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On December 4th and 5th, 2014, the European Council for Juvenile Justice met for the fourth time, in Brussels. The two-day meeting ‘Towards the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice Policies in Europe: Lessons learned and future challenges’ was organised with the support of the European Commission’s Justice Programme, and took place thanks to the collaboration of the Belgian Ministry of Justice, and the European Economic and Social Committee. The event followed the 6th IJJO International Conference ‘Making Deprivation of Children’s Liberty a Last Resort: Towards evidence-based policies on alternatives’, a convergence that allowed increased attention to be drawn to the themes of child-friendly juvenile justice.

During the previous meeting, held in London in 2012, the ECJJ members focused on the theme of juvenile justice in relation to the ongoing European crisis, and analysed how to keep improving the services available to young people in conflict with the law and at risk of social exclusion, while both public administration and civil society organisations are confronted with budgetary cuts. The main outcome of the London meeting was the subsequent White Paper ‘Save Money and Realise Youth Potential - Improving youth justice systems during a time of economic crisis’.

Following this success, the 4th ECJJ Meeting in Brussels concentrated on a pivotal theme: Restorative Justice at a European level. Thanks to the presentations by Professor Frieder Dünkel, Criminology Professor at the University of Greifswald and President-Elect of the European Society of Criminology, and Professor Tim Chapman, Course Director of the Restorative Practices Masters at Ulster University, the knowledge exchange on restorative practices in EU Members States and on their crucial features for effectiveness was dynamic and compelling. At the same time, the participation of Margaret Tuite of the EU Commission, María Amor Martín Estébanez, of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, and Antanas Jatkevičius of the Council for Penological Co-operation, Council of Europe, created an invaluable opportunity for an update on EU institutions’ policies and studies concerning children and their relation with the law, a key to understanding and sharing European priorities in the field, and strengthening the regional approach at the heart of the Council.

In the course of the meeting, 47 participants, including experts in juvenile justice and members of the European Council for Juvenile Justice from all 26 European countries, participated to plenary sessions, presentations, and networking sessions. The different formats allowed for direct and proactive participation and exchange between the three sections of the Council: academics, civil society and public administration representatives. Moreover, they provided an opportunity for the numerous new members of the Council who were present to learn more of the ECJJ working methods and priorities, and to take part in every consultation. According to the necessities expressed by a selected group of ECJJ members and experts during the Executive Committee Meeting of November 4th ‘Consultation on the European Juvenile Restorative Justice Roadmap and Forthcoming Meeting’, ample space was left for debates and consultations concerning ongoing projects and future priorities, as well as the functioning and communication strategy of the ECJJ itself.
In the course of the 4th ECJJ Meeting, the plenary sessions, as well as the consultations, tackled three key elements crucial to the pursuit of the Council’s objective.

First of all, the roundtable featuring EU institutions’ representatives, as well as the subsequent discussion with members of recognised regional and international organisations, tackled the progress and future challenges of juvenile justice at the European level. In particular, the aforementioned presentations outlined: the results of the data collection study of the European Commission on the involvement of children in criminal proceedings; the upcoming study of the Fundamental Rights Agency on the implementation of child-friendly principles in EU justice systems; and the influence of the Council of Europe’s guidelines on national legislations.

On the side of civil society organisations, the speakers outlined the significant priorities for the coming years, including: implementing more thoroughly children’s participation; addressing informal and traditional forms of justice, such as restorative practices, as part of juvenile justice; strengthening a trans-national approach to principles and reforms; reflecting on the meaning of the strict age limits of juvenile justice systems. The two plenary sessions addressed such crucial issues combining two different and complementary perspectives, the institutional policy agenda, and the grassroots approach by civil society.

Secondly, the bulk of the meeting was dedicated to the ongoing ECJJ project: the ‘European Research on Restorative Juvenile Justice’, and to investigating the achieved results and future goals of the research. In particular, two teams are involved in the research: professor Dünkel and Parosanu are in charge of the 28 snapshots, while Professor Chapman, Ms. Gellin and Ms. Anderson handle the Model. On this occasion both teams presented their results: Professors Dünkel and Parosanu outlined the legislative, structural and implementation framework in the 28 EU Member States, addressing strengths and shortcomings of different systems, whilst Professor Chapman, Ms. Gellin and Ms. Anderson outlined the results of three case studies, and presented the first draft of the ‘European Model for Restorative Justice with Children and Young People’, which includes the essential feature of ‘effective restorative justice’, and the significance of a regional approach to such theme.

Finally, the members were presented with the future activity plan of the ECJJ, including the connection and follow-up of the EU Agenda, upcoming projects and research, and trainings. They consulted and agreed to the selected priorities and contributed greatly to the discussion concerning the functioning of the ECJJ network, in particular tackling the communication strategy.
3. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Dr. Francisco Legaz Cervantes  
Founder and Chairman of the International Juvenile Justice Observatory

"It is an honour for me to welcome you all to the Fourth Meeting of the European Council for Juvenile Justice.

First and foremost, I would like to thank the people who are joining me at this table: Ms. Valérie Gengoux, of the Criminal Policy Service, Representative of the Belgium Ministry of Justice, for her engagement with the IJJO’s activities and for hosting this event. I would also like to thank Mr. Xavier Verboven, Representative of the European Economic and Social Committee, for his interest and support of this meeting.

Similarly, I would like to express my gratitude to all of you as official members of the European Council for Juvenile Justice, for taking part in this meeting and in particular for the keen interest and enthusiasm you have expressed since 2009, when we conceived the foundations of this network.

I would also like to thank the representatives of the several European institutions that presented us with their policy agendas on juvenile justice yesterday, for believing and relying on us.

As you well know, the organization of this meeting is the result of a global strategy and the IJJO wishes to become closer to national and regional realities and needs all over the world. This is the reason why the IJJO created the European Council for Juvenile Justice and the rest of its Continental Councils in Asia-Pacific, North and Latin America, Africa and other regions of the world.

In this sense, last September the First Meeting of the ASEAN Subcommittee was celebrated in the context of the IJJO’s Asia-Pacific Council for Juvenile Justice, thanks to the support of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the Ministry of Justice of Thailand. Likewise, the First Meeting of the North American Council for Juvenile Justice will also be held later this year. This brings us to today’s event, the Fourth Meeting of the European Council for Juvenile Justice.

I would also like to highlight that this meeting, alongside the design of the European Model on Restorative Justice with Children and Young People, conforms to the basic parts of the ECJJ Roadmap for 2013-2015, drafted as follow up to the conclusions of the Third Meeting of the ECJJ, held in London 2012, and the recommendations of the latest Council’s publication, the white paper ‘Save Money, Protect Society and Realise Youth Potential - Improving Youth Justice Systems During a Time of Economic Crisis’.

In this regard, the IJJO started working on restorative justice some years ago from a theoretical perspective through research projects and European grants focused more on alternatives, diversion and restorative justice. At policy level, we took part in the group of experts for the design of the global report titled ‘Promoting Restorative Justice for Children’ led by Marta Santos Pais, the United Nations representative on Violence against Children.

Our experience on restorative justice was also established in the context of technical cooperation programs, by responding to governments from Latin America and Asia in their requests on incorporating restorative justice approaches in the development of
law reforms and the modernization of public policies on violence prevention and youth justice.

As a result of these activities and of the fact that the IJJO aims to share lessons learned and good practices on youth justice from Europe, we realized that there was a lack of common understanding among practitioners, policy makers, and even within international and regional institutions about what restorative justice really means and involves.

For that reason, we started to discuss this gap, among ourselves, collaborators and the European Commission, and in 2014 we began to work on the design of a roadmap on restorative justice, aiming to provide practitioners and policy makers with a theoretical framework, a pool and selection of good practices implemented in the 28 Member States, as well as operational guidelines to implement restorative justice in the whole process of violence and criminal proceedings. All these aspects that are attended to in the roadmap and the EU model will be discussed and validated by you, experts and Council members, during this Fourth Meeting of the ECJJ.

And last but not least, I would like to note the fact that we could not have been able to do any of this work without all of you, the real experts on restorative justice, the professionals who have been working on this for the decades, and the knowledge you have as academics, practitioners and policy makers. In this sense, I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to Tim, Maija, Monique, Andrea, Professor Dünkel and the University of Greifswald for having accepted this challenge and to all of you for being here today."
Bernard De Vos  
*General Delegate for Children’s Rights, Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles*

Mr. De Vos introduced the main themes of the session, namely the key possibilities offered and developed in the framework of the EU institutions’ policies concerning children. Representing a Children’s Ombudsman, Mr. De Vos also underlined that the issues connected to juvenile justice are very relevant to his activity, and the exchange of good practices at European level represent a crucial opportunity to improve national juvenile justice policies. He then moved on to introduce the following speakers.

Margaret Tuite  
*Coordinator for the Rights of the Child, DG Justice, European Commission*

To present the role that the EU plays in fostering children’s rights and influencing national practice, Ms. Tuite introduced three main areas of activities: EU legislation; the research on data collection; non-legislative measures and initiatives to favour the exchange of good practices and trans-national collaboration, funded by the EU.

Starting from legislative measures, Ms. Tuite underlined the progress that was made in the course of the last years to harmonize national guarantees, supporting through directives the implementation of a common minimum level of safeguards, and of relevant international standards. Particularly significant to this end are the directives on the right to an interpreter, the right to a lawyer and the forthcoming directive on children who are suspected or accused in
criminal proceedings. Ms. Tuite expressed the hope that the Parliament will play an important role by protecting some of the measures that have been challenged by the Member States.

Nonetheless, despite the progress achieved, various issues remain to be tackled. For instance, that of children below the age of criminal responsibility, who do not enter the formal criminal justice system, but can still be subject to punishment and measures including the deprivation of liberty, and are not guaranteed legal assistance. In this sense, the scope of the directive remains quite limited.

Concerning data collection, the Commission carried out an extensive study to gather all the relevant data about children involved in criminal justice throughout Europe, whatever their role in the process might be, whether suspect, offender, victim, or witness. The study also took into account international, comparable data, from the Council of Europe or United Nations platforms.

The result was the design of 290 indicators concerning criminal justice alone, largely based on the Council of Europe guidelines on Child-Friendly Justice, whose intention was to evaluate the effectiveness of national procedures in guaranteeing the appropriate safeguards to children who are involved in criminal justice. Of these 290, data was collected in all 28 Member States for only 2 indicators. For a considerable number of indicators there was no data collected, while for over 100 indicators, data was only partially populated. This indicates the opportunity to collect this type of data, also in the member states that are not currently doing so. A crucial outcome of the study were the national reports, available on the Commission’s website, which highlighted good practices as well as weaknesses to be addressed, for instance the limited possibility for a child to participate in their own proceedings, or the fact that various rights are made available to children only upon specific request, or the lack of specialized training for professionals dealing with children.

Looking ahead, this research will be instrumental in drafting the latest directive on children in criminal proceedings, which could help overcome some of the aforementioned issues, towards which consultations between Commission representatives and member States representatives were organised, to further possible progress. Furthermore, the applications to EU-funded programmes to develop child-friendly justice are growing, showing increased awareness and engagement on these specific themes. The Commission is looking forward to developing further programmes and investing in diversion. Last, Ms. Tuite recalled the importance of the European Parliament’s statement adopted in late November, calling for renewed attention to children’s rights, and putting particular emphasis on the issues connected to juvenile justice, with a specific reference to the negative consequences of detention.

María Amor Martín Estébanez
Programme Manager – Legal Research
Equality and Citizens’ Rights Department,
European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

Ms. Martín Estébanez introduced, first of all, the work of the EU Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA). Established in 2007, the FRA has the purpose of providing European Institutions and Member States with evidence and expertise with regards to the implementation of EU law concerning fundamental rights. The agency has developed a strong cooperation with the
Commission, for instance for the study on data collection just presented by Ms. Tuite. The research led by the FRA focused on the perception of professionals at national level who deal with children, both as victims and witnesses, as well as on interviews collecting the views of children themselves who have been involved with the judicial systems, both in civil and criminal proceedings.

The cross-country analysis concentrated on certain EU countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Poland, Spain, Romania, United Kingdom, selected to capture the diversity of our justice systems. The research found that in most countries there are legal provisions for procedural safeguards to be applied in criminal proceedings, but often guidelines for practical instructions are lacking, as well as adequate training for professionals involved. Professionals interviewed emphasized the need to adapt the environment of the hearings involving a child, a process that can prove very stressful, if not traumatic, for young people. Such provisions are essential to guarantee the value of the hearings, which become instrumental in allowing for children’s participation and to avoid secondary victimization, and although they exist, they often are not duly applied due to lack of appropriate funding. In practice, hearings are rarely child-friendly, as the setting can be intimidating and the procedure repetitive. More procedural safeguards are in place for criminal proceedings particularly in serious cases concerning children as victims, less so as witnesses.

There are divergent views on the necessity to hear a child, but agreement that a child’s age and maturity, linguistic capabilities and state of health should always be taken into account. Respondents to the research considered that hearing a child in family law cases is important. Although “maturity” is a critical factor determining the modalities of participation, it is not determined in a harmonised way across the countries studied, where maturity is determined either by age group or on a case-by-case basis. Moreover, the meaningful fulfilment of the child’s right to be heard is linked to the availability of free legal aid, which the research
found is available to child witnesses in six out of ten countries studied and to child victims in eight. However, legal aid is provided without a means test in only five of the studied countries.

The research also found that not all countries studied have special courts for children, special panels or judges, although specialisation is a key factor to promote appropriate training for professionals and well equipped courts. In regard to the child’s right to information, the research did not identify in all countries studied specific requirements for information to be provided in a form accessible and understandable by a child with due regard to their age and maturity, and other factors, such as an impairment or not speaking the official language. In addition, it is often not clear, especially in civil cases, who has the responsibility to inform a child, while specific guidance in this regard and the production of child-friendly general information material would be very useful.

Concerning the child’s right to protection and privacy, national legal frameworks foresee a variety of protection measures during court hearings, including removal of defendants, using video recorded pre-trial hearings, use of video links to testify and use of screens to visually separate from defendants. However, in practice these measures are often under-utilised and their use subject to the judges’ discretion. Furthermore, when asked about the right to non-discrimination, respondents considered equality a basic principle. Yet, specific legal provisions and measures to ensure it are often lacking.

Finally, Ms. Martín Estébanez recalled that the child’s best interest is embedded as a concept within the normative framework of most EU Member States. However, the risk underlined by most respondents is that the principle is perceived as a complex and rather vague concept with little practical applicability as specific methods and tools to identify, assess and report on it are missing, and called for more attention to a truly multi-disciplinary approach to the treatment of children.

Antanas Jatkevičius
Council for Penological Co-operation, Council of Europe

Mr. Jatkevičius presented the influence of the Council of Europe’s (CoE) recommendations on the national legislations and practices. As all 28 EU member States are also parties to the Council of Europe, recommendations concerning fundamental rights of children are particularly relevant to European legislation. Through the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, and the protections guaranteed by the national constitutions and relative courts once recommendations are transposed into national legislation, it can be argued that the standards of CoE recommendations are moving from soft to hard law, therefore generating legal obligations for States. The relation between the CoE recommendations and national legislation can thus be described as a mutual one, as they are produced thanks to the work of member States’ representatives in the framework of the CoE.

With regards to the theme of juvenile justice, the CoE issued specific recommendations addressing the social reaction to juvenile delinquency, and specifically concerning delinquency of youths coming from migrant families. These first recommendations have been integrated in more recent ones, in particular the 2003 recommendation ‘concerning new ways of dealing with juvenile delinquency and the role of juvenile justice’ and the 2008 recommendation on the ‘European Rules for juvenile offenders subject to sanctions and measures’, which are both particularly interesting in analysis of the theme of deprivation of liberty as a last resort.
Mr. Jatkevičius personally took part in the experts’ group that worked on the drafting of the 2003 recommendation, and both measures underline the importance of investing in suitable alternatives to formal criminal prosecution for children, which should become part of regular procedures, taking into account the principle of proportionality and the respect of the juveniles’ best interest.

In particular, the significance of community sanctions and measures was underlined, which should also involve third parties, such as the family and legal guardian of the youth, and possibly include processes of mediation and restoration. A holistic approach, based on the multi-disciplinary collaboration of different services, including social actors, should also be fostered when dealing with children. Furthermore, Mr. Jatkevičius underlined that, amongst such alternative measures, priority should be given to those that contain educational value and those that employ restorative methods. He furthermore stressed the importance devoted to limiting as far as possible the use of measure that entail deprivation of liberty within the CoE recommendations, and the requirement that these measures are proportional.

Consequences at national level for non compliance with the aforementioned requirements are also envisioned in the recommendations, and include the obligation to inform the youth of such available remedies. Finally, the ‘Guidelines of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on child friendly justice’, were approved in 2010 and have since become part of the CoE strategy on children’s rights, and of the programme ‘Building a Europe for and with Children’. The guidelines have been adopted by all member States to the Council of Europe and their application is not limited to criminal justice, covering all three stages before, during and after the trial, but to all the justice proceedings involving children for criminal, civil and administrative law. This broad scope, as was previously mentioned, is crucial to ensure adequate protection to children in contact with the law.

**REMARKS ON DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY AND JUVENILE JUSTICE GLOBAL INITIATIVES**

Mr. Roy started by thanking the audience and the IJJO for the opportunity to speak, as well as for the ‘Juvenile Justice without Borders’ Award attributed to Penal Reform International. Beyond the celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, it is important to look ahead, and define future challenges. Mr. Roy outlined five key issues.

First of all, Restorative Justice: addressing juvenile justice from an international perspective, from PRI’s point of view, means including informal and traditional justice systems within Restorative Justice, not only the formal criminal system that have commonly been at the heart of the discussion. It is important, when dealing with such systems, not to dismiss them a priori, but to integrate their approach with reform and a child’s rights orientation. When this process works, it can be incredibly successful, and presents the advantage of keeping children out of formal penal proceedings. One example is the PRI’s action in Bangladesh, where the organisation worked on the shalis courts system, traditional village-level mediation, and which proved very effective.

The second point is the need of evidence-based policies when dealing with children who have committed serious offenses, such
as rape, murder, or radicalization of youths in terrorism. Evidence in this field, of persisting criminal behavior is evidently insufficient, and PRI is promoting further research, especially concerning the possible consequences of serious criminal behavior in terms of long detention sentences and on the privacy guaranteed to the child who has committed the crime, bearing in mind that public opinion is increasingly becoming part of the process.

The third issue is appropriate disciplinary measures for children who are detained. The interest for this particular question derives from PRI’s battle against solitary confinement being applied to children. In this case, professionals working in the prison setting raised the problem of finding viable alternative disciplinary measures, excluding punishment that can entail physical or psychological damage to a child.

The fourth problem is age. There is a strong need to reflect on the meaning of the 18 years old age limit, and on the vulnerability of the 18 to 24 year old group which, research shows, is even more fragile than the 16 to 18 year old section of the population. These youths need to be included in the discussion, and their specific needs must be addressed more clearly.

The fifth and final issue that Mr. Roy tackled was the question of children’s involvement and participation. We need to diffuse the evidence that was gathered and that shows how mentoring programmes and peer-groups programmes that feature presentations and speeches by ex-young offenders are much more effective in involving children in the same situation and communicating with them.
Fabrice Crégut

Juvenile Justice Coordinator, Terre des Hommes

Mr. Crégut began by introducing the work of Terre des Hommes, a Swiss non-profit organisation set up in the 1960s with the aim of protecting children’s rights, that focuses especially on protection and health, and is active in more than 36 countries. Terre des Hommes is also part of a federation of bodies, all known as Terre des Hommes, which operate in more than 60 countries. The foundation in Lausanne, in particular, tackles juvenile justice in various projects, implemented in 18 countries.

After thanking the IJJO for the invitation, he recalled another important event in the near future, the World Congress for Juvenile Justice, organised by Terre des Hommes that will take place in Geneva in January 2015. He observed that international events such as the IJJO Conference, dealing with technical, evidence-based policies to address youth crime without deprivation of liberty, help to create a connection between the experts and those policy makers that face security issues, but are too often confronted with the short-term approach of the political arena. Mr. Crégut stated that studies show that detention has negative effects on the lives of children, and for this reason Terre des Hommes has decided to focus on juvenile justice in the future world congress, devoting particular attention to the exchange between civil society organisations in order to favour the application of a child’s rights’ approach to justice systems. The Congress will deal with five core themes: international standards; practices to deal with violence; lessons learned through reforms of the legislative frameworks; good practices related to the implementation of judicial decisions; regional and international cooperation between States.

This last subject will be addressed in specific workshops on the second day of the Congress. Participating countries have been selected to represent the considerable variety of existing juvenile systems, and to give the opportunity to experts to illustrate different methods of reforms, in order to fight the perception that the battle for children’s rights is a prerogative of western countries. Mr. Crégut also recalled that international events such as the IJJO International Conference, and Terre des Hommes’ World Congress are complementary in fostering awareness and good practices’ diffusion, and the results of both will be shared with the participants to the UN Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, that will be held in Qatar in 2015. It is essential to recall that different initiatives complement each other, and all are necessary to maintain the attention on the rights of children in juvenile justice, a goal that is far from being achieved, considering the recurring waves of repressive approaches that tend to prevail, including in more developed countries.

Finally, the activity of the inter-agency panel on juvenile justice was mentioned. Created following a resolution of the ECOSOC to gather organisations that deal with the issue, the panel aimed to foster further cooperation between them and in the activities of assistance that they provide to their States, but is now facing a deep crisis that culminated in the elimination of its secretariat for lack of funding. The challenge for the organisations that take part in the panel, such as the IJJO, Terre des Hommes, UNODC, UNICEF, Defence for Children International and many others, is now to rebuild a network of actors capable of providing the aforementioned technical assistance to States. The reconstruction process will take part in the course of the next year, and, to succeed, needs to stress the value of the global initiatives that necessarily make our organisations partners, beyond single actions. Amongst such global initiatives, Mr. Crégut recalled the need for an international study on children deprived of their liberty, the advocacy for the ratification of international standards, in particular the additional protocol n. 3 to the
Convention on the Rights of the Child, as well as regional initiatives, such as the implementation of the recommendations of the Council of Europe.

LOOKING AHEAD: MILESTONES FOR EFFECTIVENESS OF DIVERSION AND ALTERNATIVES

Manuel-Jesús Dolz Lago  
Public Prosecutor, Supreme Court of Spain

Mr. Dolz started by thanking Dr. Francisco Legaz Cervantes, Chairman of the IJJO, and recalled that he was recently awarded the Cross of San Raimundo de Peñafort by the Spanish Government, the highest possible distinction in the field of justice.

He underlined the importance of art. 37.b of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and of the fight against deprivation of liberty of young offenders. Retribution and traditional methods of punishment, that prevail within the formal criminal justice systems, are not responsive to the broader necessities of a young person who is in conflict with the law, and therefore have proved far less effective than an educational approach to address anti-social behavior. Re-education can and should be carried out without resorting to detention. Deprivation of liberty can be necessary, but only in a very limited number of cases related to serious offenses, and should always be considered a last resort. Even in this case, though, detention must be adapted to the individual circumstances and needs of the individual, and paired with the overarching objective of reintegration. These principles are also at the heart of the international standards that have been universally ratified and whose implementation is essential to respect the best interest of the child.

The best interest of the child, despite being accused of being a vague and indefinite concept, must be at the core of juvenile justice systems, and in this sense, the general Comment n. 14 of the Committee on the Rights of Children, issued in 2013, is a very significant step towards better defining this concept, and possibly towards its better integration into national legislation.

To explain this process, Mr. Dolz analysed and illustrated the way that the principle is interpreted in Spanish legislation, where it gains a threefold meaning. First, as a general interpretative principle that can be invoked by the young person, his or her legal representatives, and the institutions that are in charge of the child’s protection, to make sure that the child is always treated as subject of rights in the course of a trial. Secondly, at the stage of adjudication, the judges will have to justify their decisions, and the measures they adopt on the basis of the child’s best interest. Finally, Mr. Dolz recalled the importance of a multi-disciplinary approach, and therefore the participation of different experts to the trial, to assess the needs of a child taking into account the psychological and social dimension of his or her well-being.

Then, Mr. Dolz spoke most specifically of how measures that entail deprivation of liberty are provided for in Spain. He mentioned that deprivation of liberty consists of two steps, a first period in closed, semi-closed or therapeutic institution, and a second period of surveyed liberty. This reminds us that reintegration into society is a gradual process, and, more importantly, that it should comprehensively address the risk factors that the young person faces. Therefore, alternative measures should include prevention, and special attention to the poorer, more fragile sectors of our society.
Frieder Dünkel  
**Criminology Professor, University of Greifswald, President-Elect of the European Society of Criminology**

Professor Dünkel started by analyzing the meaning of juvenile justice, and calling for a broader scope of the term, in order to officially include young adults.

Considering young people between the age of 18 and 21 as part of the target of juvenile justice policies is indeed common practice in more than one State, a choice supported by scientific evidence that the human brain keeps developing until the age of 25 years old. Nonetheless, too often the demarcation of the 18th year of age is the determinant of a strong divide between juvenile and adults’ systems. In a context where policies addressed to juveniles are often driven by other rationales than empirical evidence, and more linked to political necessities, the example of the Netherlands, which extended the scope of juvenile justice to young adults up to 23 years of age, proves to be a significant change.

Secondly, deprivation of liberty is an issue that deserves more attention, and, in particular, further empirical data. Evidence, nonetheless, cannot be collected properly if there is no agreement on the definition of deprivation of liberty. Are measures such as monitoring, house arrest or open institutions to be considered as deprivations of liberty? The issue must be clarified to gain more scientific precision and evidence as a basis for political reform. The issue must be clarified to gain more scientific precision and evidence as a basis for political reform. Yet, financial constraints still prove a difficult obstacle to overcome in order to put in place significant, often meaning long-term research.

Then, Professor Dünkel addressed the meaning of the ‘good-practice’ definition. Despite the relevance that is normally attributed to good-practices diffusion, he argued, unsuccessful experiences prove as interesting as successful ones. Indeed, they have as much to say about what measures are effective, and what methods require change. Demonstrating failure to erase bad practice may be difficult scientifically, but remains equally important. Finally, speaking about the importance of recommendations and international standards, he called for more independent evaluation mechanisms, to ascertain whether implementation is carried out, and, more importantly, how, rather than only collecting reports from governmental sources. In this sense, mentioning the point that Mr. Roy made on serious offenders, he underlined the significance of good rehabilitation programmes that are carried out in detention settings, and highlighted the need to keep investing in them.

**PRESENTATION OF ECJJ MEMBERS’ INITIATIVES**

This session consisted of different interventions of some ECJJ members to present their latest initiatives, projects and research, as well as priorities and agenda, informally.

With the core objective of encouraging mutual learning and information exchange, the session saw the contributions of Ms. Anda Smiltena, who presented an overview of the situation of juvenile justice in Latvia; Ms. Dagmar Doubravová, who introduced the most important initiatives of the Rubikon Centrum, in Czech Republic, since 2005; Mr. Neve Rijciaš, who shared the results of the first nationwide study on Juvenile Probation in Croatia. Later on, Ms. Erika Varadi presented significant projects that in the last four years have addressed crime prevention in Hungary; Mr. Ruairi Gogan highlighted the interesting results of a study on prolific young offenders and their links to criminal networks, and, finally, Mr. Ton Liefaard presented research addressing deprivation of liberty issues, commissioned by the Council of Europe.
Dr. Legaz Cervantes, the IJJO Chairman, started by welcoming all the participants to the 2nd day of the Fourth Meeting of the European Council for Juvenile Justice. He thanked his co-panelists: Ms. Gengoux, representative of the Belgium Ministry of Justice, for her engagement with the IJJO’s activities and for hosting this event, and Mr. Verboven, representative of the European Economic and Social Committee, for his interest and support for this meeting.

Similarly, he expressed his gratitude to all of official members of the European Council for Juvenile Justice who were present, for taking part in the Meeting and in particular for the keen interest and enthusiasm they had demonstrated since 2009 when the IJJO conceived the foundations of this network.

He thanked the representatives of the several European institutions that presented their policy agendas on juvenile justice the day before, for believing and relying on the IJJO mission. Finally, he recalled the IJJO will to act on the basis of a global strategy, whilst growing closer to national and regional realities, and hence the significance and the role of the regional councils.

Ms. Gengoux then took the floor, speaking both as an official member of the ECJJ, and as a representative of the Belgian Ministry of Justice. She presented the longstanding collaboration between the IJJO and the Ministry of Justice, and emphasized how the support from the Ministry originates in the shared values with the ECJJ, and in the belief that its work represents a real asset to improve the functioning of juvenile justice systems around Europe, and build a European approach to the theme. She also recalled the support of the Belgian Ministry for the upcoming conference on the best interest of the child, organised by the Council of Europe on the 25th Anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.
Mr. Jatkevičius introduced himself as a new member of the ECJJ, and explained his interest in juvenile justice began with his master thesis, and then his involvement in civil society organisations, up to his engagement within the Council of Europe, and the Council for penological Co-operation, dealing especially with the issues of imprisonment and probation. He then presented his work on Lithuania, where he is part of the of the penal and administrative law unit in the Parliament as a scientific expert. Finally, Mr. Jatkevičius recalled the importance of supporting the implementation of international standards, and, in particular, of the recommendations of the Council of Europe. In this light, he introduced the recent initiative on Violence in Juvenile Institutions, which is at the heart of the CoE’s work on the rights of the child at the moment, with a paper being presented and discussed in one of the Committees, and which may become a recommendation in the near future.

Following the opening session, Mr. Cédric Foussard took the floor and thanked the members of the European Council for Juvenile Justice for their presence. Moreover, he emphasized how important it is for the enhancement of Juvenile Justice systems in Europe, that the representatives of 28 EU Member States accepted the invitation to the conference and brought their expertise to the gathering.

After briefly describing the activities and the history of the International Juvenile Justice Observatory, which conducts its advocacy work through the North American Council for Juvenile Justice (NACJJ), Latin American Council for Juvenile Justice (LCJJ), Asia-Pacific Council for Juvenile Justice (APCJJ), African Council for Juvenile Justice (ACJJ) and European Council for Juvenile Justice, Mr. Foussard focused on the work of the latter.

The European Council for Juvenile Justice was established in 2009 and represents a unique network bridging the gap between juvenile justice stakeholders and working ceaselessly for juvenile justice without borders. Mr. Foussard reminded the audience that the Council consists of more than 80 experts and presented the three sections emphasizing the richness of the Council: the NGO section, the Public Administration section and the Academic section.
Mr. Foussard underlined that the European Council for Juvenile Justice has initially met by section, and has since moved on to a more open structure of meeting, to favour better communication and increased exchanges between specialists of different fields. The First Meeting of the European Council for Juvenile Justice was held under the aegis of the French Ministry of Justice in Paris in December 2009. The Second Meeting of the European Council for Juvenile Justice was held in Rome, under the auspices of the Italian Ministry of Justice and with the support of the European Institutions, on November 11th, 2010. The Third Meeting ‘Investing in Children: Ensuring effective and efficient youth justice systems in time of crises’ was held in London in November 2012.

Mr. Foussard concluded his presentation by once again expressing his gratitude to all ECJJ participants for their attendance; he hoped for a productive 4th ECJJ Meeting that would pave the way to effectively improve the alarming situation faced by young people in conflict with the law throughout Europe.

Adélaïde Vanhove
Policy Officer on European Affairs, IJJO

Ms. Adélaïde Vanhove complemented the previous presentation of the ECJJ’s work, focusing on the main achievements of the ECJJ meetings and noted that after the Second Meeting of the ECJJ in 2010 in Rome, three Green Papers on Child-Friendly Justice were produced, published and presented to the relevant institutions and stakeholders. Later on, in the framework of the London Meeting, the ECJJ worked on the White Paper, drafted by Ms. Marianne Moore, published in 2013, which explored how the current economic and social setbacks in Europe have affected youth justice policy and practice. It presents a range of solutions, which promote a child-rights approach to youth justice. It was also mentioned that the White Paper relies on the input provided by the ECJJ members, as well as on the opinions of young European citizens who have been or are in contact with the law. Ms. Vanhove also added that the main purpose behind the White Paper was to provide guidelines to policy-makers and civil society stakeholders and clearly identify drivers that will provide a more efficient justice system. As such, the full potential of young people in each country can be fulfilled.

Ms. Vanhove reminded the ECJJ members of the communication tools that have been developed to favour the work of the Council. First of all, the ECJJ webpage, which helped to facilitate the promotion of ECJJ, its work and the activities of its members. This collective instrument allowed the IJJO to keep the ECJJ members up to date on European matters and initiatives developed by the IJJO on a more regular basis. Then, the extranet, a collaborative workspace, which offers the opportunity to share and exchange news, information and documents between the ECJJ members was also mentioned by Ms. Vanhove.

After discussing communication, Ms. Vanhove, in the last part of her presentation, introduced the International School for Juvenile Justice (ISJJ). Ms. Vanhove thoroughly described the main idea behind the ISJJ. It can be perceived as a ‘virtual school without borders’, established in order to train juvenile justice professionals, such as judges, lawyers, prosecutors, etc. It is worth emphasizing that ISJJ disseminates information and knowledge about the newest and the most relevant juvenile justice policies not only in Europe, but in the whole world.

Moreover, Ms. Vanhove mentioned that in 2013 the online course of ISJJ - ‘Juvenile Justice within Europe from an International Perspective’, was
available for all ECJJ members and accessible to all IJJO collaborators. The course was led by Professor Ton Liefaard, who holds the UNICEF Chair in Children's Rights at the University of Leiden in the Netherlands, and was designed to demonstrate all aspects of juvenile justice system in Europe, with the particular focus on the implementation of International Human Rights standards for young people in conflict with the law at the domestic level.

CONSULTATION ON THE JUVENILE JUSTICE RESEARCH

Cristina Goñi  
Secretary General, IJJO

Ms. Goñi started by recalling that, in consideration of the presence of some new members, who have only recently joined the ECJJ, it was important to provide a brief overview of the development and activities of the ECJJ. She also underlined the international evolution of the juvenile justice theme: since the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child there have been many international, regional and United Nations instruments adopted in the field of boys and girls involved in the cycles of violence, conflict and crime, with some remarkable examples being general comments 10 on children's rights in juvenile justice, 12 on the right of the child to be heard, 13 on the right of the child to freedom from all forms of violence, and 14 on the child's best interest. Regional institutions are giving more relevance to the issue of children in conflict with the law and are publishing regional guidelines in Latin America, as the Organisation of American States and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the ASEAN, or the excellent work of the African Child Policy Forum and CDI with the Moñuno declaration and the African child friendly justice guidelines. The IJJO and its regional councils have been involved in or are leading these processes. However, Europe is the region providing the most in terms of quantity and perhaps the best in terms of quality, if quality means specific and concrete guidelines to protect children rights during the whole criminal process. But, despite the number and specialization of these instruments, the desired effect has not been achieved. What are the reasons for this lack of consistency between policy and practice? The IJJO invests effort into analyzing progress made as well as challenges and milestones that will improve the effectiveness of public policies to protect the rights of those boys and girls involved in the cycles of violence and crime.

In this framework, she moved on to introduce the Research on Juvenile Restorative Justice in Europe. First of all, she outlined the previous activities of the IJJO on the theme of restorative justice, which ranged from the involvement in European projects and studies, to the activities of technical assistance that the IJJO provides to governments in the Latin America region and Asia. In these contexts the IJJO always makes an effort to diffuse restorative principles and a restorative approach to juvenile justice. While Europe remains an important reference point to further diffuse these values, the IJJO staff have progressively realized the lack of a common European framework and approach to restorative practices.

This awareness lies behind the birth of the project on the ‘European Research on Restorative Juvenile Justice’. Ms. Goñi then introduced the three main outcomes of the research: the 28 snapshots, an overview of the regional situation of restorative practice; the European Model; and the Toolkit, dedicated
to making the Model an operational tool for professionals. Both the Model and the Toolkit will be translated and made available in 5 European languages. Finally, Ms. Goñi introduced the research team and left them the floor for a presentation of the different components of the study.

PRESENTATION OF THE ‘RESEARCH AND SELECTION OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE JUVENILE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PRACTICES IN EUROPE: SNAPSHOTS FROM 28 EU MEMBER STATES’

Andrea Parosanu
Legal Researcher, University of Greifswald

Ms. Parosanu started by briefly introducing the content of the snapshots. The overall objective of this publication is to provide an overview of the development of different restorative practices in the different EU countries, devoting particular attention to good practices. In order to do so, the study analyses both the legislative and institutional framework, and the practical measures of restorative justice implementation. First of all, the researchers looked at what forms of restorative practices exist in the country, and evaluated their quality. They then took into account the legislative framework, and how restorative justice is included in the criminal system, as well as the organisational structure, meaning which agencies and services are responsible for delivering the restorative measures and the status of mediators or facilitators (volunteers, full time professionals).

Also, it was considered whether the restorative programmes are developed nationally, regionally, or merely locally. Furthermore, the study will provide an evaluation of the trends in the use of restorative practices, evaluating whether it is expanding or declining.

Finally, Ms. Parosanu explained that the evaluation of these practices has been devoted considerable attention, and whether the effects on recidivism are taken into account and how they can be proved. This element, together with an analysis of future challenges and crucial obstacles to the further development of restorative justice, will conclude the publications. She then introduced her colleague, Professor Dünkel, to share some of the initial results.

Frieder Dünkel
Criminology Professor, University of Greifswald, President-Elect of the ESC.

Prof. Dünkel began his presentation with the project ‘Restorative Justice in Penal Matters in Europe’. The project began on the 1st of July 2011 and finished on the 31st of December 2014. Prof. Dünkel emphasized that the ultimate goal of the project was the comparison of restorative justice measures and processes/procedures in 36 countries and jurisdictions (28 EU Member States + Ukraine, Russia, Turkey, Serbia, Switzerland, Macedonia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina). Moreover, there was a need to evaluate Restorative Justice procedures and measures in order to elaborate recommendations for further developing Restorative Justice in the context in other countries.
To provide a framework for understanding the concept of Restorative Justice and what should be done for its successful implementation, Prof. Dünkel presented several definitions of Restorative Justice, which, in his opinion, are the most relevant. In addition, he stressed, that elements of Restorative Justice can also be a part of the traditional justice system which partly transfers the classic penal philosophy. Those elements, according to him, are mediation, reparation, and restitution as diversionary measures or non-custodial sentences. Moreover, Restorative Justice, according to him, can be an additional part of custodial or non-custodial sentences and even of conditional release from prison.

After briefly describing the roots of Restorative Justice and its main goals, Prof. Dünkel presented international standards on dealing with juvenile offenders. Basically, every international standard, would it be the standards adopted by ECOSOC or Directives of European Parliament, stipulates that mediation shall be considered as an essential part at any stage of the process. Furthermore, it should be ensured that priority is given to sanctions and measures that may have an educational impact on the young offender, rather than punitive. Hereafter, Prof. Dünkel shared with the audience forms of Restorative Justice and Practice in Europe. The first and most common practice presented by the Professor was Victim Offender Mediation (VOM) / Reconciliation. He described this process as the resolution of the conflict between victim and offender with the help of a mediator. According to the study this practice is implemented nationwide in all studied countries, in particular in Germany, Austria, Finland, Denmark, Belgium, Netherlands, and Norway. In many countries. VOM is one of many means for fulfilling preconditions for diversion or sentence mitigation. It is worth mentioning that Victim Offender Mediation is usually conducted by NGOs, Probation Services and Social Services and the mediators are usually trained professionals, probation and social workers. The survey showed that victim-oriented mediation is the most common in countries such as Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Finland, Sweden. This process is not necessarily directly linked to the criminal procedure, but in cases it regularly guarantees benefits of diversion or mitigation for offenders, whereby offender orientation is often limited to certain types of offences (sometimes offences that can attract custodial sentences of up to 3 or sometimes 5 years).

The second most common practice, mentioned by Prof. Dünkel was conferencing – a process that involves a large number of participants and actors (family members, relatives, friends and representatives of the local community). The survey showed that conferencing demonstrates high levels of participant satisfaction and promising reoffending rates, most prominently in Northern Ireland. Unfortunately, this practice is implemented only in 12 out of 36 studied countries. Professor Dünkel indicated that the study also showed that conferencing is mostly limited to localized projects in the field of Juvenile Justice (Austria, Germany, Hungary, Ukraine, Latvia, Poland, Scotland, Netherlands), and applied on the national level only in Northern Ireland, Belgium, England/Wales, and Ireland. Finally, Professor underlined that conferencing is a viable option for cases of more serious offending, and could be a means for expanding the use of Restorative Processes beyond the current concentration in the sphere of diverting less serious offending from the formal criminal procedure.

Reparation independent of restorative processes takes place in 32 countries, subject of the analysis. Professor Dünkel emphasized that this practice seeks to affect the delivery of reparation by offenders to victims of crimes, or to take such reparation by the offender into account in the criminal procedure. It was also mentioned that there exist specific reparative court measures, like “Reparation Orders” in the UK, or certain “educational measures” or “special obligations” that require the making of apologies or non-financial reparation to victims. The most common manifestation of reparation-oriented practices outside of
restorative processes lies in special provisions of substantive and procedural criminal law that provide for court diversion or sentence mitigation in the event of effective repentance.

Professor Dünkel spoke about community service, which is predominantly used as an alternative to custodial sentences/fines for cases within a specified severity threshold or educational measures in the context of juvenile justice as a condition for diversion from prosecution or court punishment. This practice is common in 31 studied countries.

Hereafter, Prof. Dünkel enumerated the stages of the criminal procedure at which Restorative Justice is available. In his opinion, delivery of reparation or successful restorative process can be the solid ground for/condition of pre-court diversion, court diversion, court sanctions with restorative character (including community service) and Restorative Justice as a ground for sentence mitigation. The Professor also mentioned that Restorative Justice can be used in prison settings. In particular, Rule 56.2 of the European Prison Rules states that 'whenever possible, prison authorities shall use mechanisms of restoration and mediation to resolve disputes with and among prisoners.' He stated that usage of Restorative Justice in prisons is a potentially promising strategy for early release programmes, rehabilitation programmes, as conditions to be met when released on probation and as means of resolving conflicts within prisons. The practice of utilisation of Restorative Justice in prisons is available only in individual institutions as pilot projects (England/Wales, Bulgaria, France, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Scotland, Switzerland, Ukraine); but nationwide in Belgium. He also specified that in Poland, Portugal, Croatia, Germany legislative provision is made for Restorative Justice in prisons, however these are largely defunct in practice as no sufficient services are provided.

Finally, Professor Dünkel proceeded to the findings of the survey - use of Restorative Justice in practice in 36 European countries. The most remarkable statistical examples were presented: in Norway about two thousand young offenders are referred to VOM each year and in Finland 4,311 juvenile offenders referred to VOM in 2011, whilst in Austria, Slovenia and
Hungary the number of juveniles referred to victim-offender mediation is declining. Other European countries as Bulgaria, Ukraine and Poland also showed modest results. In Bulgaria 2% of all court measures for juveniles involve Restorative Justice; in Ukraine: 364 referrals of juveniles 2004-2011; Poland: 200-300 per year. Consequently, Professor Dünkel gave his explanation for the low use of Restorative Justice in practice. First and foremost, lack of will among judicial gatekeepers to use it, usually due to distrust of the legitimacy of mediators as deliverers of justice, secondly, the availability of other diversionary options more in line with traditional understanding of appropriate intervention; thirdly, strict application of the principle of legality; fourthly, insufficient knowledge about the benefits of Restorative Justice (among legislators, politicians, judicial gatekeepers and the general public); finally, a lack of will among legislators and politicians (in turn connected to issues of poor/lack of statutory basis or funding).

In the last part of his presentation, Prof. Dünkel gave the general evaluation of Restorative Justice. The study showed that the implementation of Victim-Offender Mediation leads to high rates of satisfaction among victims and offenders who have participated in restorative processes. Moreover, so-called meta-analyses revealed that restorative justice programmes (VOM and conferencing) in terms of effectiveness achieved higher rates of satisfaction among both victims and offenders than traditional criminal justice responses, including perceptions of fairness. Restorative practices are often associated with promising effects on recidivism, as evidenced by a growing pool of research results. To conclude his presentation, the Professor stressed that restorative justice is a promising and desirable strategy that achieves the best outcomes when restorative processes are involved.

PRESENTATION OF THE ‘EUROPEAN MODEL FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE WITH JUVENILES’ AND TOOLKIT FOR PROFESSIONALS

Tim Chapman
Course Director of the Restorative Practices Masters at Ulster University, Northern Ireland

Prof. Chapman welcomed the ECJJ members and other stakeholders for the second roundtable of the 4th ECJJ Meeting and kindly introduced the members of his panel - Ms. Maija Gellin, Programme Director of Mediation in Education in Finish Forum for Mediation, and Ms. Monique Anderson, Academic expert in Restorative Justice and Victimology in Leuven Institute of Criminology.

Prof. Chapman then presented the ‘European Model for Restorative Justice with Children and Young People’. Prof. Chapman first emphasized that the practice of Restorative Justice is very limited in most European countries and in some countries does not exist at all, and therefore there exists a need for case studies in the countries which have already passed a law implementing mediation or conferences in their youth justice system. Belgium, Finland and Northern Ireland were chosen for this research, as each of them has at least 8 years of experience of restorative justice with juveniles. He also recalled that this kind of study would not be possible without the Operating Grant 2014 (JUST/2014/JCOO-JACC/OG), provided by the Justice Programme of the European Union. After giving these details, Prof.
Chapman underlined that the main objective of the project was not to analyse and compare how the practice of restorative justice is conducted in these countries, but to elaborate a set of recommendations for the countries wishing to implement the restorative justice system taking into consideration the practices of Belgium, Northern Ireland and Finland.

Prof. Chapman moved on to describe more thoroughly the other essential feature of the Model: the key values of the European Restorative Justice tradition. According to him, the European Model should be based primarily on the commitment to children’s rights. Moreover, such Articles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child as Article 3, Article 12 and Article 19 were particularly emphasized, as they ensure that the restorative justice process is conducted in the best interests of the child, facilitate the right of the child to be heard, and protect the child from harm. Prof. Chapman also mentioned that the Victims of Crime Directive should be at the core of European Model, as it strengthens the right to information, support and protects victims of the crime and their families and expects the EU Member States to guarantee proper training of professionals taking into consideration the interests of the victims.

Hereafter, Prof. Chapman explained why the European Model should be strongly oriented towards a welfare approach. The findings produced by the study demonstrate that the punishment of the young offenders is usually a result of fear of crime. That is, the policymakers believe that the punishment of young offenders and taking them into custody will protect the public from the crime. The media also plays a crucial role, usually reporting isolated crime stories committed by young people and fostering the perception among the general public that there is a need for deterring and isolating young offenders. However, Prof. Chapman shared with the audience that there is increasing evidence of the contrary: a more welfare oriented approach, based on reintegration of young offenders, diversion measures and the participation of the general public, is more likely to protect society from juvenile delinquency and prevent recidivism.

Finally, in order to show how the practice of restorative justice of young offenders is conducted in Belgium and to demonstrate the key factors that make it effective, Prof. Chapman gave the floor to Ms. Monique Anderson, Academic Expert in Restorative Justice and Victimology in Leuven Institute of Criminology.

Monique Anderson  
**Academic Expert in Restorative Justice and Victimology in Leuven Institute of Criminology.**

Ms. Anderson began her presentation by mentioning that, in terms of implementing restorative justice, Belgium is an interesting case - it was the first among all European civil law countries to introduce the practice of restorative justice into the system of juvenile justice. Moreover, it is regarded as having one of the most welfare oriented juvenile justice systems in the world. Ms. Anderson emphasized that the Belgian youth justice system deals not only with young offenders, but also with young victims of crime and young people with welfare needs. That is to say, that both young victims and young offenders are responded to in a similar way though the framework of welfare and care, rather than deterring and detention. Therefore, the youth justice system is separate from the criminal justice system.
Hereafter, Ms. Anderson identified the main elements of the concept of restorative justice in Belgium as: community service, ‘written project’, mediation and conferencing. The latter are available to young offenders in each judicial district of Belgium. Ms. Anderson also emphasized the importance of distinguishing conferencing from mediation, whereby mediation processes result in the conclusion of an agreement between parties of the conflict, conferencing results in the conclusion of an ‘agreement and declaration of intent’. Ms. Anderson explained that the declaration usually includes elements concerning the compensation to the victim, reparation to society and the guidance towards elimination of the violent behaviour.

In the second part of her presentation, Ms. Anderson stated that once the Restorative Justice process has begun, the case would be transferred to the publically funded NGO, which would be responsible for conducting the restorative process. The restorative process can only be initiated if both parties of the conflict voluntary agree to participate.

Ms. Anderson also reminded the ECJJ members that the voluntary participation, along with confidentiality and the neutrality of the mediator, are the main pillars of the restorative process. Trained professionals are the crucial elements for the successful mediation process between conflicting parties, however, as it was indicated by Ms. Anderson, in Leuven there is one mediation service that engages trained professionals in the mediations processes. Hereafter, Ms. Anderson indicated that, usually, judges are informed about the results of the mediation and conferencing process, but the further details of the restorative justice process remain confidential.

An NGO is usually responsible for supervising the agreement between two parties of the conflict and to report the details of its fulfillment to the youth judge or public prosecutor. If the agreement has been fulfilled, the youth judge has the opportunity to mitigate for this during their final decision, however in cases where the restorative process does not meet the need of the juvenile offender, the court can utilize other measures. Ms. Anderson underlined that the processes of conferencing and mediation are usually underestimated and underused. As she indicated, the research conducted in Flanders showed that the mediation process usually has a positive effect on the restorative justice process, as it leads to the satisfaction of the needs of both victim and offender: acceptance of apology and reparation of damage.

Ms. Aderson concluded her presentation by stating that Belgium has one of the most solid systems of Restorative Justice for juveniles, based on conferencing and mediation. However, what is obvious, in her opinion, is the need to improve the participation of victims in the process. Furthermore, it is crucial that the mediators and NGOs are more assertive in spreading the information about restorative justice to the general public and policy makers, as there is still lack of knowledge about restorative justice, which prevents people from engaging in the process.

Maija Gellin
Programme Director of Mediation in Education, Finnish Forum for Mediation

To illustrate how the Finnish system of Restorative Justice is built, Ms. Maija Gellin took the floor. She first indicated that the main feature of the restorative justice system in Finland is victim-offender mediation that is used at the different levels of society - from kindergarten, through families and neighbourhoods, to the
involvement of police and courts. Regarding the restorative process for juveniles, mediation gives a possibility to the parties of the conflict to be heard, meet in a safe environment and to reach an agreement.

After briefly addressing the restorative process in Finland as a whole, Ms. Gellin focused her attention on mediation in the field of education, especially in kindergartens and schools. Ms. Gellin stressed that school mediation is essential for children, as they can learn not only how to resolve and handle conflict, but may also gain awareness of their right to access to justice and their right to be heard. Such a participatory approach also gives an opportunity for children to learn about democracy, conflict resolution, and responsibility for their own lives. Ms. Gellin highlighted that in order for such a participatory approach to take place, school staff should be trained and mediators should be involved. According to the latest research conducted by the University of Lappland in 2011, as Ms. Gellin indicated, the schools increased their social capital with the help of restorative approaches: 95% of cases referred to mediation resulted in a lasting agreement. Moreover, 87% of the parties of the conflict stated that during the mediation they had a chance to be heard. It is worth emphasizing that the process of mediation also prevents further escalation of the conflict, as well as further victimization and stigmatization of the parties.

Eventually, Ms. Gellin proceeded to the practice of neighbourhood mediation in Finland. She indicated that the KOTILO-project was elaborated in order to ensure the peaceful co-existence between the residents of one neighbourhood, in particular in suburban areas with a large number of immigrants and Finns. The methods of neighbourhood mediation include conflict prevention work, mediation, advisory work and education. Furthermore, volunteers are trained in order to prevent conflict and conduct mediation practices.
In the last part of her presentation Ms. Gellin thoroughly described victim-offender mediation in Finland. The law on mediating criminal cases was implemented in June 2006 and stipulates that mediation is a free of charge process, where two parties can meet in order to resolve the dispute with the presence of an impartial mediator. According to Ms. Gellin the process of mediation is a real benefit for two parties of the conflict, as it helps to prevent reoffending and gives the sense of appeasement to the victim, as well as to the offender. Therefore, Ms. Gellin called for the application of this method in more serious cases such as family violence, in order to help the victim to cope with psychological consequences of violence.

In Finland, the process of mediation can be requested either by one of the parties to the conflict, by legal representative of a young offender or victim, police or prosecuting authority. However, the practice shows that most cases are requested by the authorities. In cases of domestic violence, the process of mediation is initiated by the police. The mediators make an assessment of the case, decide whether the mediation can be applied and develop recommendations for the parties of conflict. Eventually, the mediation takes place only between the parties who voluntary express their will for the mediation process to be initiated. Once initiated, the process of mediation can result in various types of agreements, specifically monetary compensation or compensation in the form of work. If the parties reach reconciliation, they have to sign an agreement authenticated by the mediators.

In the last part of her presentation Ms. Gellin thoroughly described victim-offender mediation in Finland. The law on mediating criminal cases was implemented in June 2006 and stipulates that mediation is a free of charge process, where two parties can meet in order to resolve the dispute with the presence of an impartial mediator. According to Ms. Gellin the process of mediation is a real benefit for two parties of the conflict, as it helps to prevent reoffending and gives the sense of appeasement to the victim, as well as to the offender. Therefore, Ms. Gellin called for the application of this method in more serious cases such as family violence, in order to help the victim to cope with psychological consequences of violence.

In Finland, the process of mediation can be requested either by one of the parties to the conflict, by legal representative of a young offender or victim, police or prosecuting authority. However, the practice shows that most cases are requested by the authorities. In cases of domestic violence, the process of mediation is initiated by the police. The mediators make an assessment of the case, decide whether the mediation can be applied and develop recommendations for the parties of conflict. Eventually, the mediation takes place only between the parties who voluntary express their will for the mediation process to be initiated. Once initiated, the process of mediation can result in various types of agreements, specifically monetary compensation or compensation in the form of work. If the parties reach reconciliation, they have to sign an agreement authenticated by the mediators.

Finally, Ms. Gellin called for more cooperation in order to spread the knowledge about restorative justice and change the mindset and attitudes of the general public to the process.

**Tim Chapman**

*Course Director of the Restorative Practices Masters at Ulster University, Northern Ireland*

Prof. Chapman first thanked Ms. Anderson and Ms. Gellin for their thorough presentations and proceeded to introduce the system of Restorative Justice in Northern Ireland. He underlined that the most remarkable feature of the system are youth conferences, which are fully integrated into the criminal justice system. Moreover, the community based restorative justice sector engages not only young offenders, but also their families, which results in the reduction of crime tools and prevents re-offending.

The Justice (Northern Ireland) Act adopted in 2002 delegated the power to the Public Prosecution Service to organise youth conferences for youngsters charged with criminal offences. Those juveniles are cautioned by police and are referred for a diversionary youth conference only in case of repeated offending. Such conferences avoid court prosecutions and result in agreements of reparation. If the young offenders do not comply with the agreement of the conference, they are likely to be prosecuted for the original offense in the Youth Court. It is worth emphasizing that the opportunity of a youth conference is offered to all young offenders and they can attend it on a voluntary basis. Prof. Chapman also explained that the conference can take place notwithstanding the presence of the victim of the crime, although all the efforts are made in order to enable the victim to participate. The young offender has a right to bring a lawyer, however the latter cannot speak
on the behalf of the client, but can ensure that his rights are not violated. Both of the parties of the conflict can bring their supporters. Taking into consideration the nature of the offence, the general public can be invited to the conference in order to express their views on the situation. Prof. Chapman underlined that the main idea behind the youth conference is to guarantee reparation to the victim, and to prevent the juvenile from re-offending. To ensure that the conference runs smoothly, it takes place under the supervision of professionals from Youth Justice Agency (YJA) (e.g. social workers, youth workers, probation officers and teachers). Such professionals usually help the parties to reach an agreement, which can be in the form of written apology, reparation to the victim or/ and community, participation in the specific programmes and treatment for drug or alcohol abuse. If an agreement is reached, the Youth Justice Agency (YJA) ensures that the young offender complies with the conditions and implements the necessary measures if the young offender does not comply. Prof. Chapman also explained that YJA cooperates with the relevant community organisations, which help the young offenders to comply with agreed action plan and to adapt it to the nature of the crime (e.g. if the young offender committed race-based hate crime, he could be sent to a organisation helping ethnic minorities).

It can be inferred that the main idea behind the concept of restorative justice in Northern Ireland is the balance between the need for reparation to the victim and protection of the community on one hand, and the interests of the young offender on the other. Prof. Chapman also emphasized that the Northern Ireland conference model involves three stages: pre-conference, conference and post-conference. In the first stage, the mediator encourages the offender and the victim to participate in the process, guaranteeing their safety, respect and empathy.

In the second stage, the mediator facilitates the story-telling process for both parties to the conflict, engages them in the dialogue, and helps them to express their emotions and reach an agreement on how to repair the harm and avoid re-offending. In the final stage of the process, YJA collaborates with community organisations in order to implement the agreement and to hold young offender accountable for the crime.

During the conference, a police officer narrates the facts of the offence. Afterwards, the young offender is invited to tell his version, whereby the victim is encouraged to ask the questions about the details of the crime. Once all questions are answered, the victim is invited to present his or her version of offence and its
impact. It is worth mentioning, that during the process both parties are encouraged to talk to each other directly, rather than through a mediator. The dialogue continues until the young offender apologizes or the victim is convinced that the offender feels repentance. Prof. Chapman indicated that sometimes, in addition to the apology, the juvenile offender can offer compensation to the victim or offer to make the reparation through unpaid work.

Finally, the mediator takes into account the needs of the young person in order to prevent him or her from recidivism. In this case particular attention should be given to the point of view of the young person, their parents, or other relatives. The parties of the conflict finally agree on the action plan, which is likely to prevent re-offending, give a sense of appeasement to the victim and has a realistic chance of being completed. Such an action plan should be approved by Youth Court. Once approved, the YJA allocates a professional in order to support the juvenile offender, supervise their compliance with the action plan and conduct the rehabilitation and reintegration program.

After briefly describing the process of the youth conference, Prof. Chapman particularly underlined that its success depends on participation and the satisfaction of the parties. Moreover, post-conference support of the young offender is even more crucial than the conference itself. He presented some statistics according to which in Northern Ireland since 2003 there have been over 15,000 youth conferences. The YJA coordinated the conferences with various types of offences: drug offences, disorderly conduct offences, vandalism, damage of property and robbery. It was also indicated that in 2009-2010 victims participated in 74 % of all conferences. Furthermore, victims of the crime were satisfied with the outcome of the conference in 90% of cases. The victim’s satisfaction is crucial for the support of restorative justice and should be sustained and increased.

As a conclusion, Prof. Chapman shared with the audience main elements, observed in the case studies of Belgium, Finland and Northern Ireland, that proved to be necessary in order to establish a robust European Model for Restorative Justice: the importance of participation of the victim, involvement of civil society and local communities; spreading knowledge about restorative justice to general public, thereby engaging their participation and support; respect to main principles of restorative justice - participation, confidentiality and neutrality of the mediator; the significance of high standard training for mediators and conference facilitators; research and evaluation: government and relevant organisations should collect data in order to evaluate the restorative justice process and increase its efficiency.
Ms. Vanhove introduced the importance of the ECJJ Roadmap 2015 – 2017, which includes the plan of activities of the Council for the coming years, divided per line of action: EU Agenda; projects and research; trainings. Each section, and the underpinning priorities, have been designed to be discussed together with the members, and to collect their opinion on whether they are responsive to national and European necessities, as well as their suggestions on other themes that could be of particular interest for the work of the ECJJ. She then left the floor to her colleague for a brief presentation of the selected priorities and of the EU Agenda section of the Roadmap.

Ms. Melotti started by introducing the priority issues that need to be addressed by the ECJJ. First and foremost, the topic of Restorative Justice, which promotes the educational goal over punishment and, building the basis for effective reintegration into society, represents a promising perspective for the ECJJ. Secondly, the theme of access to Justice and Procedural Rights for young offenders, in particular a focus on procedural rights, an issue that is currently at the heart of the EU institutions’ commitments. Finally, the ECJJ roadmap focuses on the protection of children on the move, often victims of trafficking and exploitation, and whose judicial rights are more often endangered. This theme has been selected as a priority at national and local level, in need of further attention by the EU.

Hereafter, Ms. Melotti presented the work of the ECJJ, as follow-up, information diffusion and advocacy, in relation to the EU policy agenda. Starting with the regional scope of the Council of Europe, she underlined the Council’s commitment to the Strategy for the Rights of the Child 2012-2015 and its main objectives, including: the promotion of child-friendly services and systems; the fight against all forms of violence against children; the guarantee of the rights of children in vulnerable situations; and the promotion of child participation.

Then, she moved on to discuss the policy agenda of EU Commission - DG Justice. More precisely the Study: ‘Data on Children in
Judicial Proceedings in EU28’, which had been presented by Ms. Tuite the day before on behalf of the Commission, as part of the EU Agenda on the Rights of the Child. The final outcome, composed of data organised by children and by the country of investigation, as well as 28 national reports and one EU report, covers the involvement of children in judicial proceedings from 2008 to 2011. Moreover, by underlining crucial weaknesses, this study becomes an important tool for the ECJJ research and projects, as it indicates the priorities to make justice systems in Europe more child-friendly.

In the last part of the presentation, Ms. Melotti talked about the Directive on procedural safeguards for children suspected or accused in criminal proceedings elaborated by the European Parliament. In particular, she presented the advocacy work of the IJJO, the position paper that has been prepared, the various consultations with the office of the S&D rapporteur, the collaboration with partner NGOs, and called for strong involvement of the members to support the future work in support of the text through the next phase of the negotiations between the parliament and the Council.

Adélaïde Vanhove
Policy Officer on European Affairs, International Juvenile Justice Observatory

Ms. Vanhove continued by presenting the possible projects and research activities that could be launched by the ECJJ and have been included in the roadmap 2015 – 2017. First, she stressed the implementation of the Juvenile Restorative Justice Model. Notably, she advocated that in order to have a successful Juvenile Restorative Justice Model the following measures should be undertaken: projects at national level for the implementation of the Model and Toolkit for Professionals; creation of capacity building action in collaboration with national administrations; evaluation of the impact of restorative processes on the victims, and fostering the research on previous victimization of young offenders.

Ms. Vanhove also called for research on the effectiveness of procedural rights (right to information/ right to individual assessment/ right to participation to trail/ right to legal assistance). Such research could involve the collection of data at the national level and also identification of main challenges, best practices, and subsequent study visits organised in selected Member States. Furthermore, comparative study between selected Member States could be elaborated.

Finally, Ms. Vanhove called for the initiation of the project, designed to support victims of violence and crime. More precisely, she stressed the need to conduct research concerning specific support to child victims of violence in the justice system. This project could be complemented by a manual collecting best practices of monitoring and safety evaluation in custodial institutions, and a set of recommendations to national stakeholders on how to provide effective protection to children during and after judicial proceedings would be the crucial elements of such project.

Ms. Vanhove moved on to the strategies developed in order to train professionals and to improve international standards that concern juveniles in conflict with the law. Firstly, she introduced to the audience the course that will consist of different thematic modules and be structured around two main training sections: training of trainers and national interdisciplinary workshops on child-friendly justice. Secondly, a new online course of the International School for Juvenile Justice: ‘Juvenile Offenders Detention Alternatives in Europe (JODA)’. The JODA project aims to identify and disseminate good practices on alternatives to detention amongst key national stakeholders. Based on the results of the Manual, the IJJO will make available a specific course on its online platform, the international school for Juvenile
Finally, Ms. Vanhove spoke about the Training Toolkit on Juvenile Restorative Justice. As part of the implementation phase of the ‘Research on Juvenile Restorative Justice’, the ECJJ will promote the use of the Training Toolkit for Professionals, which will be available in 6 EU Languages: English, French, Spanish, Italian, German and Polish. She indicated that the key aim of the training will be to facilitate harmonisation of knowledge and practices. Moreover, to promote a European approach that supports the reintegration goal of restorative practices.

Ms. Vanhove concluded her presentation by inviting the ECJJ members and other stakeholders to open the discussion. First and foremost, she asked the members to share the information about Restorative Justice practice in their respective countries and express their ideas about the reforms deemed necessary for the establishment of a robust ‘European Model for Restorative Justice with Children and Young People’.

The first person to reply to her question was Ms. Joyce Damato. In her opinion, it is crucial that the meeting of European Council for Juvenile Justice takes place every year with every country having a representative/contact person in it.

Ms. Cristina Goñi approved the suggestion of Ms. Joyce Damato, but stated that the reason the meeting takes place only once every two years is the financial constraints of the organisation. She also reminded the audience that initially, at the very beginning of the ECJJ, three representatives from each member state were invited, but due to the lack of financing the number of representatives was reduced to one from each member state. At the same time, she agreed on the importance of meetings to discuss the priorities of the ECJJ, which currently focus on improving the
communication strategy reinforcing all its external and internal tools: the website, the newsletter, the online collaborative workspace. According to Ms. Goñi, a key component of the ECJJ communication is the internet tool: extranet - the documentation center, which allows the ECJJ members to upload documents, share information with each other and gives an opportunity to start the discussions through the block sections. She also indicated that until the day of the meeting the extranet was not used regularly by the members of the ECJJ and therefore, Ms. Goñi encouraged their active participation and engagement in the extranet, as she sees it as the main element of ECJJ communication strategy.

Dagmar Doubravová
Rubikon Centrum- Czech Republic

Ms. Doubravová took the floor and stated that in her opinion the extranet is a really useful tool, which gives a possibility to share experiences and information. She also expressed her appreciation of the newsletter and made a promise to share the good experiences in the domain of juvenile justice in her country.

Avril Calder
President of the International Association of Youth and Family Judges and Magistrates

Ms. Avril Calder agreed with Ms. Doubravová, but indicated that if the members are to become more involved in the extranet they must get into the habit of checking it, because it can be loaded up with a great deal of information and eventually important knowledge or news can just be missed. She also suggested that there should be some kind of indicator that would alert the members that information has been shared in the extranet.

Koulla Yiasouma
Director of Include Youth

Ms. Yiasouma explained that what hampered her use of extranet was the necessity to remember the login and the password. Therefore, she proposed another tool, which was used by Include Youth and appeared to be very successful: Twitter. She explained that posting things on Twitter on the regular basis expands the possibility for public discussions about various issues online, while extranet of ECJJ is limited to the Council’s members.
Ruairi Gogan  
*Principal Officer, Community Programmes Unit, Irish Youth Justice Service*

Mr. Gogan agreed with Ms. Yiasouma and gave the example of the criticism of the EU Council, where all information is also very confidential. He suggested, taking into consideration that the only information that should be confidential in the work of ECJJ is the names of the young offenders and records, the Council, indeed, needs to consider the idea of being much more open and sharing information with the general public. In this case, he believes, the Council would be open to the other views, and especially to the views of children in the system.

Catalin Claudiu Bejan  
*Director General Adjunct of the National Administration of Penitentiaries, Ministry of Justice of Romania*

Mr. Bejan agreed that some social networks can be useful to promote the activities of the Council, but doubted that social networks, such as Facebook or Twitter, can be helpful in the communication between the members of the Council, as some members do not use them often. At the same time, according to him, the meeting of the Council once every two years is insufficient, and he therefore supported the idea of weekly or monthly e-mails with alerts, important projects, strategic documents and information from the other members of the Council. In case of disagreement between the members of the ECJJ, Mr. Bejan advocated the idea of having Skype conferences between the members.

Cristina Goñi  
*Secretary General, IJJO*

Ms. Goñi stated that the IJJO provides a platform for the conferencing and online meeting, which is called Webex. This instrument allows for the online meeting of 50 people at the same time and thus, Ms. Goñi suggested, it provides an important tool to allow for more frequent exchanges within the Council, and may be used to organise the next ECJJ Meeting in the course of the first semester of 2015.
Another question, proposed for the discussion by Ms. Calder, was to evaluate how high up the list juvenile justice sits in the countries of the Members of the ECJJ and future direction for enacting legislation - if there are restorative justice acts in the legislation of their respective countries and what kind of priorities in the domain of restorative justice exist at the national level. However, due to the time constraints it was decided that each representative would share the information about the situation of the youth justice in their countries via e-mail.

Ms. Stando Kawecka added a remark that restorative justice in Europe is an important issue, however, in such countries as Poland, within the juvenile justice system it is important to improve the guaranteeing of procedural safeguards for juveniles. More precisely, the problem is how to incorporate procedural safeguards which create minimum standards in criminal procedure. The juveniles should be guaranteed an impartial tribunal, which is sometimes not possible due to the fact that the Polish Juvenile Justice System is based on the concept that the same judge deals with the juvenile from the first contact, from the first information about the alleged offence till the end of the enforcement of imposed measures. In her opinion such a concept is contradictory to current international standards, which put a lot of emphasis on procedural safeguards typical for criminal procedure. Therefore, every country has its own priority issues in the juvenile justice system, which should be resolved.

Mr. Ricijaš, latest addition to the ECJJ members, stated that the roadmap and the priorities of the ECJJ fully correspond to the national strategy in the field of juvenile justice in Croatia, which was written in compliance with European strategy. Mr. Ricijaš also suggested that, taking into consideration his involvement in the Council for Improving and Supervising the Quality of Implementation of Juvenile Sanctions and Juvenile Proceedings in Croatia, he could be a representative or as it was called by Ms. Damato a ‘focal person’ in the Council.
Avril Calder  
*President of the International Association of Youth and Family Judges and Magistrates*

Ms. Calder thanked all members for their participation and concluded the session by anticipating that the new communication tools, discussed during the meeting would be introduced into the communication strategy of ECJJ. She also suggested the possibility to regularly organise online conferences of the ECJJ in the future.

Cédric Foussard  
*Director of International Affairs, IJJO*

Mr. Cédric Foussard thanked Ms. Calder for moderating the session and expressed his gratitude to the European Economic and Social Council for providing the venue for the conference and passed over to Mr. Xavier Verboven to conclude the meeting.

Xavier Verboven  
*European Economic and Social Committee*

Mr. Xavier Verboven started his speech by pointing out that juvenile delinquency and social exclusion are very important issues nowadays and concern everybody. He stated the youth employment and the situation of young people in conflict with the law also represent an important part of the agenda of European Economic and Social Committee and have been repeatedly discussed with the European Commission. He indicated that European Economic and Social Committee aims to ensure the minimum standards for the young people during the criminal procedure. Therefore, he expressed his gratitude for this possibility to follow a debate on such an important topic.

Francisco Legaz Cervantes  
*Founder and Chairman of the IJJO*

Dr. Francisco Legaz Cervantes concluded the Fourth Meeting of the European Council for Juvenile Justice by first thanking all the members for their presence and indicating the significance of such meetings. He noted that such spirit of collaboration as the one present during the meeting will result in a positive future for the juvenile justice field and improve the situation of juveniles in conflict with the law in Europe.
15.00 - 16.00
Institutional Panel: ‘EU Activities in the Area of Juvenile Justice’

Moderator: Bernard De Vos, General Delegate for Children’s Rights, Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles

- Margaret Tuite, Coordinator for the Rights of the Child, DG Justice, European Commission

- María Amor Martín Estébanez, Programme Manager - Legal Research, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

- Antanas Jatkevičius, Council for Penological Co-operation Council of Europe, Lithuania

16.00 - 16.30
‘Remarks on Deprivation of Liberty and Juvenile Justice Global Initiatives’

Moderator: Cristina Goni, Secretary General, and Cédric Foussard, Director of International Affairs, IJJO, Belgium

- Nikhil Roy, Programmes Director, Penal Reform International

- Fabrice Crégut, Juvenile Justice Coordinator, Terre des hommes

16.30 - 17.00
‘Looking Ahead: Milestones for Effectiveness of Diversion and Alternatives’

- Dr. Francisco Legaz Cervantes, Founder and Chairman of the IJJO

- Manuel-Jesús Dolz Lago, Public Prosecutor, Supreme Court of Spain

- Frieder Dünkel, Criminology Professor, University of Greifswald, President-Elect of the European Society of Criminology, Germany

17.00
Refreshments

17.30 – 19.00
Presentation of ECJJ Members’ Initiatives

This session aims to exchange information and to give the opportunity to ECJJ members to present their lastest initiatives, projects, research or institutional agenda on juvenile justice.

Moderator: Cédric Foussard, Director of International Affairs at the IJJO

- Anda Smiltena, Latvia - The juvenile justice situation in Latvia

- Dagmar Doubrovová, Czech Republic - Probation program for juveniles realized by the RUBIKON Centrum since 2005.

- Neven Ricijás, Croatia - Juvenile Probation in Croatia - Results from the first national research study

- Erika Varadi, Hungary - The new crime prevention projects of the last 4 years in Hungary

- Ruairi Gogan, Ireland - Latest developments on a study of prolific young offenders and their links to criminal networks.

- Ton Liefaard, The Nederlands – Presentation of a Research provided for the CoE on violence in institutions.
9.00 – 9.30
Welcome Speeches

- Dr. Francisco Legaz Cervantes, Founder and Chairman of the IJJO
- Ms. Valérie Gengoux, Criminal Policy Service, Ministry of Justice, Belgium
- Mr. Antanas Jatkevičius, Member of the Council for Penological Cooperation, Council of Europe, Lithuania

9.30 – 10.00
Presentation of the ECJJ Activities 2012-2015

- Cédric Foussard, Director of International Affairs, International Juvenile Justice Observatory
- Adélaïde Vanhove, Policy Officer on European Affairs, International Juvenile Justice Observatory

10.00 – 12.30
Consultation on the European Research on Restorative Juvenile Justice

Moderator: Cristina Goñi, Secretary General, International Juvenile Justice Observatory

10.00 – 10.30
Presentation of the Research and Selection of the Most Effective Juvenile Restorative Justice practices in Europe: 28 National Snapshots

- Andrea Parosanu, Legal Expert on Mediation, University of Greifswald, Germany
- Frieder Dünkel, Criminology Professor, University of Greifswald, President-Elect of the ESC

11.00 – 11.45
Presentation of the ‘European Model for Restorative Justice with Juveniles’ and Toolkit for Professionals

- Tim Chapman, Course Director of the Restorative Practices Masters at Ulster University, Northern Ireland
- Maija Gellin, Programme Director of Mediation in Education, Finnish Forum for Mediation
- Monique Anderson, Academic expert in restorative justice and victimology, Leuven Institute of Criminology

11.45 – 12.30
Open Consultation

Discussants: ECJJ members.

12.30 – 13.30
Lunch Break

13.30 – 15.00
Presentation of the ECJJ Roadmap 2015-2017

15.00 – 16.00
Roundtable: ‘Contributions and Exchanges from the ECJJ Members to the Roadmap 2015-2017 and the EU Policy Agenda on Juvenile Justice’

15.30 – 16.00
Closure of the Meeting

- Dr. Francisco Legaz Cervantes, Founder and Chairman of the IJJO
- Xavier Verboven, European Economic and Social Committee, Belgium
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