that the fruits of Bucharest therefore remained, for the most part, in the hands of the individuals who took part.

Consequently, and given the lack of continuity in representation – well under 20 per cent of coalition representatives in Florence had been present in Bucharest – there was no real “bridge” between the two meetings. This meant that one of the aims of the debates – to assess progress in coalition work over the past two years in order to help shape the agenda for the coming two years – could only be partially fulfilled.

In light of the above, it seems vital to be realistic about the goals and potential outcomes of these biannual encounters. They cannot be expected to produce strategic plans or, in general, cooperative resolutions. Their usefulness lies essentially in enabling ideas and initiatives to be shared that can be taken on board by individual coalitions as appropriate, as well as reaching certain informal conclusions and proposals regarding the future orientation and action on the part of each coalition.

The approach of the present outcome document tries to reflect that reality.

The next regional meeting is scheduled for the second half of 2012, and coalitions are invited to submit offers for hosting the event.

B. Organising coalitions

The realities described, and the issues discussed, on this point very much mirrored those of 2008 in Bucharest, in good part, no doubt, because so many participants were new.

B.1. Characteristics of coalitions

The great diversity in coalitions remains on all fronts, including in terms of their size and composition, level of formality, degree of internal communication, access to funding (including from government sources) and range of activities. That said:

- Most coalitions, whether formalised or informal (i.e. not legal entities) platforms or networks, have a broad-based membership representing different field of expertise.
- Most are composed uniquely of NGOs.
- Many include UNICEF National Committees⁷ but it appears that UNICEF usually limits itself to financial support, more especially in the organisation's programme countries (i.e. those with an operational Country Office).
- Very few receive any government funding (Belgium and Netherlands are two of the exceptions).
- Access to regional (notably EU) funding is very rare.

The one change that can be noted over the past two years is that domination of coalitions by one or two particularly influential NGOs no longer seems to be perceived as a major problem. It is not clear whether or not this reflects a real evolution (and even less if, in that case, it stems from deliberate efforts to avoid the situation) or whether it is linked rather with the difference in participation in the two meetings.

B.2. Access to resources

While noting funding problems in particular, participants underlined the need for coalitions to conserve their independence as a priority.

As far as **government funding** is concerned, it may therefore be necessary to limit any applications and acceptance to certain general promotional activities rather than to monitoring and reporting or to the coalition's work as a whole. Thus, for example, the Dutch coalition receives public money specifically to disseminate information about children's rights, including in schools, in line with CRC Art 42, which the government does not do directly. Indeed, it can be recommended that coalitions remind the government, e.g. by lobbying Members of Parliament, of its obligations under CRC Art 42 in order to secure funding for such exercises. At the same time, it was noted that in many countries there is no legal basis for State funding of NGOs.

Experience with obtaining project funds from the **European level** remains very limited: EU application and other requirements are difficult to comprehend, and information is generally anything but user-friendly. Participants hoped that the NGO Group could be of help in facilitating access, and also called for a "ready-to-use" guide.

Several coalitions reported on positive experiences with approaches to the **private sector** for contributions in money or in kind, on condition that formal agreements were drawn up to prevent any PR-oriented manipulation.

⁷ UNICEF National Committees are independent NGOs – for more information visit: http://www.unicef.org/about/structure/index_natcoms.html

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Right Coalitions in Europe - Outcome Document

Finally, **self-financing** was deemed to be feasible, but naturally only if coalition membership was big enough and sufficiently resourced. As noted previously, there were no perceived problems relating to domination by the richer organisations: participants' experience was more of cooperation and partnership on an egalitarian basis. The idea of membership fees poses a problem. On the one hand, unless they are resource-determined, they have the highly undesirable effect of excluding smaller organisations. On the other, they constitute literally a "buy-in" – and thus a commitment – to the coalition, and can be designed to cover most or all of the core costs. The larger organisations, it was noted, can then be invited to ensure (directly or indirectly) resources for project costs. The realities described, and the issues discussed, on this point very much mirrored those of 2008 in Bucharest, in good part, no doubt, because so many participants were new.

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs
Children's Rights Coalitions in Europe

20-22 October 2010

Florence, Italy

Istituto degli Innocenti
P.za Santissima Annunziata 12



C. The role of coalitions in making the most of the CRC in Europe

C.I. CRC Reporting

The core activity for all coalitions is, not surprisingly, still the preparation of the “supplementary” or “alternative” report to the Committee.

Participants identified some of the **main conditions for a successful reporting exercise** as:

- Broad coalition membership with a wide range of skills and experience.
- Using the Concluding Observations on the previous State Party report as one of the main inspirations for the priorities and focus of the content.
- Access to reliable data from the greatest possible number of sources other than coalition members, which implies that the coalition has a level of credibility that will enable it to secure outside cooperation.
- Where possible, having a system of on-going data collection and continuous up-dating, which facilitates both identifying trends and avoiding the need for last-minute attempts to retrieve information.
- Securing a pre-report visit from the CRC Committee member who is “rapporteur” on the country.
- Making sure that the report reflects the concerns of the membership as a whole (although this may complicate the identification of priority themes – see above), and securing each member’s formal permission for it to be mentioned in the report.

At the same time, **three questions were not fully resolved**:

- 1) SCOPE: Should the report be **wide-ranging**, responding as far as possible to the State Party report, **or targeted** on certain issues considered to be key (and therefore not necessarily fully reflecting the concerns of the coalition membership)?

Rapporteur’s comment: while there is probably a need for some flexibility in this regard, the “alternative periodic report” must not be seen as equivalent to a comprehensive evaluation of the children’s rights situation in the country from an NGO standpoint. At the 2008 meeting and the present one, representatives of the Committee have made it clear that they are looking primarily for the following from coalition reports:

- a) in-depth examination of the 5 major issues of current concern to NGOs;
- b) information on how far the State has responded to the previous Concluding Observations and commitments made; and
- c) contesting erroneous information or filling significant gaps in the State Party report – hence, for example, the complaint expressed by Luigi Citarella at this meeting regarding the fact that the latest Spanish State Party report made no mention of the Canaries or Ceuta/Melilla, and the Committee had no immediate alternative sources of information in respect of these territories.

A full regular evaluation can of course be extremely useful at national level, but in that case it should be used as the basis for a specially-tailored report submitted to the Committee that corresponds to the latter’s request and, indeed, to the limited capacity, time-wise, of its members to review in depth the information they receive.

2) CHILD PARTICIPATION: What is or are the best way(s) for **involving children** in the reporting process? Participants fully recognised that considerable time and expertise is required for the proper selection and preparation of children contributing to the process, as well as for evaluating the ramifications and impact of their participation so as to elicit "lessons learned". For most coalitions, the challenges are not surprisingly both manifest and manifold. Ensuring representative involvement is already a major task, involving the selection of children of different ages and from different environments (urban, rural, etc.) in an inclusive manner (might children with certain disabilities be "represented" by their primary caregivers?), and in some countries there are also language problems to be overcome. Selected children then have to be made fully aware of – and invited to accept – the aim and process of the activity: their expectations must be realistic and they must understand that the report can neither reflect nor resolve their individual problems. Expert investment is also required to ensure, *inter alia*, discreet but vital guidance (**encadrement**) throughout the process and a "final debriefing" that will necessarily only take place a very long time after the basic exercise has been completed. As a "conclusion", it might be said that there was unanimity as to the requirements but also as to the practical difficulties that they raise for many coalitions.

Rapporteur's comment: this question was already discussed at considerable length in Bucharest (see Section 5, pp 16-17 of the report on that meeting). While no single answer was reached at that time either, it had been suggested that coalitions consider a number of specific questions in coming to a decision on how best to ensure consultation with children, and they were indeed invited to share their experiences of what they had found to be "good practice". Of note is that, in the meantime, the NGO Group for the CRC has produced (2009) a document entitled "Maximising children's engagement in the reporting process" and announced in Florence that it is due to follow this up with Guidelines for child reporting in the very near future.

3) TIMING: What is the best **timing** for preparing and submitting an "alternative report"? Factors to be weighed include the (currently 2-year) delay between submission of a State Party report and its review by the Committee, the consequent potential discrepancy in time-frame if the "alternative report" is submitted much later; ensuring adequate time to prepare and secure approval of the document after having been able to consult the State Party report, and the need to submit the document in a timely manner for consideration at the pre-sessional review. The NGO Group for the CRC was asked to inform coalitions as soon as there were indications as to the likely pre-sessional date for their country.

C.2. Promoting CRC implementation

In passing – but importantly – it was noted that the reporting process, while often constituting a challenge, can significantly help coalitions to strengthen and "gel". However, the time-gap between each reporting process is such that momentum is easily lost, so that every use should be made of this opportunity to foresee other activities to promote implementation of the CRC.

Coalitions felt that the quality – and thus the potential use – of Concluding Observations had been constantly improving: they were now more detailed and better tailored to each country situation, and thus constituted more useful tools. Proposed activities therefore included annual workshops to review progress in relation to the Concluding Observations, with an annual report, as produced by the Italian coalition, or the Children's Rights Alliance's annual "report card"⁸ based

⁸ <http://www.childrights.ie/index.php?q=whats-new/report-card-2011>.

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Right Coalitions in Europe - Outcome Document

on government commitments. Regular meetings with government to press for implementation (and to confront what one participant delightfully termed the government's "wonderland rhetoric" on children's rights issues) are considered important.

In the experience of the Children's Rights Alliance, an apparently successful way of maintaining momentum in the interval between reports – as well as an effective means of monitoring developments in an on-going manner in preparation for reporting – is to set up thematic sub-groups with their own name such as *Action for Separated Children in Ireland*.

Rapporteur's comment: this mirrors the thematic working groups system of the NGO Group for the CRC. As is the case for the NGO Group and coalitions themselves, the success of such arrangements depends largely on the degree to which clear goals and responsibilities are set and on the work undertaken being perceived as achievable only by pooling resources rather than by any individual participating organisation alone – see Bucharest report, p. 6.

More reactive public advocacy on children's rights problems was also suggested, but it was emphasised that great care was needed if this was to be envisioned on the part of a coalition. There was a feeling that individual NGOs are better placed to carry out public campaigns, whereas coalitions come into their own when lobbying elected representatives and decision-makers. Indeed, the importance of keeping members of national and regional parliaments informed of civil society initiatives and concerns was very much stressed during the meeting.

Coalitions are also gradually taking up the opportunity to contribute effectively to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) exercise and, as in Bucharest, are strongly encouraged to do so. The NGO Group for the CRC reiterated that it is more than happy to assist and advise in that respect. It has produced a toolkit⁹ and will be shortly issuing fact sheets on various aspects of the UPR reporting process.

Similarly, the potential for link-ups with work in the context of CEDAW was underlined.

⁹ [http://www.crin.org/docs/VeryFinalUPRToolkit\[1\].PDF.pdf](http://www.crin.org/docs/VeryFinalUPRToolkit[1].PDF.pdf).

Upcoming Europe-level tools for promoting CRC implementation

A Child Rights Toolkit is being developed by UNICEF in conjunction with the European Commission, designed to provide tools, guidance and training elements "for donors and partners in developing countries, to effectively include children's rights in development, humanitarian and security cooperation."

In 2009, UNICEF launched a General Measures of Implementation Project to look at how 35 European and other industrialised countries (as well as the EU) have taken on board CRC Arts 4, 42 and 44(6) which cover the structures and mechanisms that are fundamental to the CRC as a whole being implemented effectively. The initiative stemmed from the fact that, while General Comment No. 5 (2003) on the subject gives guidance on interpreting the content and ramifications of Art 4, it does not set out the measures involved. These have been defined as:

1. National plans and strategies for implementation of the CRC
2. National mechanisms for coordinating implementation
3. Law reform and judicial enforcement of the rights of children
4. Awareness-raising, training and education
5. Resource allocation and "making children visible in budgets"
6. Monitoring and data-collection
7. Statutory children's rights institutions
8. Participation of civil society in implementation of the CRC
9. International cooperation
10. Ratification and implementation of other relevant international standards

Roll-out of the pilot is under way and should be completed in 2011.

Save the Children is also carrying out a research project to assess how far the 'general measures of implementation' have been realised at European, national and community level. The 18-month project, which was launched in early 2010, focuses on five European countries – Italy, Lithuania, Romania, Sweden and the United Kingdom – and is carried out by the respective national Save the Children organisations, coordinated by Sweden.

The project involves desk research and interviews with policy makers and representatives of non-governmental organisations as well as children. Both a European-level and national reports will be published and will include best practice examples as well as recommendations for future action aimed at policy makers at community, national and EU level.

The findings will be disseminated through national and community level seminars in each country as well as a regional conference.

C.3. Cooperating with ombudsmen

The CRC Committee considers the establishment of the post of ombudsman (or similar) to be an essential general measure of implementation of the Convention, and contact and cooperation with this "national mechanism" is high on the agenda of all concerned with children's rights, including coalitions.

Fundamental to this question is the need to acknowledge the unique situation of ombudsmen – they are neither State representatives nor civil society, and in particular they have a complementary role to that of NGOs and cannot be seen as replacing the latter in any way. Not recognising this can have a number of ramifications, including:

- governments may see the existence of a children's ombudsman as reducing the need for consultation and cooperation with NGOs on children's issues (this seems to be happening in Sweden, for example);
- this view may extend to considering the roles of ombudsmen and NGOs as broadly similar: reacting to complaints from or on behalf of children;
- NGOs themselves may see the ombudsman as "one of their own", but however far their views on children's rights issues may apparently converge, it is vital that NGOs also recognise the "independence" of this role.

Clearly, NGO coalitions should first be advocating for, and monitoring:

- a national ombudsman for children whose status and mandate reflect the 1993 (Paris) "Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions"¹⁰. In this regard, several key elements that need to be respected in particular were highlighted, including: a status that guarantees independence; a mandate that covers research, awareness-raising and responding to complaints from individual children; sufficient resources being made available to enable proper fulfilment of the mandate;
- regional and/or local ombudsmen coordinated by the national one;
- child participation in the selection process and representation on an on-going basis.

There is continuing scepticism about situations where children's affairs fall within the remit of a general ombudsman. Even if there is a special office within that institution, it is felt that a children's ombudsman needs to play more of an advocacy role that may be minimised when the mandate is part of a wider body. At the same time, if the ombudsman service is generally effective, coalitions can concentrate more on ensuring that children's issues are high on its agenda than on advocating for a distinct post (the case in Spain, for example).

Overall, participants agreed that it is better to have no ombudsman at all than one whose effectiveness is limited due to lack of independence or transparency, restricted mandate, inadequate resources or simply the personality and questionable expertise and/or commitment of the incumbent (reflecting problems in the selection process). In such cases, a new system would need to set in place.

Against this background, and of course depending on country situations, experience to date has highlighted certain **conditions for optimising cooperation** between ombudsmen and coalitions:

- As far as one of the main roles of the coalitions is concerned – reporting to the CRC Committee – good practice would seem to dictate that any similar **report by an ombudsman be entirely independent from that of the NGOs** but that there be prior consultation to ensure that there is no pointless overlapping either in approach or content.

¹⁰ <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/parisprinciples.htm>.

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Right Coalitions in Europe - Outcome Document

- Clearly it is also desirable on a general level (as experience in Croatia and Spain shows, for example) that there be **regular consultations and exchange of information between NGOs and the ombudsman**. This can also help to improve linkages between the coalition and concerned ministries if the latter are also involved.

Events to keep in mind for 2011

- The **CRC Day of General Discussion**¹¹ in September 2011 will be devoted to Children of Prisoners.
- **Building a Europe for and with children**¹²: there will be a “**Monaco+5**” review as a follow-up to the 2006 Council of Europe Monaco meeting that launched this programme, drawing up the programme strategy for the coming years.

For more information about the main events of 2011, please see:

http://www.crin.org/resources/events/#latest_event

¹¹ See: Fact Sheet on NGO participation in Days of General Discussion http://www.crin.org/docs/FileManager/NGOGroup/Fact_sheet_CRC_DGD_EN.pdf.

¹² http://www.coe.int/t/transversalprojects/children/default_en.asp.

D. Working in the European context

At a one-day meeting in Brussels that took place in the week just preceding the Florence encounter,¹³ Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the European Commission responsible for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship, noted:

*“Ensuring the respect of the rights of the child is a common responsibility. The **European Parliament** has always been supportive of the [Children's Rights] Strategy and holds regular dialogues with national parliaments in which issues related to the rights of the child can be discussed. The **Presidency** leads the work of the **Council of Ministers** and plays a key role in ensuring the high level of protection for children that the **European Council** has asked for. The **Committee of the Regions** gathers representatives from local authorities that have a crucial role to play in designing and implementing policies for children. The **Council of Europe** has a wealth of experience in promoting the rights of the child in Europe and is active on a number of crucial policy areas. The **Ombudspersons** are in touch every day with the reality of children in the Member States. **UNICEF** offers precious guidance to the EU and to its Member States in the implementation of the UN Convention. And **civil society** is present, and active, inside and outside the EU.”*

This enumeration not surprisingly reflects much of the agenda of the Florence meeting, but it also underscores the complexities of operating in the European environment. The wide variety of actors and the many initiatives undertaken or in process certainly provide a vast range of potential opportunities open to coalitions, but they are also, by their very numbers, breathtakingly difficult to grasp and act upon in an effective way. Consequently, as was constantly underlined throughout the meeting, it is not only imperative that strategic decisions be made as to what, where and how a given coalition will direct its energies at European level, but also that coalitions can receive trustworthy information and guidance on which to base those decisions.

Important elements underlying decisions on the need and desirability for involvement and the likely impact and added value of doing so include:

- **Access to information:** a basic concern lies in the difficulties many coalitions have encountered not only in obtaining information on the existence and content of relevant initiatives but also, and more especially, on how exactly they could become involved in what are often seen as processes lacking transparency.
- **Capacity building:** the problems surrounding access and involvement need to be addressed by more systematic strengthening of knowledge about what data and information are available where, and how to optimise advocacy efforts at European level. It was suggested that larger organisations already experienced in the field could provide guidance. A mapping exercise to promote awareness of the different data sources available (including, for example, Eurobarometer) would also be useful.
- **Networking and coherence:** since there was general agreement that coalitions should not try to set up their own networking body, it was proposed that greater use be made of existing networks, such as Eurochild and the NGO Group for the CRC, according to the question at hand. Concern was nonetheless expressed over the largely EU-focused nature of most efforts to date, to the detriment of attention to the Council of Europe, with its wider membership and singularly human rights mandate, and to linkages between the two bodies.

¹³ 5th European Forum on the Rights of the Child, 14 October 2010.

E. Working with and through regional organisations

E.1. European Union

The basic thrust at the European Union regarding children's issues is founded on the obligation to ensure that no action has a negative impact on children and that what it does within its competence is in conformity with children's rights. The move is now towards a more pro-active obligation whereby it *has* to take action on children's rights whenever it is competent to do so.

Examples given of progress in this field included the appointment of a Children's Rights Coordinator; the establishment of the European Forum for Children's Rights, and the formalisation of the inter-service unit under which each service has a designated staffer responsible for promoting children's rights. However, NGOs and their coalitions are urged to work to improve the effectiveness of these initiatives.

There are currently three EU strategies of special note:

- 1) An overall **Europe 2020 Strategy**¹⁴ was launched on 3 March 2010. A Communication from the European Commission on implementing this strategy was foreseen for November 2010, but was still "being prepared" in December 2010. The main thrusts of the document relevant to coalitions are:
 - Poverty reduction/welfare reform
 - Social justice and cohesion
 - Public health issues
 - Reduction in the school dropout rate to under 10%
- 2) The Commission issued a Communication on 19 October 2010 setting out the strategy for the effective **implementation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights** by the European Union.¹⁵
- 3) The European Commission set out the **EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child** on 15th February 2011.

The Commission will contribute to making the justice systems in the EU more child-friendly and to improving children's well being notably by:

1. adopting, in 2011, a **proposal for a Directive on victims' rights** raising the level of protection of vulnerable victims, including children;
2. tabling, in 2012, a **proposal for a Directive on special safeguards** for suspected or accused persons **who are vulnerable**, including children;
3. revising, by 2013, the **EU legislation facilitating the recognition and enforcement of decisions on parental responsibility** with a view to ensuring, in the interest of the child, that decisions can be recognised and enforced as quickly as possible, including, where appropriate, the establishment of common minimum standards;

¹⁴ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:2020:FIN:EN:PDF>.

¹⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/news/intro/doc/com_2010_573_4_en.pdf.

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Right Coalitions in Europe - Outcome Document

4. **promoting the use of the Council of Europe Guidelines of 17 November 2010 on child-friendly justice** and taking them into account in future legal instruments in the field of civil and criminal justice;
5. supporting and encouraging the **development of training activities for judges** and other professionals at European level regarding the optimal participation of children in judicial systems;
6. supporting the exchange of best practices and the **improvement of training for guardians, public authorities** and other actors who are in close contact with unaccompanied children (2011-2014);
7. paying particular attention to children in the context of the **EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies**, which will be adopted in spring 2011 and will notably promote the more efficient use of structural funds for the integration of Roma;
8. strongly encouraging and providing support to all Member States to ensure the **swift introduction and full functioning of the 116 000 hotline for missing children** and the child alert mechanisms (2011-2012);
9. supporting Member States and other stakeholders in **strengthening prevention, empowerment and participation of children to make the most of online technologies and counter cyber-bullying** behaviour, exposure to harmful content, and other online risks namely through the Safer Internet programme and cooperation with the industry through self-regulatory initiatives (2009-2014);
10. continuing the implementation of the 2007 **EU Guidelines on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of the Child** that focus on combating all forms of **violence against children**. The EU will also evaluate the implementation of the Guidelines. The EU will implement the **EU Guidelines on Children and Armed Conflicts** based on the 2010 Revised Implementation Strategy;
11. setting up, in the course of 2011, a **single entry point on EUROPA with information for children on the EU and on the rights of the child**. The Commission will invite other EU institutions to join this initiative.

Coalitions are urged to examine how they can play a role in advancing its aims.

E.2. Council of Europe

The many opportunities – and indeed needs – for NGOs and coalitions to take advantage of work in the context of the Council of Europe, and contributing to that work, were highlighted during the meeting. Among the general roles mentioned were:

- Providing information to the European Court of Human Rights
- Submitting complaints to the European Committee of Social Rights
- Contributing to the drafting of treaties
- Submitting oral and written statements
- Applying to serve as project consultants

Coalitions were invited to contact their national Council of Europe thematic focal points to examine further the concrete possibilities for cooperation in one or more of these different ways.

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Right Coalitions in Europe - Outcome Document

Coalitions were also urged to follow up on Comments, Issue Papers and other reports published by the Council of Europe's **Commissioner for Human Rights**¹⁶, as well as on the Commissioner's country visits.

E.3. ChildONEurope

The European Network of National Observatories on Childhood (ChildONEurope) is a research body set up in 2003 by decision of the Permanent Intergovernmental Group "L'Europe de l'Enfance". Its specificity therefore lies in its status as an instrument that works, in the first place, to inform and advise governments. It currently has 8 members and 16 associates, and is hosted at the Istituto degli Innocenti, Florence. Among its recent or current working issues are:

- early childhood education and care services
- child well-being indicators (launched but no analysis yet)
- child participation (linkage with the Council of Europe policy review 2010-2011, see below)
- national and intercountry adoption (management of demand)
- review of CRC Committee Concluding Observations on EU countries
- systems of children's legal representation
- family mediation
- unaccompanied foreign children

Several of these research topics clearly correspond to coalition preoccupations and interests, and coalitions are invited to take advantage of the processes and results of these exercises.

E.4. Eurochild

The Eurochild network, set up in 2004 and currently comprising over 130 members in 35 European countries, is funded mainly through the European Commission. It concentrates on information exchange, monitoring and advocacy at European level regarding a broad range of children's rights issues which currently include:

- poverty and social exclusion
- early childhood education and care
- family support
- child participation
- alternative care

Eurochild is also part of an informal grouping of NGOs (including, for example, Save the Children) known as the Children's Rights Action Group (CRAG) that is contributing to and monitoring all relevant EU initiatives.

Several Eurochild member organisations were represented at the Florence meeting, in addition to the presence of Maria Herczog of the CRC Committee who is Eurochild's current president. They strongly encouraged coalitions to consider the organisation's aims and activities to see if membership would respond to many or most of their main networking and support needs at European level.

¹⁶ Thomas Hammarberg's mandate is ending in 2011, a new Commissioner will be appointed.

E.5. Specialist networks

Alongside these bodies with wide-ranging mandates are several that have a very focused target group or type of activity. Mentioned in particular during the meeting as potential partners for networking on their specific fields were:

- European Federation for Street Children
- Separated Children in Europe Programme (SCEP)
- European Council on Refugees and Exiles/European Legal Network on Asylum (ECRE/ELENA)
- Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM)
- Réseau REMI (Euro-Mediterranean Network for the Protection of Unaccompanied Children) – **[NB Francophone only]**

These variously allow for participation as such and/or access to information.

F. Thematic priorities at European level

From the various presentations and information provided during the meeting, a number of issues stood out as being the focus of particularly widely-shared concern, notably:

- poverty and social exclusion
- early childhood
- unaccompanied and separated children
- violence against children
- child participation.

Rapporteur's comment: It is worth noting that two otherwise important areas were, surprisingly perhaps, hardly mentioned during the meeting as issues of concern among civil society organisations at either national or European level:

- Juvenile justice was referred to only by the Council of Europe, which pointed to its newly-adopted Guidelines for Child-Friendly Justice and underlined its commitment to improving children's access to international justice, e.g. through the European Court of Human Rights and the potential CRC Optional Protocol to provide children with a complaints mechanism.
- Alternative care was explicitly mentioned only by Eurochild.

The meeting went more especially into depth regarding work and developments in violence and child participation.

F.1. Violence against children

In her position as Special Representative of the UN Secretary General on violence against children, Marta Santos Pais has set four main goals up to 2012:

- Securing a **clear agenda to prevent and address** all forms of violence against children in all countries, and therefore involved in CoE plan
- Achieving necessary **legislative reform** (an expert consultation is to be held on this in Geneva, May 2011)
- Given the lack of coherent bodies and policies, establishing **mechanisms for (self-) reporting violence against children** with trustworthy follow-up ensured
- Improving **data collection** and analysis to inform policies

In addition, she has launched a global campaign for the universal ratification, by 2012, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography, which some European countries have not yet taken on board. As a key element of that campaign at European level, she also highlighted the need to support the Council of Europe's call for the ratification of the 2007 Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse (CETS 201). Known as the **Lanzarote Convention**, it entered into force on 1 July 2010. 10 CoE member States have now ratified, 32 have signed but not yet ratified, and five have done neither.¹⁷

¹⁷ <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=201&CM=1&DF=&CL=ENG>.

It was noted that the Protocol and the Lanzarote Convention are vital and mutually supportive instruments for protecting children from sexual violence, and coalitions were strongly urged to check the status of their respective countries in relation to both and, as required, to lobby for their ratification.

For its part, as a way of supporting the mandate of the Special Representative, in 2009 the Council of Europe adopted Policy Guidelines on integrated national strategies for the protection of children from violence.

F.2. Child participation

Discussion relating to child participation is already recorded elsewhere in this report (notably as regards the reporting process), but two additional references to the issue were made during the meeting and are of particular interest.

First, the Council of Europe has set in place a Framework for the 2010-2011 policy review process on child and youth participation. The in-country review team includes NGOs. Main outcomes of the review process will be the development of 1) guidelines for mainstreaming child and youth participation at different decision making levels and 2) of educational and training tools on the issue.¹⁸

Second, Eurobarometer – the Public Opinion Analysis sector of the European Commission – published in October 2010 a qualitative study on the rights of the child for which it surveyed 170 focus groups composed of young people 15-17 years old in all EU countries.¹⁹

¹⁸ http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/youth/Source/IG_Coop/Fmwk_policy_reviews_participation_en.pdf.

¹⁹ http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/quali/ql_right_child_sum_en.pdf.

By way of conclusion

The realities of coalitions are very different on every front (size, composition, status, resources), as are the environments in which they operate. The Florence meeting once more underlined that the value of this kind of encounter for their representatives to exchange experiences, discuss problems, debate new ideas and keep "up to speed" on initiatives in, or relevant to, Europe cannot be over-stated. Indeed, many if not most would like to see such meetings organised much more frequently.

Alongside this, Florence confirmed that there is also a clear need and wish for something that these meetings cannot provide: the formulation and implementation of joint action strategies to impact European decision-making. For sure, there is considerable interest on the part of coalitions in having a stake in developing what are becoming increasingly numerous policy and legal instruments at European level and which are of undoubtedly growing significance for the promotion and protection of children's rights in their own countries. To do this, they need at least to have access to a permanent focal point – as they do at international level in the shape of the NGO Group for the CRC – which can inform and guide them through the European maze. Even better, no doubt, would be deciding on a forum and body that can also bring their collective concerns effectively to the appropriate European entity or encounter, bearing in mind the reluctance expressed towards setting up a new permanent structure to achieve this.

Perhaps moving in that direction should be one of the main bridges between Florence 2010 and the next Regional Meeting.

Nigel Cantwell

Moderator/Rapporteur
Geneva, February 2011

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Rights Coalitions in Europe

20-22 October 2010

Florence, Italy

Istituto degli Innocenti
P.za Santissima Annunziata 12

Annexes



Annex I: Call for Action

**Strengthen relationship between
National Observatories for Childhood and the NGO network for the CRC
to promote synergies for monitoring the implementation of the CRC
in European Countries**

The Italian NGO Group for the CRC made contact with the Secretariat of the European Network of National Observatories on Childhood (ChildONEurope) - which has the role enabling it to make proposals regarding the themes to be chosen for analysis by the Network - to discuss the opportunity of developing a Call for Action to strengthen the relationship between National Observatories for Childhood and the NGO Network for the CRC.

ChildONEurope is a technical-scientific body born in 2003 in the framework of the Permanent Intergovernmental Group "L'Europe de l'Enfance". The partners of ChildONEurope consist of the representatives of National Observatories and National Ministries in charge of policies for children.

The text of the Call for Action was elaborated by the Italian NGO Group for the CRC together with the Secretariat of ChildONEurope, presented the last day of the 6th Regional Meeting by the Italian NGO Group for the CRC and then submitted at the approval of the National Coalitions attended the Meeting.

Meanwhile, the Call for Action was presented by the Secretariat of ChildONEurope at the General Assembly which took place in January 2011. The General Assembly approved and subscribed the Call for Action.

Finally, the Call for Action has been signed by almost 30 National Coalitions.

**Strengthen relationship between
National Observatories for Childhood and the NGO network for the CRC
to promote synergies for monitoring the implementation of the CRC in European Countries**

Considering that

All European Countries have ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), the most widely recognised human rights treaty.

There are more than 100 million children living in the European Union as well as an unknown number of undocumented children.

The Member States have an important role to play to ensure that all children enjoy the rights enshrined in the CRC.

Considering that

The CRC calls all those who works with/for children to a common commitment regarding the implementation and monitoring of the rights enshrined into the Convention, as it also reaffirmed in the Outcome document of UNGASS on Children and Adolescence, 2002 "*World fit for children*".

Considering that

National Coalitions of NGOs are involved through-out all European Countries in promoting and monitoring the CRC. The various coalitions, although different in form and structure, have in common the fact that they are organized as an NGOs network, in order to promote the monitoring of the Convention and to advocate for the implementation of children's rights.

The creation of Coalitions is indeed encouraged by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, which urges the submission of a single joint Report, capable to provide a comprehensive and shared overview by the different NGOs which work in the country. Considering that Governments in many countries tend to consider the periodic review process ended once it has been discussed within the UN Committee, the role of NGOs becomes crucial in order to support a sustained and continuous action of monitoring and updating.

In European countries **National Observatories for Childhood** have been established with the aim of collecting data and carrying out researches on different aspects of children's life conditions and also, in order to draft reports on the evolution of national laws implementation on childhood and on the CRC.

Having noticed that

The national networks of NGOs have a common link thanks to the organization of a European meeting every two years aiming to exchange best practices, to discuss working modality and improve the efficacy of their work.

The National Observatories for Childhood organized themselves since 2003 in a European Network of National Observatories on Childhood (ChildONEurope) with the aim of:

- exchanging knowledge and information on laws, policies, programmes, statistics, studies, research and best practices regarding childhood and adolescence.
- undertaking surveys, studies and research on specific issues related to childhood.
- identifying, sharing and promoting best practices from the results achieved through the work of comparison and analysis.
- developing and exchanging knowledge on indicators and methodologies in order to obtain the comparability of data and information.

It is useful and suggested to:

- Promote the reciprocal knowledge between the ChildONEurope Secretariat and the Network of the NGOs National Coalition starting from the meeting of the 20-22 October 2010 and subsequently in the framework of other initiatives in order to create a permanent relationship of mutual knowledge and information exchange.
- Promote contacts between the National Observatories and the National NGOs Networks at national level with the aim of sharing data and information and, if the case, fostering a dialogue on analysis, research and general reflections on the state of the implementation of the CRC at national level.
- Create regular updating and share the list of contacts between the National Observatories and the National NGOs Networks, both in the framework of the ChildONEurope Assemblies and in the biennial meetings of the National NGOs Networks.

- Albanian Children Alliance
- Alliance of NGOs for the Rights of the Child (Czechia)
- Ankara Child Right Platform (Turkey)
- Associations for Children (Croatia)
- Central Union for Child Welfare (Finland)
- Child Rights Information Center (Moldova)
- Child Rights Network Switzerland
- Children's Rights Alliance (Ireland)
- Children's Rights Alliance for England
- Coalition for monitoring Child rights in Serbia
- Coordination des ONG pour les Droits de l'Enfant (Belgium)
- Dutch NGO Coalition for Children's Rights (The Netherlands)
- Greek network of Children's Rights
- Informal Coalition of NGOs for Children Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Italian NGO Group for the CRC
- Kinderrechtencoalitie Vlaanderen vzw (Belgium)
- Kosovar Youth Council



6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Rights Coalitions in Europe



20-22 October 2010

Florence, Italy

Istituto degli Innocenti
P.zza Santissima Annunziata 12

- National Coalition Austria
- National Coalition for the implementation of the CRC in Germany
- National Network for Children (Bulgaria)
- NGO Group on CRC Alternative Report (Ukraine)
- Plataforma de organizaciones de Infancia (Spain)
- Platform for Children (Malta)
- Swedish NGO Coalition for the rights of the child
- The Norwegian Forum for the CRC
- Together (Scottish Alliance for Children's Rights)
- Wales NGO Monitoring Group on the UNCRC

Annex II: the Agenda of the Meeting

Wednesday, 20th October 2010

09:00 - 09:30 Registration

09:30 - 11:00 Opening Plenary Session

Opening Statement

- *Arianna Saulini*, Coordinator of the Italian NGO Group for the CRC

Welcome

- *Alessandra Maggi*, President of Istituto degli Innocenti
- *Maria Teresa Tagliaventi*, Italian National Centre for Childhood
- *Luigi Citarella*, member of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child

Overview of the Meeting

- *Nigel Cantwell*, moderator of the Meeting - A follow up from the previous meeting (Bucharest 2008)

11:00 - 11:30 Coffee Break

11:30 - 13:00

Keynote speech: key child rights challenges in Europe today

- *Maria Herczog*, Member of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child

Presentation of the NGO Group for the CRC, *Lisa Myers*, NGO Group for the CRC
Presentation of the Child Rights Information Network (CRIN), *Jennifer Thomas*, Child Rights Information Network (CRIN)

New initiatives to monitor and to promote the CRC General Measures of Implementation - *Camilla Nygren*, Save the Children Sweden and *Jyothi Kanics*, UNICEF

13:00 - 14:30 Lunch

14:30 - 18:00 Network Governance

- Plenary Introduction - *Conchi Ballesteros*, Plataforma de Organizaciones de Infancia (Spain)

Working Groups

- Working Group 1 – Structure & Governance - Structure and membership of NGO Children's rights coalition. Moderator *Jef Geboers*, Kinderrechtencoalitie Vlaanderen vzw (Belgium)
- Working Group 2 - Priority issues & plan for action of a Children's rights coalition - Reporting to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, what else? Moderator *Marianne Hagen*, Norwegian Forum for the CRC (Norway)
- Working Group 3 – Accessing resources to support Children's Rights Coalitions - Different experiences at national level: foundation, EU funds –budget lines available. Moderator *Beata Stappers-Karpinska*, Dutch NGO Coalition for Children's Rights (The Netherlands)

Plenary - Reporting back from Working Groups

Thursday, 21st October 2010

09:30 – 10:00 Monitoring the CRC from an NGO perspective

- Plenary Introduction - *Viviana Valastro, Italian NGO Group for the CRC*

10:00 – 11:00 Working Groups

- Working Group 1 – About the CRC Reporting Process - How to sustain the monitoring process beyond the Concluding Observations. Evaluation instruments to check if and how recommendation of the CRC Committee and the ones of the Children's Rights Coalitions are taken into account at national level. *Moderator Catherine Hodder, Children's Rights Alliance in England (UK)*
- Working Group 2 - Opportunity of using the CRC monitoring outcome with other human rights monitoring mechanisms - Sharing experiences and opportunities connected with other human rights monitoring mechanisms (eg. CERD, UPR, CAT). *Moderator Jennifer Thomas, Child Rights Information Network (CRIN)*
- Working Group 3 – Child Participation in the CRC Reporting Process - Child led monitoring. *Moderator Lisa Myers, NGO Group for the CRC (Geneva)*

11:00 – 11:15 Coffee Break

11:15 – 12:30 Working Groups continue

12:30 - 13:00 Plenary - Reporting back from Working Groups

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch

14:30 – 18:00 Further Children Rights networking

- Plenary Introduction - *Maria Corbett, Children's Rights Alliance (Ireland)*

Working Groups

- Working Group 1 – Co-operation with Ombudsman Role of the Ombudsman in monitoring the CRC, cooperation model with NGO coalitions, good practice. *Moderator Vanessa Sedletzki, UNICEF Innocenti Research Center*
- Working Group 2 - Networking on thematic issues at European level - How to strengthen collaboration across borders/among European networks on specific issues (eg. Separated Children in Europe Programme (SCEP)). *Moderator Mihaela Manole, Save the Children Romania*
- Working Group 3 - National advocacy targeting changes at the EU level - How best to link national advocacy to what's going on at EU level. *Moderator Camilla Nygren, Save the Children Sweden*

Plenary - Reporting back from Working Groups

Friday, 22nd October 2010

09:30 - 11:00 Concluding plenary session: implementing Children Rights at European Level

- *Olivia Lind*, Save the Children Brussels Head of Office, EU strategy and Children's Rights. Role and Competence – How does it affect our work at national level?
- *Tiina-Maria Levamo*, Programme Adviser CoE, the Programme "Building a Europe for and with Children"
- *Roberta Ruggiero* – ChildOnEurope, The European Network of National Observatories on Childhood, improve collaboration with NGO network at national level

11: 00 – 11:30 Special Address by the UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Children

- *Marta Santos Pais*, UN Special Representative on Violence Against Children

11:30 -12:00 Coffee Break

12:00 – 13:00 Closing session

- *Nigel Cantwell*, Moderator of the Meeting
- *Arianna Saulini*, Italian NGO Group for the CRC

Annex III: List of Participants



NATIONAL COALITIONS

Albania	Ermira Kurti	Albanian Children Alliance
Albania	Sanije Fatkoja	Albanian Children Alliance
Austria	Alexander Schwentner	National Coalition Austria
Azerbaijan	Subada Shiraliyeva	NGO Azerbaijan Children Alliance
Azerbaijan	Zalina Gafarova	NGO Azerbaijan Children Alliance
Belarus	Andrey Makhanko	INGO Ponimanie
Belgique	Frédérique Van Houcke	Coordination des ONG pour les droits de l'enfant
Belgium	Jef Geboers	Kinderrechtencoalitie Vlaanderen vzw
Bosnia Herzegovina	Berina Hamzic	Informal Coalition of NGOs for Children rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bosnia Herzegovina	Aleksandra Kukoljac	Informal Coalition of NGOs for Children rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bulgaria	George Bogdanov	National Network for Children
Croatia	Gorana Hitrec	Associations for Children
Czech Republic	Marketa Mertlova	Alianca nestatnichch organizacich
Czech Republic	Miroslav Prokers	ANO - Alliance of NGOs for the Rights of the Child
Finland	Maarit Kuikka	Central Union for Child Welfare
Finland	Hanna Heinonen	Central Union for Child Welfare
Germany	Kirsten Schweder	National Coalition for the implementation of the CRC in Germany
Germany	Bendig Rebekka	National Coalition for the implementation of the CRC in Germany
Greece	Sofia Tzitzikou	Greek network of Children's Rights
Ireland	Maria Corbett*	Children's Rights Alliance
Italy	Viviana Valastro	Italian NGO Group for the CRC
Italy	Isabella Poli	Italian NGO Group for the CRC
Italy	Aldo Velardi	Italian NGO Group for the CRC
Italy	Samantha Tedesco	Italian NGO Group for the CRC
Italy	Francesca Silva	Italian NGO Group for the CRC
Italy	Luigia Belli	Italian NGO Group for the CRC
Italy	Lorenzo Bocchese	PIDIDA
Kosovo	Kujtim Sermaxhaj	Kosovar Youth Council
Malta	Bernadette Mizzi	Platform for Children
Moldova	Gavriiluc Cezar	Child Rights information Center (CRIC)
Norvegia	Marianne Hagen*	The Norwegian Forum for the CRC
Norway	Kari Engen Sorensen	The Norwegian Forum for the CRC
Poland	Gabriela Kuhn	The Nobody's Children Foundation
Portugal	Leonor Santos	Child Support Istitute

6th Regional Meeting of NGOs Children's Right Coalitions in Europe - Outcome Document

Portugal	Dulce Rocha	Child Support Istitute
Russia	Stefania Kulaeva	NGO Anti-Discrimination Centre MEMORIAL
Scotland	Juliet Harris	Together (Scottish Alliance for Children's Rights)
Serbia	Marija Petrovic	Coalition for monitoring Child rights in Serbia
Spain	Conchi Ballesteros	Plataforma de organizaciones de Infancia
Sweden	Karin Fyrk	Swedish NGO Coalition for the rights of the child
Sweden	Jessica Renborg Huldt	Swedish NGO Coalition for the rights of the child
Switzerland	Michael Marugg	Child Rights Network Switzerland
The Netherlands	Beata Stappers-Karpinska	Dutch NGO Coalition for Children's Rights
The Netherlands	Majorie kaandorp	Dutch NGO Coalition for Children's Rights
Turkey	Berin Alaca	Ankara Child Rights Platform
UK	Catherine Hodder*	Children's Rights Alliance in England
Uk - Walles	Trudy Aspinwall	Wales NGO Monitoring Group on the UNCRC
Ukraine	Olena Kochemyrovskva	NGO Group on CRC Alternative Report
Ukraine	Maria Alekseyenko	NGO Group on CRC Alternative Report

NGOs

Albania	Celoaliq Blerina	All together Against Child Trafficking (BKTF)
Albania	Danjela Shkalla	All together Against Child Trafficking (BKTF)
Cyprus	Eve Jolly	World Vision
	Ivano Abruzzi	Eurochild
Iceland	Margrét Julia Rafnsdóttir	Save the Children Iceland
Italy	Chiara Curto	Italian Committee of Unicef
Kosovo	Rudina Ademi-Sahl	Save the Children in Kosovo
Lithuania	Steponova Kristina	Save the Children Lithuania
Romania	Mihaela Manole	Save the Children Romania

ORGANIZERS*

Yuri Pertichini	ARCI Ragazzi
Silvia Aimone	Batya
Alessandra Capozzi	INMP
Arianna Saulini	Save the Children Italy
Vittoria Pugliese	Save the Children Italy
Federica Giannotta	Terre des Hommes

*Members of the Italian NGO Group for the CRC

STEERING COMMITTEE

Arianna Saulini	Save the Children Italy
Vittoria Pugliese	Save the Children Italy
Gabriela Alexandrescu	Salvati Copii (Save the Children Romania)
Jens Matthes	UNICEF
Jyothi Kanics	UNICEF
Lisa Myers	Ngo Group for the CRC
Camilla Nygren	Save the Children Sweden
Andreea Rusu	Salvati Copii (Save the Children Romania)
Karin Fagerholm	Save the Children Sweden

