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1. Bringing a global perspective on juvenile justice: The IJJO

2. IJJO Initiatives on monitoring and evaluation the implementation of international standards.

The IJJO:

**brining a global perspective on juvenile justice**

- International organization, set up in 2003 as a Belgian Foundation of public interest based in Brussels.

IJJO Aims:
- To bring a comprehensive and holistic vision of juvenile justice
- To set-up multidisciplinary network of experts
- To promote development strategies and policies

Target group: Children and young adults at-risk or in conflict with the criminal law.
IJJO Action Lines

- Research & Analysis
- Training & Technical Assistance
- Public Awareness & Information Dissemination
- Advocacy work through the ACJJ, the APCJJ, the NCJJ, the LCJJ & the ECJJ
IJJO INTERNAL STRUCTURE

EUROPEAN COUNCIL FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE (ECJJ)
Third Meeting: Nov 2012
London

INTERNATIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE OBSERVATORY (IJJO)
Brussels (Belgium)

LATIN AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE (LCJJ)
First Meeting: Guatemala 2011

NORTH AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE (NCJJ)

ASIA-PACIFIC COUNCIL FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE (ACJJ)
First Meeting: June 2012
Thailand

AFRICAN COUNCIL FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE (ACJJ)
“SAVE MONEY, PROTECT SOCIETY AND REALISE YOUTH POTENTIAL”
Improving Youth Justice Practice in a time of Economic Crisis

By focusing on the following key policies, youth justice systems will save money, better protect society and also begin to realise youth potential.

- **PREVENTION**: sustainable and comprehensive
- **Diversion**: reducing the number of children coming into the criminal justice system
- **UTILISING COMMUNITY SANCTIONS**: it is more effective to rehabilitate a child in the community rather than in detention
- **REDUCING THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN PRE-TRAIL AND POST-TRIAL DETENTION**
“A voice for the future of JJ in Asia-Pacific”

- Explore the priorities for action identified by members states
  - Prevention
  - Administration of juvenile Justice
  - Diversion and Restorative Justice
  - Probation and leading community based sentencing practices
  - Policy and Legislative Reform
  - Rehabilitation and Reintegration
  - Advocacy

- showcase promising aspects of juvenile justice reform initiatives across the AP region, identify the potential for further reforms

- showcase Asia Pacific wide snapshot of compliance of “good news” stories
2. IJJO Initiatives on monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of international standards.
“Measures of deprivation of liberty for young offenders: how to enrich international standards in juvenile justice and promote alternatives to detention?”

- It aims to summarize the international standards on the use of detention and its alternatives with a view to providing a baseline of information on international standards in these two related areas.

- It presents an EU-wide snapshot of compliance with international standards in these areas, an important part of which is to identify what support or assistance the EU might provide to further their implementation.
“Evaluation of the Implementation of international standards in National juvenile justice systems”

- to research on ways of monitoring and evaluating the implementation of juvenile justice International standards

- tools, mechanisms, leaders, training, Etc.

- a survey was sent to the 27 MS Ministries of Justice

- eventually comes up with series of recommendations.
Level of implementation of international JJ standards into laws:

- Data analysis by special services/offices (internal evaluations) or university research/research institutes,

- Some countries: No specific instruments or responsibilities for data collection/analysis,

- Responsibility of different departments (Ministries of Justice, Education, Social Policy)

- No clear indicators for the implementation of JJ standards,

- Not clear to what extent international JJ standards are part of trainings and/or influence criminal policy.
Level of implementation of international JJ standards into laws:

- International JJ standards contain (in most areas) sufficient guidelines (see Recommendations of the Council of Europe in particular),

- From a legal point of view: implementation satisfying,

- Limited knowledge about the practice of implementation,

- Data collection not sufficient,

- Not enough evaluation on effectiveness.
OBJECTIVES

- Develop an **uniform and standardised instrument** for examining whether and to what extent the different juvenile justice standards are regarded both in the **law and in practice**.

- **Compare experiences** of different countries and share good practices

- Promote links between European countries, which will help to **harmonise juvenile justice systems**.
a) Development of Indicators:
   - general and generic enough so that they are applicable to the various juvenile justice approaches in Europe.
   - sufficiently concrete to allow the degree of adherence to the standards to be identified.

b) Development of questions, which can respond to the different chosen aspects of European Juvenile Justice Systems, to finally determine if International Standards are being met.

c) Implementation of the questionnaires through national representative of Public Administration and independent expert.

d) Quantitative and Qualitative results
“Juvenile Justice Indicators for Europe: How to Measure Juvenile Justice”

Questionnaire I on JJ system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special juvenile justice system</td>
<td>Aims of the juvenile justice system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of juvenile justice I - Routes into the juvenile justice system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of juvenile justice II – Age groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of procedural safeguards for juvenile offenders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions by the juvenile court/judge after a formal hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Questionnaire II on Detention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Regard for the right to privacy and (religious) self determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision by staff</td>
<td>Disciplinary measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of education</td>
<td>Complaints and complaint procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and leisure time activities</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Regulations and provisions governing contacts with the outside world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Involvement of parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression/ self-inflicted harm/ deaths/ conflict</td>
<td>Early release provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release preparations</td>
<td>Aftercare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspections and monitoring of institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juveniles suffering from mental illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concluding remarks – Recommendations.

- To ensure financial, political and institutional independence.

- To establish cooperation and greater synergy within international, regional and national monitoring mechanisms:
  - To provide all of the same legal references and standards.
  - To check background and previous monitoring reports.

- To highlight special vulnerability of children and risk of ill-treatment when are detained and in police station.

- The monitoring approach mustn't have a data collection or a financial approach since it must ensure implementation of evaluation of JJ standards.
Concluding remarks – Recommendations.

- Facilities visited must be part of all the kinds of institutionalization (child protection, pretrial, health mental, etc).

- Special focus should be put on discipline measures and on vulnerable groups.

- Conditions in Detention
  - Separation from adults
  - Environment - rehabilitative and safe
  - Education, healthcare, dignity and privacy
  - Preparation for reintegration
  - Complaints, information and advocacy (CH, parents/legal guardians)

- Representatives of monitoring bodies must guarantee private meetings with children (delegations expertise CR/ground).
Concluding remarks – Recommendations.

- All the staff and personal must be interviewed and asked for training, vocation and accredited training systems required.

- Monitoring reports and evaluation should be presented publicly to all the stakeholders involved and society awareness.

- Recommendations must be timelined and included follow-up and tracking steps/proceedings.

- In case are not, sanctions and public aware and concern should be raised.
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