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Objectives

Presentation of the three IJJO Green Papers, which are the results of the research work developed within each one of the three sections of the European Council for Juvenile Justice, a consultative body of the European Juvenile Justice Observatory, the IJJO’s European branch.

As result of the Second Meeting of the European Council for Juvenile Justice – held in Roma in November 2010 – it has been decided to launch three statements of the most relevant issues regarding the promotion of a child friendly justice. This was in line with the recommendations of the recently adopted EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child.

The three Green Papers focus on the following subjects:

- “The Evaluation of the Implementation of International Standards in European Juvenile Justice Systems”; to this extent, this Green paper starts with an overview about the basic principles of the international juvenile justice standards. Moreover it discusses the question of the binding character of international juvenile justice standards. And provides information about the knowledge of the level of implementation of these standards and shows with the help of some examples how juvenile justice standards are implemented into law and practice. The paper dedicates an item to existing tools and instruments for the evaluation of juvenile justice systems both at national as at international level. Finally, last part contains conclusions and recommendations in the hope that they might be subject to further discussions and developments in order to improve European juvenile justice.

- "The social reintegration of young offenders as a key factor to prevent recidivism"; this Green Paper is aimed at examining the orientations and scopes of young offenders' reintegration efforts across Europe so as to highlight perceived challenges and positive practices developed by NGO in each Member State to be taken into account in further policy and programme developments. The recommendations presented at the end of the paper as a response to the gaps and needs highlighted throughout the discussion can positively influence the development of standards and programmes at European level, and act as a leverage for the most positive and forward-looking experiences emerging at national and local level across Europe.

- "Measures of deprivation of liberty affecting child and young offenders: How can international standards of juvenile justice be promoted and alternative measures encouraged?"; this final Green Paper aims to summarise the international standards on the use of detention and its alternatives with a view to providing a baseline of information on international standards in these two related areas. Second, the Paper aims to examine, insofar as
this is possible, the extent to which these standards are being implemented in the Member States of the European Union. In this regard, it presents an EU-wide snapshot of compliance with international standards in these areas, an important part of which is to identify what support or assistance the EU might provide to further their implementation. It then makes recommendations as to how the gap between the theory of the international standards and practice in Member States can be narrowed, including by activities of the European Commission itself.
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Mr. Cédric Foussard – Director of the International Juvenile Justice Observatory welcomed all participants and thanked them for their presence. He introduced the role of the Observatory specifying that the work of the JJJO as research centre relies on three different axes: prevention, intervention and inclusion. Moreover, Cédric Foussard specified that the Observatory is also an advocacy centre; to this extent, the JJJO represents and fights for children in conflict with the law and in favour of a more child-friendly justice.

Afterwards, Cédric Foussard introduced the topic of the day that is to say the presentation of three JJJO Green Papers, which are the results of the research work developed within each one of the three sections of the European Council for Juvenile Justice, a consultative body of the European Juvenile Justice Observatory, the JJJO’s European branch. Mr. Foussard also took the time to go back over the present context, which happens to be twofold: first of all, the Observatory just put an end to a European Dimension Project that started following a European conference, which took place in Seville in 2007. This Project dealt with ways of preventing juvenile delinquency coming thus within the scope of the present Green Papers. Secondly, the presentation of these three Green Papers also comes within the scope of a quite busy European actuality. Not to mention the Lisbon Treaty or a more ambitious Stockholm Programme, the EU recently adopted a new agenda on the Rights of the Child. Thus, since February 15th 2011, as Cédric Foussard pointed it out, the context happens to be quite favourable to those advocating for children. Hopefully the present three Green Papers will take part in this objective as well. Eventually Cédric Foussard thanked the European Economic and Social Committee for its welcome and hoped everyone a productive session.

Ms. Cristina Goñi – Director of the European Juvenile Justice Observatory also thanked everyone for giving the JJJO and the OEJJ a chance to present the last version of the three green papers. She pointed out that the three statements have been done thanks to the work of all the members of the European Council for Juvenile Justice whom share their knowledge and expertise as main stakeholders taking part of this advisory body. She especially thanked Ms. Ineke Pruin, Dr. Ursula Kilikelly and Ms. Séverine Jacomy – Vité for each conducting the research that lead to the three Green Papers. Ms. Cristina Goñi also apologized for the absence of Ms. Séverine Jacomy – Vité and informed the audience that she will herself be presenting the Green Paper entitled “The Social Insertion of minors and young offenders, key in the fight against recidivism”.

Mr. Jose Maria Zufiaur – European Economic and Social Committee (in French) presented himself to the audience as a member of a Spanish union, as well as a member of the European Economic and Social Committee. He reminded the audience of the CESE’s work and objectives
underlining its important role as a consultative body among the EU Institutions. Mr. Jose Maria Zufiaur also drew the audience’s attention to the fact that the IJJO and the CESE have already worked together in March 2006 and July 2009. These years, the CESE voiced opinions related to the rights of the child thanks to its collaboration, among others, with the IJJO. The CESE is currently working on a new opinion willing to improve the rights of the child and Mr. Jose Maria Zufiaur acknowledged being in charge of its making; he was hoping to complete it by October 2011. Furthermore, he confided to the audience an upcoming meeting with the President of the Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs Commission of the European Parliament, a former Spanish Minister of Justice, in order to promote a new opinion, which is closely related to the Stockholm’s Programme. Eventually, Mr. Jose Maria Zufiaur thanked the IJJO for using the CESE’s office to hold the present conference and wished everyone a pleasant and successful day.

Mr. Cédric Foussard – Director of the International Juvenile Justice Observatory thanked Mr. Jose Maria Zufiaur for his words of inauguration and introduced the first roundtable of the day on “The implementation of international standards in European juvenile justice systems”, as well as Ms. Ineke Pruin, a research associate at the Department of Criminology at the University of Greifswald.
Ms. Ineke Pruin – University of Greifswald – Germany first underlined how seriously the deprivation of liberty should be taken into consideration. Thus, it must remain the last resort and one should remember that police and pre-trial detention is also a form of deprivation of liberty. As a result, it should also be avoided or, at least, kept to the minimum. Moreover, if one cannot prevent a child from being deprived of his or her liberty, one should make sure that the detention environment will enable his or her rehabilitation and not foster more fear or mistrust.

Ms. Ineke Pruin also stressed the binding character of the international and European juvenile justice standards for the twenty-seven Member states of the European Union. Thus, juvenile justice should remain of great importance for the European Union institutions. To this extent, Ms. Ineke Pruin confessed her happiness to present her work on the implementation of international standards in European juvenile justice systems.

To come up with this Green Paper on the implementation of international standards in European juvenile justice systems, Ms. Ineke Pruin confessed that she had to deal with a few technical problems. One of the main challenges faced by those who worked on this Green paper was the lack of a unified terminology. For instance, the concept of minimum age of criminal responsibility varies sometimes greatly from one country to another. Thus, for a long time, this minimum age was very low in Scotland – it was indeed recently raised from 8 to 12 – whereas in other countries, such as Portugal, it’s 16. To the same token, another challenge faced by those who worked on this Green Paper was the lack of data. It was indeed difficult sometimes to find the appropriate information in so far as most countries do not gather all kind of information on juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice.

Ms. Ineke Pruin also confessed that her work underlined strong differences across Europe. Not to mention again the minimum age of criminal responsibility, one could focus on the definition of an offense. From one country to another, this definition can indeed greatly vary; thus, form of behaviors that can be considered offenses in one country can be regarded as harmless in another.

From one country to another country, there are also differences in the way children are judged: in some countries, if they have committed serious offenses, children are indeed still brought in front of standards criminal courts instead of courts thought, designed and meant for children. Ms. Ineke Pruin regrets such practices and that there are no assessments of such practices.

Moreover, according to Ms. Ineke Pruin, differences between the European systems of juvenile justice also arise from the lack of alternatives in some countries, especially in Central and Eastern Europe. These countries often lack indeed infrastructures to offer alternatives to detention to children in conflict with the law. As a result, across Europe, children are not treated the same way.
Moreover, once again, Ms. Ineke Pruin admitted that she had to face a lack of data, this time regarding the living conditions of children in detention. According to her, this main issue is a difficult one to solve in so far as it relies on the responsibility of several partners. In some countries, gathering the data is indeed the task of the state whereas in others, it is done by independent organizations. Concerning this particular and recurrent issue, Ms. Ineke Pruin eventually wondered what could be the role of the European Commission: how could it help solve, or even solve, this problem? Youth being the future of Europe, according to Ms. Ineke Pruin, it is indeed legitimate that European institutions, such as the Commission, get involved.

Mr. Cédric Foussard thanked Ms. Ineke Pruin for her speech and invited Marek Stavinoha to pursue.

Mr. Marek Stavinoha – European Commission started by reminding the audience all the official texts related to the topic of the day, thus quoting, among others, the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989, the E.C. Agenda on the Rights of the Child, the article 24 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, etc. Mr. Marek Stavinoha insisted on their importance and then carried on with the agenda of the upcoming Polish presidency.

The latter will have three main priorities. Firstly, it will insist on the need to make child rights policies important policies of the European Union. Children should be the compasses for all policies and at all stages of a policy’s development. In this regard, the implementation of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights is also crucial. Moreover, the Polish presidency would like to make sure that within the Commission, there would be trainings on the fundamental rights of the child. Secondly, the Polish presidency assesses the need for more basic data and for more information from the field. Knowing that policies should always be evidence-based, it wishes to do something regarding that particular matter. Eventually, Mr. Marek Stavinoha underlined the third main priority of the upcoming Polish presidency: it would like to raise awareness about
children rights, not only within the Commission, but also within Europe by launching tools online or maybe a specific website.

Mr. Marek Stavinoha added that on top of these three main priorities, general actions would be taken. Thus, a proposal on the rights of the victim will be adopted and turned into a directive. To this extent, in accordance with the objective of a more child-friendly justice, children will be presumed vulnerable victims and in need of specific protection. Moreover, Mr. Marek Stavinoha claimed that the upcoming Polish Presidency would carry on supporting the implementation of the roadmap on procedural rights. In this manner, it is already backing the adoption of the proposal on the right of access to a lawyer in criminal proceedings and on the right to communicate upon arrest. Eventually, the Polish Presidency will support and encourage the training of legal European experts in order to favour a better participation of children in courts.

To conclude his presentation, Mr. Marek Stavinoha invited the audience to take part in the development of a Green Paper on conditions of detention [Strengthening mutual trust in the European judicial area – A Green Paper on the application of EU criminal justice legislation in the field of detention – Published on June the 14th 2011]

Mr. Klaus Boele – Committee of the Regions first reminded the audience the role of this consultative body representing regional and local authorities within the European Union. Then, Mr. Klaus Boele stroves towards explaining what could be the role of the local and regional bodies regarding the rights of the child. According to him, local and regional bodies have a lot of competences when it comes to juvenile justice. To this extent, Mr. Klaus Boele advocated for a better implementation of international standards by the state to enable local and regional bodies to properly fulfill their functions. Like Mr. Marek Stavinoha before him, Mr. Klaus Boele came out in favour of more training on the rights of the child. He stressed the importance of education not only for those working with children but also for the children themselves, their teachers and parents.
Ms. Cristina Goñi – Director of the IJJO’s European branch, the European Juvenile Justice Observatory – representing Séverine Jacomy-Vité – Swiss consultant specialized in the rights of the child – first thanked all the NGOs that took part in the making of the present Green Paper stressing the importance to listen to the civil society in order to stay informed. The present Green Paper is indeed the result of the work of the NGO section of the European Council on Juvenile Justice; it was launched after an IJJO campaign on Paths of integration of children in conflict with the law. Its general and main aim is to examine the orientations and scope of young offenders’ inclusion.

First of all, for clarity’s sake, this Green Paper remembers the key legal framework as well as the general principals and prerequisites of juvenile justice and of the rights of the child as a whole. As a result, it stresses one key point that is to say that first and foremost, children are children, not adults, and they should be treated in such way. Moreover, reintegration is a long-term and continuous objective that should be taken into consideration as soon as one child is convicted of an offense. Juvenile Justice is not indeed just about detention or procedural rights, it also deals with all kinds of various matters related to such procedures, such as inclusion, the topic of the present Green Paper. Eventually, the present Green Paper recalls as a key principle that all children in conflict with the law, not just young offenders, are to be taken into account when it comes to juvenile justice.

After reviewing these key principles, the present Green Paper gives an overview of programs and policies related to young offenders’ reintegration. Such stylistic composition stresses, among others, the importance of coordinating after care services. At the moment, programs dealing with reintegration are numerous and of various nature; one could imagine that a better coordination of all these initiatives might improve the situation for young offenders striving towards reintegration.

The present Green Paper also lists general recommendations that could be useful at a European level. For instance, it advocates for the establishment of a European platform that would revisit practices, legal frameworks and standards across Europe. One should also monitor the existence and quality of national policies and practices. It could also be a good idea to develop a European directive on the need for an individualization of education and work options offered to children in custody. To the same token, one should also support national strategies and projects, which nurture integrated approaches for young offenders in detention. The present Green Paper also encourages legislative and policy changes to guarantee sustainable living options for young offenders coming out of custody. Eventually and perhaps more importantly, no one should forget to take into account the views of the child; it should fully participate at all stages of the judicial procedure.
Ms. Katarzyna Wolska – Wrona – Attaché for the Polish Presidency of the Council of the EU acknowledged that the present conference was a great opportunity to remain informed and to raise interesting questions related to juvenile justice matters. Ms. Katarzyna Wolska – Wrona agreed with her colleague’s presentation; Mr. Marek Stavinoha presented most of the work that the Polish Presidency will try to pursue during the next six months. Ms. Katarzyna Wolska – Wrona just wanted to highlight the Polish presidency's commitment to work on developing more legal instruments guaranteeing the well being of children. To conclude her presentation, Ms. Wolska – Wrona shared with the audience her enthusiasm about the upcoming discussion and the task that will be held by Poland for the next six months.

Mr. Benoit Van Keirsbilck – Défense des Enfants - Belgium started by sharing his concerns with the audience. Mr. Benoit Van Keirsbilck admitted indeed being worried by the image of the youth conveyed in our society. It is often twofold: they are either poor little victims or bad and dangerous teenagers.

Mr. Benoit Van Keirsbilck also admitted being worried by the augmentation of restrictive measures taken against children; he indeed regrets that the law becomes more and more restrictive against them. Besides, more restrictive laws imply more children in detention and Mr. Benoit Van Keirsbilck wished that, around the present table, everyone knew that detention had to remain the very last resort. To this extent, there should have a change of paradigm: detention should be considered as one alternative whereas now everyone is looking for alternatives to detention.

Concerning reintegration, Mr. Benoit Van Keirsbilck wanted to remember the audience that the criminal justice and procedural systems disintegrate the child. This is why one child needs to be reintegrated; it is crucial to help children find their place within society when they are coming out of custody. This is definitely the best way to prevent recidivism.

Mr. Benoit Van Keirsbilck also asked some questions such as “What is an offense?” – to define what can or cannot be considered as an offense is indeed of great importance in so far as a country that legislates a lot and lists many potential offenses has automatically more chances
to end up with a high level of offenders. Eventually, Mr. Benoit Van Keirsbilck wanted to highlight the importance of funding juvenile justice systems in order to prevent an outbreak of child offenders.

Spontaneous intervention from **Ms. Adrianna Opronolla** from Caritas Europe who thanked the IJJO and EJJO for the launch of these three Green Papers. Caritas Network recently started looking more carefully at the issue of minors and to this extent, the present conference appears like a great opportunity to learn more about the subject. Concerning the last intervention and Ms. Ineke Pruin’s intervention, Ms. Adrianna Opronolla had to express her surprise: learning that in some countries the minimum criminal age is only at 10 is an outraging fact, especially if the only solution offered to these children is detention.

On a different topic, one should know that Caritas Europe has been fighting poverty for years now and Ms. Adrianna Opronolla regrets that poverty and situations faced by young offenders are not more tightly examined and linked. According to Ms. Adrianna Opronolla, there is a need for stronger integration and connection of these matters, especially during the policy making process. As a result, one should make the commitment to always remember the issue of poverty when dealing with young offenders and inversely those fighting against poverty should keep in mind the dreadful judicial consequences that poverty can lead to.

**Ms. Cristina Goñi** – European Juvenile Justice Observatory welcomed Ms. Adrianna Opronolla’s intervention and agreed that a more transversal approach should be considered when dealing with such topics. Besides, the Green Paper elaborated by Ms. Séverine Jacomy-Vitte tried to linked inclusion with the burning issues of social inclusion and antipoverty initiatives but also to employment, education and training, justice and Human Rights policies, between others.
Ms. Ursula Kilkelly – Faculty of Law, University College, Cork, Ireland – presented the third Green Paper discussed that day. This one was focusing on two related issues: the use of detention and the question of intervention.

After looking at international standards, Ms. Ursula Kilkelly acknowledged the need for a more multi-agency approach and the need for a wide range of alternatives to detention. Like other speakers before her, Ms. Ursula Kilkelly also underlined the importance of training those working with children, that is to say lawyers, counsellors, teachers, etc. Moreover, the importance of assessing the existing models, programs and systems already implemented was also highlighted: it enables to have a global sense of what is working where.

Like Ms. Ineke Pruin before her, Ms. Ursula Kilkelly regretted the general lack of information on various matters. For instance, Ms. Ursula Kilkelly recognized that there is an upward trend in detention; nevertheless, there are very few comparisons between states. No one really knows the nature of the jailed population; therefore, no one can assess the presence of children and help them regarding their greater vulnerability. There is certainly a need for an independent structure monitoring the conditions of detention. To solve this recurrent problem of lack of data, Ms. Ursula Kilkelly also believed that the European Union, or an international body, could launch a centralized agency: the latter could gather all information available, look for missing useful data and interpret them all. According to Ms. Ursula Kilkelly, this would greatly facilitate the work of those dealing with young offenders on a daily basis.

Mr. Cédric Foussard – IJJO thanked Ms. Ursula Kilkelly for her speech and mentioned the upcoming Green Paper on conditions of detention. In the name of the IJJO, he committed to presenting the present Green Paper to those working on the one dealing with conditions of detention.

Mr. Etienne Joiret – Justicia Centre Hospitalier Jean Titeca (in French) presented his work. As a psychiatrist within the Jean Titeca Hospital, he is in charge of young offenders with psychiatric problems.

In Belgium, it all started in 1996 when the creation of specific infrastructures for young offenders with psychiatric problems was launched. Such proposition was made because many acknowledged the lack of care for these specific patients. Eventually, in 2002, five pilot infrastructures were built. In 2006, these infrastructures were improved – more beds and better ambulatory cares available. The launch of these infrastructures nurtured some worries: some were concerned about the deprivation of liberty, others wanted to know how judicial and
medical matters would be articulate, and some were even worried that psychiatry was going to be instrumented to get young offenders out of detention. Nevertheless, the project carries on. It even set minimum standards. They are the following: compulsory therapeutic project built by a multidisciplinary team – continuous dialogue between the judicial, reeducational and psychiatric structures (quarterly dialogue organized between the lawyers, the medical staff and the child) – on going clinical and scientific research – regular assessment of practices (not the case in Belgium yet but the officials should definitely address this problem).

To conclude, Mr. Etienne Joreit had to admit that after seven and half years of practice he could only acknowledge the complexity of the situation. Eventually, he asked a few questions. For instance, Mr. Etienne Joreit was eager to know if psychiatric care for young offenders was increasing in Europe or in other parts of the world. Moreover, he asked for more evaluation of the implemented practices and even wondered if this was seen as a priority by national or European officials.

Mr. Johan Put - University of Leuven - wanted to stress the importance of a more welfare approach in juvenile justice systems. As a matter of fact, it is of great importance in so far as some countries, such as Belgium, do not respect international recommendations and only have one court system; nevertheless, the Belgium system, because it is so welfare oriented, is, according to Mr. Johan Put, one of the best to deal with young offenders.

Mr. Johan Put also regretted that international standards did not often refer to the division of tasks and competences between private and public sectors before agreeing with Mr. Benoit Van Keirsbliick, detention should be the alternative and what is now considered as the alternatives should be seen as the norm. Besides, one should keep on looking for alternatives (or “norms”).

Mr. Johan Put also advocated in favour of less juvenile justice standards: it is one thing to create new ones and another to make sure that those already existing are correctly implemented. Moreover, Mr. Johan Put believed that being critical of juvenile justice a standard was of great importance in so far as it allows more vigilance and effectiveness. It is not because these standards concerned children that they should be sacralised, on the contrary. Eventually,
Mr. Johan Put questioned the method sometimes used in comparative researches: they are often based on questionnaires whereas based on his experience long one-on-one conversations give richer and more accurate results.

Spontaneous intervention from Mr. Eric Van der Mussele, a lawyer from Flemish part of Belgium. He acknowledged that thirty years ago there were no financial aids to help children in conflict with the law. Nowadays, there is still a lack of youth lawyers – only 500 in Flanders. Moreover, one should admit that there are two problems: firstly, children have a hard time going through long procedure. Secondly, it is sometimes difficult to make sure that a child has a lawyer. Concerning the latter, the EU could maybe legislate in favour of competent lawyers assisting children.

Spontaneous intervention from Ms. Kersty McCourt – the Open Society Institute - who acknowledged that OSI just published a report dealing with the socio-economic impacts of pre-trial detention. It underlined the dreadful consequences of that arbitrary period of time. It also highlighted the situation faced by children with parent(s) in detention. The latter OSI report is available to whoever is interested.

Conclusions

Mr. Yann Marguet – representing Mr. Marcelo Aebi – University of Lausanne and Director of The European Society of Criminology – started concluding the present conference by stressing the various difficulties faced so far. It indeed appeared to be difficult to obtain cross-country works. There is also an important lack of data in different domains. This was underlined as a great problem since some efficient programs are abandoned due to this lack of evaluation and thus lack of data. Moreover, Mr. Yann Marguet insisted on the training of those collecting these data. They should be competent and reliable in order to make sure that the data collected are just as relevant and reliable. Eventually, Mr. Yann Marguet advocated in favour of a better use of networks; since many organizations face the same problems, it could indeed be helpful to use these networks more often or maybe more efficiently.

Ms. Sabrina Brutto – Istituto don Calabria eventually concluded the present conference by referring to the European Dimension Project, conducted, among others, by the IJJO and the Istituto don Calabria. This project analyzed five different topics in five different countries: the violence towards minors in Spain, cyber-crime and e-bullying in France, the juvenile gang in the United Kingdom, the influence of the use of narcotics and alcohol in criminal activities in Poland and the exploitation of foreign minors in Italy. These five researches underlined actual burning issues and hopefully the present three Green Papers will be able to address these problems and to find proper solutions and adequate measures to even more juvenile justice matters.
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Under the framework of the EU Agenda on the Rights of the Child
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June 9th 2011, Brussels (Belgium)
European Economic and Social Committee
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EJJO Objective

“To create a European space for reflection and brainstorming for the development of initiatives and the establishment of codes and standards for good practices in favour of the education and integration of young Europeans in social exclusion situation and in conflict with the law”

EUROPEAN COUNCIL FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE

“...formulate recommendations on the development and evolution of juvenile justice in Europe; gather quantitative and qualitative information on the situation of children, adolescents and young people in conflict with the law; propose coordinated actions between public administrations, non-governmental organisations and academic and training centres, in all EU Member States”.

...making possible the debate about the most relevant issues and topics in Europe regarding juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice systems
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IJJO Green Papers on Child Friendly Justice

- Public Administration’s Section: “The evaluation of the implementation of international standards in the European Juvenile Justice Systems” (Dr. Ineke Pruin, University of Greifswald, Germany).

- NGO’s Section: “The social reintegration of young offenders as a key factor for combating recidivism”. (Severine Jacomy – Vite. UNICEF).

- Academic’s Section: “Measures of deprivation of liberty affecting child and young offenders. How can international standards be promoted and alternative measures encouraged?” (Dr. Ursula Kilkelly. Faculty of Law, University College, Cork. Ireland).

Permettez-moi de dire quelques mots sur le CESE et ses fonctions.

Depuis le traité de Rome, le CESE est l’organe consultatif des principales institutions européennes: La Commission, Le Conseil et, finalement, depuis le traité de Nice, également du Parlement. Le CESE est, par conséquent, une agence faisant partie du processus législatif communautaire.

Le CESE doit être obligatoirement consulté sur toutes les questions découlant du Traité sur l’Union européenne, bien qu’il soit aussi bien souvent consulté sur d’autres domaines, et politiques. Par ailleurs, le comité peut émettre des avis d’initiative propre – ainsi sont appelés ses rapports du Comité –.


Ces membres, dénommés Conseillers, s’organisent en trois groupes: Groupe I (Employeurs), Groupe II (travailleurs), Groupe III (organisations sociales diverses: les consommateurs, les agriculteurs, l’économie sociale, les professions libérales, la pêche, les associations familiales, etc.). Au total, nous sommes 344 membres des principales organisations d’entreprises, syndicales et sociales des 27 États membres de l’UE.

Le travail effectué par le CESE est structuré en 6 sections:

1) ECO: Union économique et monétaire, cohésion,
2) INT: Marché unique, production et consommation,
3) TEN: transports, énergie, infrastructures, société de l’information,
4) SOC: Emploi, Affaires sociales et citoyenneté;
5) NAT: Agriculture, développement rural et environnement, et
6) REX: Affaires étrangères.
Il existe aussi une Commission consultative sur les Changements industriels - CCMI - qui a été formé au sein du CESE après l'expiration du traité CECA.

En somme, le Comité rassemble une grande partie de la société civile organisée de l'UE et exprime les vues de la société civile aux institutions communautaires, contribuant ainsi à la bonne gouvernance de l'UE.


Actuellement, à la demande de la Commission européenne, nous avons convenu de produire un avis sur les droits de l'enfant, suite à la publication de la communication sur "l'Agenda de l'UE sur les droits de l'enfant." Dans ce contexte, j'ai l'honneur de présider le groupe d'étude et nous espérons achever nos travaux lors de la session plénière du mois d'Octobre.

Par ailleurs, c'est d'une volonté commune à l'OIJJ, à son Président Mr. Legaz et à son directeur ici présent Mr. Foussard, que nous souhaitons élaborer d'autres Avis sur certaines questions plus spécifiques, tels que « les mineurs délinquants et la santé mentale », en collaboration avec le Parlement européen. Une proposition que j'ai eu l'occasion de commenter au Président de la Commission Justice du Parlement européen, M. López Aguilar.

Enfin, nous nous félicitons que vous ayez choisi nos locaux afin d'organiser ce séminaire de haut niveau avec des représentants des institutions européennes, des universités, des gouvernements nationaux et des institutions internationales, nous vous souhaitons une journée d'étude fructueuse - dont le comité bénéficiera, j'en suis certains- et nous réaffirmons notre volonté de poursuivre cette coopération déjà ancienne avec l'OIJJ.

Merci beaucoup et bon travaux.

"Implementation of international standards in European juvenile justice systems"
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1. International JJ standards

- United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (1990),
- United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (1990),
- General Comment No. 10 (2007): Children’s rights in juvenile justice (GC No. 10).

2. European JJ standards

- Council of Europe’s Recommendation Rec(2003)20 concerning “New ways of dealing with juvenile delinquency and the role of juvenile justice”, adopted on 24 September,
3. Main principles

- Existence of a special juvenile justice system,
- Existence of procedural safeguards for juvenile offenders,
- Introduction and use of diversion,
- Introduction and use of alternative sanctions and measures (after a formal hearing),
- Deprivation of liberty as last resort, no indeterminate prison sentence,
- Humane and child friendly “prison” regime.

4. Some comments on the binding character of international juvenile justice standards

- Convention on the Rights of the Child
- Other rules/guidelines/recommendations
5. The level of implementation of international JJ standards in Europe: General comments on the challenges of international JJ research:

- Differences between the European juvenile justice systems (theoretical approaches, age groups, sanctions and measures, underlying philosophies),
- Lack of unified terminology,
- Lack of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Minimum age for educational measures of the family/youth court (juvenile welfare law)</th>
<th>Age of criminal responsibility (juvenile criminal law)</th>
<th>Full criminal responsibility (adult criminal law can/must be applied; juvenile law or sanctions of the juvenile law can be applied)</th>
<th>Age range for youth detention/ custody or similar forms of deprivation of liberty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15***/18</td>
<td>Only welfare institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>14***/16</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>14/16*</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15/18/21</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18/18 + (mit. sent.)</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark****</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14/18/21</td>
<td>14-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England/Wales</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10/12/15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland****</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td>15-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13-18 + 6 m./23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14/21</td>
<td>14-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>13-21/25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10/12/16**</td>
<td>10/12/16-18/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16/18/21</td>
<td>12-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17/18/21</td>
<td>10-16/17-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway****</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15/17/18</td>
<td>13-18-15-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16/21</td>
<td>12/16-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>18/21 (20)</td>
<td>16-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden****</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15/18/21</td>
<td>15-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18/25</td>
<td>10-22/17-25/30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td>12-18/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Criminal majority concerning juvenile detention (youth imprisonment etc.);
- ** Only for road offences and exceptionally for very serious offences;
- *** Only for serious offences;
- **** Only mitigation of sentencing without separate juvenile justice legislation

© Prof. Dr. Frieder Dünkel, University of Greifswald/Germany
5.1. Level of implementation of international JJ standards into laws:

- All EU-member states have introduced procedural safeguards, diversion schemes and alternative sanctions for juvenile offenders, but in different ways.
- Critical aspects:
  - Minimum age?
  - Status offences?
  - Transfers to adult criminal courts?
  - Free legal defence?
  - Life imprisonment?
  - Legal regulations for deprivation of liberty?

5.2. Level of implementation of international JJ standards in practice:

- Knowledge limited, depends on availability of data.
- Critical aspects:
  - Frequent use of diversion?
  - Extent of custodial dispositions?
  - Principle of minimum intervention?
  - Living conditions of juvenile offenders deprived of their liberty?
6. Instruments and tools for the evaluation of the implementation of international JJ standards

- Committee on the Rights of the Child – reporting system,
- UNICEF Juvenile Justice Indicators,
- Good practices in the member states?

7. IJJO Questionnaire 2011: Results

- Data analysis by special services/offices (internal evaluations) or university research/institutes,
- Some countries: No specific instruments or responsibilities for data collection/analysis,
- Responsibility of different departments (Ministries of Justice, Education, Social Policy),
- No clear indicators for the implementation of JJ standards,
- Not clear to what extent international JJ standards are part of trainings and/or influence criminal policy.
8. Conclusions

- International JJ standards contain (in most areas) sufficient guidelines (see Recommendations of the Council of Europe in particular),
- From a legal point of view: implementation satisfying,
- Limited knowledge about the practice of implementation,
- Data collection not sufficient,
- No common indicators,
- Not enough evaluation on effectiveness.
- Impact of the EC: Make standards work, insist on JJ research, help in finding common indicators.

Thank you!

For further information:

Dr. Ineke Pruin
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Department of Criminology
Domstr. 20,
D-17487 Greifswald/Germany
E-mail: ineke.pruin@yahoo.de
Internet: http://www.uni-greifswald.de/datenkd
Tel.: ++49-(0)621-154402
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1. GREEN PAPER BACKGROUND AND AIM

• 2010 - European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion.

• Coalition group of European Social NGOs.

• Starting point: awareness campaign “Paths of integration for children in conflict with the law”.
Final Conference on Child Friendly Justice
European Dimension Project
JLS/2007/ISEC/488

- To put particular emphasis on the situation of children in conflict with the law and the need to ensure their integration.
- To bring the issue of integration of young offenders to the centre of European debate.
- To hear the voice of children at risk of social exclusion and improve the effectiveness of juvenile justice systems in relation to social and professional reintegration.
- To underline the importance of supporting, improving and evaluating programs on resettlement of children and young people in conflict with the law.

1. GREEN PAPER BACKGROUND AND AIM

Green Paper aims to

- To examine the orientations and scope of young offenders’ reintegration efforts across Europe so as

- to highlight perceived challenges and positive practices to be taken into account in further policy and programme developments.
2. **KEY LEGAL FRAMEWORK:**

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS**
- General Comment No 10(2007) on children’s rights in juvenile justice of the Committee on the Rights of the Child.
- General Comment No. 13 (2011) on the Right of the child to freedom from all forms of violence and Humanities, Brussels 2009.

**EUROPEAN POLICIES:**
- Recommendation CM/Rec (2008)11 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the European Rules for Juvenile offenders subject to sanctions or measures.
- Recommendation No. R (89) 12 of the Committee of Ministers to Members States on Education in Prison.
3. **GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND PREREQUISITES:**

- Social Inclusion For All
- Detention as a Measure of Last Resort.
- Child – Friendly Justice.
- Reintegration as a Continuous and Long-Term Objective.
- Support to reintegration as an outcome-oriented process.

4. **SCOPE OF ANALYSIS:**

- **FOCUS ON REINTEGRATION FROM CUSTODY**
- **INCLUSION OF REINTEGRATION FROM NON-PENAL CUSTODY**
- **REINTEGRATION FROM PRE-TRIAL DETENTION**
- **REINTEGRATION OF YOUNG ADULTS**
5. OVERVIEW OF POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES IN FAVOUR OF YOUNG OFFENDERS’ REINTEGRATION IN EUROPE:

• Legislative Framework.

• Coordination, capacity and After Care services.

• Programmes and Measures.

• Preparatory and Temporary release.

• Monitoring, Evaluation and Research.

6. KEY COMPONENTS OF SUCCESSFUL REINTRODUCTION APPROACHES

• GUARANTEERING INTEGRATED AND INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK.

• PREVENTING INSTITUTIONAL DEPENDENCY AND ENSURING CONTINUITY OF CARE.

• ADDRESSING THE YOUTH’S OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR AND PROMOTING FACTORS OF RESILIENCE.

• OPENING UP REALISTIC AND FAIR SOCIO-PROFESSIONAL PERSPECTIVES.
7. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AT EUROPEN LEVEL

1. Establish a European platform on the social reintegration of young offenders to revisit the existing outputs-based systems, regulations and practices, with a view to developing outcomes-oriented and holistic European standards on legal frameworks, capacity and coordination, programmes, as well as evaluation, monitoring and research, fostering the reintegration of young offenders in all European member States. EXOCOP (EU level Recommendations for the Re-Integration of (Ex)-Offenders).

2. Monitor the existence and quality of national policies and practice on the reintegration of young offenders, based on existing information sources and the observations of human rights mechanisms, and use findings as one of the fundamental rights and justice criteria to be reviewed in progress reports of acceding and neighbouring countries, as well as within internal EU Justice (EU CR Strategy), Employment and Social Inclusion initiatives.
7. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AT EUROPEAN LEVEL

3. Develop European directives on the individualisation of education and work options and outcomes for young offenders during and after custody, with an obligation for responsible institutions to anticipate and ensure gradual transition to education or job placement outside, in cooperation with local partners.

4. Support national strategies and projects which nurture integrated approaches and positive social networks of young offenders in custody, including inter alia through:
   – the involvement of family members in restorative justice processes,
   – home visits and preparation for release with families and important others of youth in custody,
   – activities in custody targeting external audiences, proactive activities and involvement of local education, leisure, culture, media and business partners.
7. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AT EUROPEAN LEVEL

5. Define modalities for young offenders to fully participate by having their view taken into account at all stages of the judicial procedure and of the implementation of the penal sanction, but also through model participatory rulings of custodial settings (access and support to individual information, self-expression and representation, democratic and collective representation mechanisms, availability of choice, etc.) and support to youth-led aftercare and prevention initiatives.

6. Encourage legislative and policy change to guarantee sustainable living options for young offenders coming out of custody, in particular:
   - ensure the provision of integrated life skills programmes during custody,
   - gradual release options and half-way accommodation,
   - the enforceable right to housing after release,
   - the mandatory provision by the justice system of aftercare counselling and administrative assistance,
   - a system of criminal record and mandatory checks limited only to relevant issues for employment purposes
   - and access to financial assistance.
Ms. Ursula Kil Kelly’s Presentation – "Measures of deprivation of liberty affecting child and young offenders: How can international standards of juvenile justice be promoted and alternative measures encouraged?" – Thursday, 9th-06-2011, European Economic and Social Committee.
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• International instruments set standards and monitor treatment of young offenders
  – United Nations
    • UNCRC, General Comments, Concluding Obs
    • Beijing Rules, Havana Rules, Riyadh Guidelines
  – Council of Europe
    • ECHR
    • CPT and Commissioner for Human Rights
    • European Rules for Juvenile Offenders
    • Guidelines on Child Friendly Justice

• Core Principles
  – Arrest, detention and imprisonment as a measure of last resort and for the shortest appropriate period of time.
  – Right to be treated in a manner consistent with respect for the child's rights, the child's age and desirability of reintegration.
  – Diversion from detention as a core principle.
  – Focus on welfare not punishment.
• Imposition of sanctions and measures
  – Based on the best interests of the child
  – Subject to the principle of proportionality
  – Takes account of the child’s age, wellbeing, development and circumstances
• Measures must be tailored and imposed without delay.
• Juveniles must be able to participate effectively and have the right to privacy.

• Need for a multi-agency approach and a wide range of alternatives to detention
• Process must strike a balance between flexibility in approach and curbing discretion – prescribed by law
• Must be supported by experts - an individualised process.
• Specialised training for those working with juveniles and involved in sentencing.
• Deprivation of Liberty
  – Arrest, detention, for penal and civil purposes
  – Different terms and uses, poor records
  – Increasing alternatives – mainstreaming is a challenge
  – Particular vulnerability of children in
    • pre-trial detention (length and conditions)
    • welfare or psychiatric institutions.

• Conditions in Detention
  – Separation from adults
  – Environment - rehabilitative and safe
  – Education, healthcare, dignity and privacy
  – Preparation for reintegration
  – Complaints, information and advocacy
  – Inspection and monitoring.
• Implementation of Standards
  – Cause for concern in all EU Member States
  – Greater compliance urged by CRC Committee

• Particular concerns - Detention
  – Increased use of detention (minorities)
  – Use of secure care/welfare detention
  – Use and length of pre-trial detention
  – Detention in police cells
  – Failure to separate children from adults.

• Rights, Conditions and Treatment
  – Problems with regime and conditions
  – Restraint, solitary confinement
  – Lack of meaningful regime, esp pre-trial
  – Protection from harm and abuse
  – Bullying, self-harm, drugs
  – Contact with family, preparation for release
  – Legality in respect of civil/welfare detention.
• Inspection and Complaints
  – Absence of independent structures to monitor conditions of detention

• Training and Specialisation
  – Carefully selected staff
  – Trained and specialised personnel in all aspects of the juvenile system

• Outstanding Issues
  – Poor systems for timely and comprehensive collection of data
  – Little evaluation of sanctions and measures
  – Limited dissemination of the evidence base
  – Few academic or inter-disciplinary networks at national or international levels
  – Accredited training systems required.
  – Focus on inspection and monitoring.
• Role for the EU Institutions?
  – No single international agency to actively promote implementation of international standards on youth justice
  – Evaluation and research – need to disseminate evidence widely
  – Development of common systems of data collection to enable comparative research and to track progress
  – EU-wide training on international standards.
Mr. Yann Marguet’s conclusions for the Conference “In the framework of the EU Agenda on the Rights of the Child: Priorities in juvenile justice” - Thursday, 9th-06-2011, European Economic and Social Committee, Brussels.

I will present the conclusions that we have drawn together with Professor Marcelo Aebi, from University of Lausanne.

The three articles presented in this conference shared one main joint: the difficulty of performing cross-European comparisons in the field of juvenile justice.

This is a recurrent issue for the research team of the University of Lausanne, which is actively involved in the compilation of the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics and the Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (also known as SPACE).

No one can disagree on the fact that we are in an important need of data, as it was already mentioned in the three Green Papers presented during the Conference. As researchers indeed and, more precisely, as criminologists, we need statistics to work on in order to give a numerical evaluation of the situation.

The problem is that more and more programs are being implemented without being assessed and even efficient programs are sometimes abandoned because of a lack of resources and infrastructure. In addition to this, more and more laws are adopted because they seem or sound efficient without an actual consultation of the scientific community.

Regarding this issue, we do think that it is time for the Governments of the Member States to understand and acknowledge that the resources could be used in a rational way by establishing what works and what doesn’t on a scientific basis. The association with Universities for these evaluations, through organizations such as the IJJO, seems to be a key for success.

In this context, we have the impression that the questionnaire sent by the IJJO to each European ministry is, and will be, a major source of data for cross-European comparisons. The results show the idiosyncrasy of every country and, to some extent, its interest in the evaluation of policies implied. It is quite astonishing to see the huge diversity in this point, with some countries avoiding the evaluations of the implementation of the standards, while others are trusting the research staff of their Universities to perform such assessments.

Several points highlighted in the Green Papers and in the standards could also really help to fill the gap that exists in the European data. We first think about the importance of creating harmonized definitions because, as mentioned by Ineke Pruin, one of the major issues existing in the cross-European comparisons field is the diversity of the national meanings for a same concept or for a same measure.
Another crucial point for us is concerning the training of the persons that are hiding behind the national data collections. Sometimes indeed, the validity and the quality of the information provided in cross-European surveys depend on the good will of a single person, whereas it should be double-checked and revised by a whole chain of monitoring in order to guarantee the reliability of the given data. We therefore think that an effort has to be made by the National Governments, through information and training, to increase the awareness of the importance of having valid, comparable data among the members of their administrations.

To finish this conclusion, I would like to mention one last point that could, in our opinion, help to improve the comparisons, as well as the implementation of the international standards. Ms. Kilkelly and Ms. Pruin, in their Green Papers, have highlighted the fact that all European countries, even the oldest members of the European Union, encounter problems in the practical implementation of the standards. Knowing this, we do believe that, through networks as the one established by the IJJO, and through the work that academics like Professor Dünkel have accomplished for many years, the local criminal policies could be influenced – even if this is done by pointing out the “bad students”. It is probably through a sort of “reintegrative shame” at the State level that improvements can be introduced.
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