

Title	Technology & Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Child Justice Systems: The Implications for Children's Human Rights
Authors	Kiss, Dora;Foussard, Cedric;Gil González, M;Lynch, Nessa;Perez-Cruz, Mariana
Publication date	2024
Original Citation	Kiss, D, Foussard, C, Gil González, M, Lynch, N & Perez-Cruz, M 2024, Technology & Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Child Justice Systems: The Implications for Children's Human Rights. Terre des hommes Lausanne Foundation, Lausanne.
Type of publication	Government publication
Rights	© 2024, Terre des hommes Lausanne Foundation.
Download date	2026-11-01 05:04:52
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/18484

Technology & Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Child Justice Systems: The Implications for Children's Human Rights

Policy Brief on
Digital Child Justice



Acknowledgement

This policy brief has been produced in collaboration with the Global Initiative on Justice With Children and the i-ACCESS My Rights project, led by the Terre des hommes-Lausanne Foundation.

The authors are grateful to the Justice With Children's Working Group of Experts on Digital Justice for Children in Conflict with the Law and the Technical Advisory Board and External Ethical Committee of the i-ACCESS My Rights project, who generously gave their time and provided input and quality assurance to the policy brief. Many thanks in particular to:

- Angela Vigil, Baker McKenzie
- Arpita Mitra, Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights
- Birgit Schippers, University of Strathclyde
- Desara Dushi, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
- Faith Gordon, Australian National University
- Jennifer Davidson, Institute for Inspiring Children's Futures University of Strathclyde
- Jef Ausloos, University of Amsterdam
- Laura Andrei, Bucharest Appeal Court
- Lyubomir Krilchev, UNICEF Bulgaria
- Magistrate Marie Laure AMANDJA, Cameroon Ministry of Justice
- Markus Angula, UNICEF Gambia
- Miklós Orbán, OPL Gunnercooke, University of Surrey
- Justice Muhammad Imman Ali, Retired Justice of the Supreme Court of Bangladesh
- Olga Themeli, University of Crete
- Ton Liefwaard, Leiden University
- Valerie Verdoodt, University of Ghent

Terre des hommes - Lausanne Foundation

Terre des hommes - Lausanne Foundation leads the Program Access to Justice (A2J) for Children & Youth aiming at promoting and protecting children's access to justice rights. The A2J program's work focuses on the following interlinked pathways of change contributing to SDGs 5 and 16: (1) procedural safeguards are reinforced across child justice systems; (2) Inclusive and non-discriminatory access to justice, with a focus on gender justice, is prioritized; (3) Plural justice systems are strengthened and officially interact together; (4) Social cohesion is enhanced through the promotion of local justice for children and youth as well as through their role as agents of change to achieve peaceful societies. For more information, please visit <https://www.tdh.org/en/our-impact/justice>

I-ACCESS My Rights – AI-driven support for a smart justice with children in Europe

The i-ACCESS project is led by Terre des hommes Regional Hub in Hungary in partnership with Terre des hommes Romania, Terre des hommes Hellas, SAPI (Bulgaria), Noldus (Netherlands), KU Leuven and Lawren.io (Belgium). The project is implemented in 2023-2024.

Global Initiative on Justice With Children

The Global Initiative on Justice With Children (JWC) is an initiative that addresses the most current issues related to the rights of children and young people in contact and/or conflict with justice systems. It is led by the Terre des hommes Lausanne Foundation, in partnership with Penal Reform International (PRI), and the International Association of Youth and Family Judges and Magistrates (IAYFJM).

The Global Initiative connects professionals from around the world and serves as a global landmark through World Congresses, as well as regional and national advisory meetings.

For more information visit: justicewithchildren.org

Suggested citation:

Kiss, D., Foussard, C., Gil González, M., Lynch, N., & Pérez Cruz, M. (2024). "Technology in Child Justice Systems: The implications for Children's Human Rights". Terre des hommes Lausanne Foundation.

2024, March

Contact us:

dora.kiss@tdh.org

cedric.foussard@tdh.org

marta.gil@tdh.org

Table of contents

- Acknowledgement
- Table of contents
- Executive summary

The Issue	07
Relevant Principles of Children's Human Rights	
<hr/>	
Digital Technology in Child Justice	09
1. Children's Human Rights in Virtual Courts	
The risks for children's human rights	
Are there benefits for children?	
Actions required to protect and realise children's human rights	
<hr/>	
2. Artificial Intelligence in Child Justice	11
I. The risks of Facial Recognition Technology in the law enforcement sector for children's human rights	
II. Predictive policing, social scoring, and child justice	
III. AI supporting children's access to justice through helping them navigate the justice system	
<hr/>	
Recommendations	16
<hr/>	

Executive summary

This policy brief^[1] underscores the critical issue around the use of technology in the child justice systems and its potential impacts on children's human rights. While digital transition and AI solutions within the justice settings are becoming more and more prevalent, little attention has been paid to the impact these have on children in contact with the law and the child justice system. The document presents four different application of digital technology in the child justice system and elucidates the associated risks and opportunities, while offering recommendations for necessary actions to ensure the lawful, safe and ethical application of digital solutions in the justice system and safeguard children from the potential harm. The recommendations are addressed to policy makers, child justice stakeholders, tech, and academia actors.

Amidst the advent of virtual courts, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, this policy brief highlights significant risks to children's rights. Age and developmental challenges in communication and comprehension are amplified in virtual court settings, particularly affecting disabled and neuro-diverse children. Issues of access to legal representation, confidentiality, and privacy concerns are also prevalent. Virtual courts can offer efficiency and timeliness but should not override a child's right to a fair trial. Good and bad practices from around the globe illustrate how virtual hearings can benefit children and facilitate their access to justice, while it can also be applied in ways which impose serious harm, breach children's rights and the fair trial principles and risk re-traumatization.^[2]

In examining artificial intelligence (AI) applications within child justice systems, this policy brief presents both risks and potential benefits. AI systems are being integrated into services and products with an increasing manner, naturally affecting children. The justice sector is not exempt from this trend either. However little attention is being paid to the specific vulnerabilities and the rights of children in contact with the law who are interacting with such systems and products or being affected by them.

The EU's proposed AI Act^[3] is welcomed, as it represents the first horizontal binding framework in the EU, setting mandatory requirements for private and public sector organizations to follow when deploying or providing AI solutions.

The upcoming final vote on the AI Act along with the establishment of a European AI Office^[4] in April 2024 are crucial steps in bridging the existing gaps in this domain and moving towards a lawful and ethical application of AI.

[1] Authors: Dora Kiss (Terre des hommes Hungary), Cédric Foussard (Terre des hommes Lausanne), Marta Gil González (Terre des hommes Lausanne), Nessa Lynch (Victoria University of Wellington & University College Cork), and Mariana Pérez Cruz (Global Initiative on Justice With Children).

[2] The Imprint. (2021). Let's Not Stick With Remote Court Hearings After Pandemic, Juvenile Defenders Say.

[3] Council of the European Union. (26 January 2024). Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and amending certain Union legislative acts - Analysis of the final compromise text with a view to agreement, 5662/24, Brussels.

[4] European Commission. (24 January 2024). Commission Decision establishing the European Artificial Intelligence Office, Brussels, 24.1.2024, C(2024)390 final

Meanwhile human rights and child rights organizations express serious concerns and question whether the proposed legislation respects children's rights, especially right to fair trial and privacy and ensures adequate safeguards for children, protecting them from online risks and harm.[5]

The section on facial recognition technology (FRT) underscores privacy risks, especially for minority and indigenous children, while highlighting the potential of such technology in law enforcement efforts to tackle the exploitation of children. The use of FRT should be governed by high accuracy standards employed only in exceptional circumstances.

Regarding predictive policing, another application of AI technology, this policy brief emphasizes how it can perpetuate biases and discrimination, disproportionately affecting children's sense of safety and well-being. Lawfulness, ethical principles, transparency, and accountability are essential for developing and using predictive policing algorithms.

In an effort to improve children's access to justice by providing information about their rights and available support services, the integration of innovative AI solutions, particularly chatbots, in the child justice system, holds immense potential. However, the deployment of general-purpose AI in the child justice environment raises critical concerns regarding safety, security, and ethical considerations. Risks, such as the dissemination of potentially incorrect, biased, or harmful content associated with the datasets used to train AI models, must be addressed. This prompts an exploration into whether customized AI can effectively aid children's access to justice through the adoption of additional safety features and tailored adaptations to suit the specific needs of child users.

Overall, the design and development of technology in the child justice system must prioritize children's rights. This document advocates for children's participation and having their voices heard in the design, development and deployment of technology and new solutions. Children's rights impact assessments (CRIA) should be a standard practice to realize child rights in the digital environment and ensure fairness and non-discrimination. Private sector involvement in technology development should also adhere to legal and ethical frameworks recognizing children's rights.

In conclusion, this policy brief underlines the need to balance the efficiency gains of technology in child justice with the protection of children's rights. It emphasizes the importance of prior and continuous impact assessment, child-centered treatment, ethical AI usage, responsible AI governance, and ensuring children's participation and their right to privacy in the evolving digital landscape of child justice systems.

[4] European Commission. (24 January 2024). Commission Decision establishing the European Artificial Intelligence Office, Brussels, 24.1.2024, C(2024)390 final

[5] 5Rights Foundation. (12 April 2023). AI Act must deliver on children's rights, civil society tells European Parliament, Brussels.

The Issue

In this policy brief, we raise awareness of the potential impacts of the use of technology in the child justice systems on children's human rights. We focus on four case studies to illustrate the risks and in some instances, opportunities and formulate recommendations for action.

Relevant Principles of Children's Human Rights

Children's human rights in child justice are mainly derived from the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC).[6] Child justice fundamentally requires child-centred treatment.

Children's Human Rights

General Principles

- Best interests
- Participation
- Right to life
- Non-discrimination

Child Justice System Principles

- Promotion of child's sense of dignity and worth
- Reinforcement of child's respect for rights and freedoms of others
- Taking into account the child's age
- Promotion of child's reintegration during and after justice proceedings
- Effective and meaningful participation
- Fair trial rights
- Respect for privacy

The General Comment No. 25 on children's rights in relation to the digital environment provides guidance on the emerging issue of children's rights in the digital environment. [7] The Committee on the Rights of the Child emphasises the importance of the rights of non-discrimination, privacy and freedom of expression.[8]

[6]See also CRC Committee (2019). General Comment No. 24 Children's rights in the child justice system, CRC/C/GC/24.

[7] CRC Committee General Comment No. 25 (2021). Children's rights in relation to the digital environment CRC/C/GC/25.

[8] Above at [12].



Digital Technology in Child Justice

1. Children's Human Rights in Virtual Courts

The term “virtual court” means situations where children participate in court proceedings through means of technology. This includes situations where a child is joining a physical court hearing through video-conferencing as well as fully virtual hearings where all participants participate remotely, online. The COVID-19 pandemic catalysed an already increasing trend towards virtual courts. Increased familiarity with technology has led to increased use and proposals for expansion. Children may participate virtually in a wide range of court processes such as family justice and care proceedings, refugee status hearings and other civil or administrative law matters, but in criminal justice proceedings the potential consequences are most severe, particularly when they could lead to deprivation of liberty of the child.[9]

The risks for children's human rights

The realisation of the child's right to participate effectively and meaningfully in the court procedure is a considerable challenge even in physical court settings.[10] Age and developmentally-related challenges with communication and comprehension are amplified in virtual courts.[11] Impaired and neuro-diverse children are likely to be particularly impacted.[12] Virtual court settings may hinder a child's access to appropriate legal representation.[13]

Confidentiality and privacy of proceedings are concerns, as unlike the physical court location, in virtual settings it is difficult to control access and the possibility of unauthorised people listening in. Children's privacy may be impacted by unsafe storage of recordings and inappropriate information sharing. Children without access to appropriate technology or reliable internet connection may suffer further disadvantage potentially resulting in lack of access to procedures, [14] or limitations to children's right to defense in a court of law.

[9] Lynch, N., & Kilkelly, U. (2021). “Zooming In” on Children's Rights During a Pandemic: Technology, Child Justice and Covid-19. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 29(2), 286-304.

[10] Lynch, N., & Liefwaard, T. (2020). What is left in the “too hard basket”? Developments and challenges for the rights of children in conflict with the law. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 28(1), 89-110.

[11] Forde, L. (2018). Realising the Right of the Child to Participate in the Criminal Process. *Youth Justice*, 18(3), 265-284.

[12] “Neurodiversity denotes a natural variation in cognitive functioning...” - University of Exeter, 2024); & Howard, K., McCann, C., & Dudley, M. (2021). ‘It was like easier’: Rangatahi (young people) and their whānau (family) talk about communication assistance in the New Zealand Youth Justice System. *Youth Justice*, 21(2), 210-229.

[13] Lynch and Kilkelly (2021),

[14] Foussard, C., Vigil, A. and Perez, M. (2023). “Impact on child justice in a world of digital courts: Perspectives from the bench”. *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics*. 9, 2 (Sep. 2023), 29–53. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.17356/ieejsp.v9i2.1143>.

Are there benefits for children?

Perceived benefits of virtual courts are generally centred around efficiency and timeliness of proceedings and protection from re-traumatization. While children's human rights require that responses are concluded within a child's sense of time, efficiency and timeliness does not outweigh a child's right to a fair trial. There may be situations where a child makes a choice to participate virtually and this would be in their best interests, but this should be after consultation with a legal representative and/or a support person ensuring that the child made an informed decision. An example would be where the alternative to a virtual court appearance is physically transporting a child from detention and putting them through court security for a short technical hearing such as pre-trial process. In this case, virtual participation may be less stressful and stigmatising for a child.[15]

Evolving attitudes to technology and increasing familiarity with participation and connections across technology may mean that children are more comfortable in technology usage such as participating virtually in court proceedings. This cannot be at the expense of due process rights and experts such as lawyers and communication assistants must ensure that children are adequately advised and supported in their choices.[16]

Actions required to protect and realise children's human rights

Virtual courts should be reserved only for certain types of proceeding. The child must be able to participate in person in proceedings where witnesses are called, where the child is intended to give evidence, hearings where the placement and freedom of a child is being decided, and situations where delicate matters about the child's personal circumstances are being discussed and evaluated. Education and training for professionals such as judges and lawyers is also required as techniques and best practice for promoting children's understanding and participation are different in virtual environments.

In addition, it is crucial to educate and build the capacities of these actors (including court administration staff) on digital skills and context specific applications of children's rights, data protection and privacy principles.[17]

[15] Foussard, C., Vigil, A. and Perez, M. (2023).

[16] : Davidson, J.; Foussard, C.; Lynch, N.; Martins, A.S.; Schwittay, H.; and Tiefengraber, H. (2023).

"Justice for Children Policy Brief: Digital Justice for Children: Innovation, Risks and Advantages". Justice for Children Policy Brief Series. Glasgow: University of Strathclyde

[17] Foussard, C., De Klerk-Pérez Cruz, M., & Virgil, A. (2023). "Consequences of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Child Justice Systems". European Integration Studies, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.46941/2023.e1.2>

2. Artificial Intelligence in Child Justice

According to the OECD, an artificial intelligence (AI) system is a “machine-based system that can, for a given set of human-defined objectives, make predictions, recommendations, or decisions influencing real or virtual environments.” [18] An AI technological boom has taken place globally in the past few years, with little and slow regulatory response. Recently, high level efforts to categorize and regulate AI has been noticeable, with the most notable example being, the EU’s proposed AI Act. Meanwhile AI’s potential benefits and risks on access to justice has not received much attention, especially when talking about child justice.

I. The risks of Facial Recognition Technology in the law enforcement sector for children’s human rights

Facial recognition technology (FRT) is a technology which involves the collection and processing of an individual’s facial image. It can be used to verify, identify and categorise people. Use cases such as live as well as retrospective facial recognition has significant risks for children’s human rights.[19] FRT surveillance in law enforcement is a significant risk for privacy, particularly for children belonging to minority groups that are more targeted by the police forces, such as ethnic minority or indigenous children. Children’s rights to freedom of expression, freedom of assembly and association may be impacted by use of FRT to monitor lawful protest. [20] Another risk for children is the increasing securitization and surveillance of children’s behaviour in educational facilities, blurring the line between education and the criminal justice system. [21]

There are calls to ban FRT entirely, while FRT may have some benefits for children as a group. It may be used by the law enforcement to identify and hold accountable perpetrators who produce and trade in child abuse images,[22] especially child sexual abuse material.[23] FRT can identify individual children and those responsible for these crimes, contributing to prosecution efforts.[24]

[18] OECD (2019), Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence, OECD/LEGAL/0449

[19] European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights Facial recognition technology: fundamental rights considerations in the context of law enforcement (Publications Office of the European Union, 21 November 2019). Nessa Lynch, Faith Gordon, and Liz Campbell, Facial Recognition Technology: The Particular Impacts on Children (in Privacy, Technology, Criminal Process, Routledge, 2023).

[20] Committee on the Rights of the Child (2021) at [68].

[21] Torin Monahan and Rodolfo D Torres (eds) Schools under surveillance: Cultures of control in public education (Rutgers University Press, United States, 2009)

[22] AI For Safer Children Hub <https://unicri.it/topic/AI-for-Safer-Children-Global-Hub>

[23] Politico. (19 December 2023). Inside the policy force scouring the internet to save abused children

[24] Edwards, G., Christensen, L. S., Rayment-McHugh, S., & Jones, C. (2021). Cyber strategies used to combat child sexual abuse material. Trends & Issues in Crime & Criminal Justice, (636);

Meanwhile as with all AI technology, serious concerns relate to the dataset used. In case the dataset is biased, or data is acquired in an unlawful manner, through for example scraping images illegally from social media[25], the ethical and lawful application of FRT, even for law enforcement efforts is not guaranteed and justified. The EU's AI Act introduces a complex set of rules on the application of FRT and the creation of facial recognition databases. The rules prescribe a general ban on the use of biometric identification systems, while allow for (regulated) exceptions mainly on the areas of law enforcement for victim and offender identification purposes. Principled use of FRT would require that the technology is used only where a high standard of accuracy can be assured and only where there is a significant threat to public safety. The draft EU AI regulation proposes to limit biometric surveillance such as FRT to limited situations involving a threat to public safety. The CRC does recognise public safety and victims' interests, but the principles of reintegration and best interests of the child require that it is only in exceptional circumstances where punitive law enforcement measures such as FRT may be employed against children.

II. Predictive policing, social scoring, and child justice

Predictive policing and crime prediction is a controversial application of AI and machine learning that claims to use data and algorithms to anticipate and prevent crimes before they occur and to allocate law enforcement resources more effectively. It may be place/location-based, or person-based.[26]

The automation of public services is a growing trend all over the world, while it has widely been demonstrated that digital technologies driven by big data and AI holds the risk of perpetuating racial disparities, fostering discrimination and promoting intolerance.[27] As an example from the Dutch childcare system shows, how racial bias was mainstreamed in the unregulated algorithms used in the public sector and as a result harmed tens of thousands of children and their parents, mostly from the low-income families disproportionately affecting people from ethnic minorities.[28]

As another an example, police databases may accumulate data on individuals (including children) known or thought to be involved in street gangs and organised crime.[29] A report by Liberty on the London Metropolitan Police's Gang Violence Matrix found that children, particularly Black children, were disproportionality represented.[30]

[25] The Guardian. (25 May 2022). Clearview AI was fined £7.5m for brazenly harvesting your data – does it care?

[26] Ferguson, A. G. (2016). Policing predictive policing. Wash. UL Rev., 94, 1109.

[27] UNOCHCR (2020). Emerging digital technologies entrench racial inequality, UN expert warns.

[28] Amnesty International. (2021). Xenophobic Machines: Discrimination through unregulated use of algorithms in the dutch childcare benefits scandal.

[29] Densley, J., Deuchar, R., & Harding, S. (2020). An introduction to gangs and serious youth violence in the United Kingdom. Youth justice, 20(1-2), 3-10.

[30] Liberty (2022) "5 Things You Need to Know About the Gangs Matrix" libertyhumanrights.org.uk

The use of predictive policing algorithms can perpetuate and reinforce existing biases and discrimination in the criminal justice system, causing detrimental impact on children's sense of safety and well-being, as well as on their perception of police and the justice system.

Innovations in AI in criminal justice, such as predictive policing, demonstrate that it is already vulnerable children such as ethnic and racial minority children, who will be disproportionately affected by the biased datasets feeding AI systems and discriminatory policing practices. Data processed as a result of historical state bias compounds the discriminatory effects.

The proposed AI Act does not put all application of predictive policing in the 'unacceptable risk' category, and only prohibits machine made predictions about individuals based on personality trait or characteristics, while allows for the application of geographic crime prediction systems. Exemptions applying to law enforcement agencies for the protection of 'national security' also limit the impact of the regulation in the justice context.[31]

It is essential to ensure that the design, development and use of predictive policing algorithms are lawful, guided by ethical principles and respect for human rights, including the rights of children as guaranteed by the CRC.[32] This includes ensuring that the algorithms are transparent, accountable, and minimise bias to avoid stigmatization and discrimination, and that the data used to train them is collected and used in a lawful, responsible and ethical manner.

While such information sharing amongst state agencies is a valid action in identifying children at risk of harm, caution must be exercised in ensuring that data about risk factors is not used to criminalise children through targeting.[33] A children's human rights lens requires an understanding that although children can make mistakes during childhood and in educational settings, such data must not be used for other purposes.[34]

An open letter signed in December 2023 by dozens of civil society groups and individual experts express serious concerns on the position adopted by the proposed final text of the AI Act on both facial recognition technique and predictive policing, stating that the EU would allow the use of AI tools that have been widely discredited by academia and could undermine human rights and the rule of law.[35]



[31] European and Artificial Intelligence & Society Fund. (13 December 2023). European Civil Society on the AI Act deal.

[32] Sacher, S. (2022). Risking children: The implications of predictive risk analytics across child protection and policing for vulnerable and marginalized children. *Human Rights Law Review*, 22(1),

[33] Keddell, E. (2022). Mechanisms of Inequity: The Impact of Instrumental Biases in the Child Protection System. *Societies*, 12(3), 83.

[34] Gillingham, P. (2019). Decision support systems, social justice and algorithmic accountability in social work: A new challenge. *Practice*, 31(4), 277-290.

[35] EDRI. (8 December 2023). NGOs and experts warn AI Act negotiators: don't trade our rights!



III. AI supporting children's access to justice through helping them navigate the justice system

In addressing the pressing need for facilitating children's access to justice through giving them information about their rights and available support services, innovative AI solutions, particularly chatbots, have huge potential. However, the deployment of general purpose chatbots in the child justice environment raise critical questions on the reliability of the content, safety, security, and ethical considerations. Additional inherent risks, including the possibility of incorrect, biased, or harmful content, which is linked to the datasets used to train AI models should also be tackled. However, stakeholders should explore whether AI with a narrower scope can facilitate children's access to justice through customization, the application of additional safety features, and tailoring of the AI system to the specific needs of child users. Within the i-ACCESS project[36], the consortium aims to explore whether such solution can contribute to better access to information of child victims and through this information can empower them to seek support and claim their rights.

The EU's 2019-2023 e-Justice Action Plan[37] recognizes the value of chatbots and envisions embedding such tool within the European e-Justice portal. However, concerns such as the 'black box' nature of AI decision-making, biases, and discrimination based on training datasets are significant challenges that need to be given due consideration. These challenges carry the potential to cause harm to children and negatively impact their rights.

Therefore, a comprehensive Legal, Ethical, and Risk Mitigation Strategy is essential. This strategy developed in the i-ACCESS project aims to identify, analyze, and understand risks associated with the development and deployment of the chat bot. It further seeks to implement robust mitigation measures to safeguard children from potential harm.

Transparency and compliance with existing regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and upcoming AI regulations are imperative. An ethical framework that aligns with these regulations will foster greater transparency in AI systems and address concerns related to data privacy and security. This framework should mandate accountability and responsibility in handling sensitive information related to children while utilizing AI in the justice system.

The Legal, Ethical, and Risk Mitigation Strategy also addresses the potential implications of the EU's AI Act on the deployment of the tool in the three EU countries and outlines the requirements that need to be met under the Act and makes practical suggestions on how to comply with these.

[36] i-ACCESS MyRights. (n.d). Project page.

[37] Official Journal of the European Union. (03 March 2019). 2019-2023 Action Plan European e-Justice, 2019/C96/05.



Recommendations

Recommendations

Children's Human Rights in Design, Development and Use of Technology

Technology in child justice systems is rapidly evolving and driven by innovation and system efficiency. However, it's imperative that this technological progress is guided by a child-rights approach.

1. Policy makers, governments, child justice professionals, child protection and safeguarding experts along with tech companies, academia and think tanks must come together to create a dialogue around the potential of technological solutions to tackle child justice issues, address the associated risks and mitigation measures.
2. Children's human rights must be central in the design, development and use of technology in child justice systems. Firstly, policy makers, justice professionals and tech companies must ensure they provide a platform for children to exercise their right to participate collectively.
3. Training and capacity building of justice and child protection professionals on the impact of digitalization on children is essential to educate them about techniques and best practices for upholding children's rights, and promoting children's understanding and participation in the justice system.
4. Strengthen systemic participation of children with lived experience, evidence about children's experiences should come from children themselves.[38] The recent General Comment on children's rights in relation to the digital environment, with an emphasis on the States parties' duty:
'... to consult with children on relevant legislative, administrative and other measures and to ensure that their views are considered seriously and that children's participation does not result in undue monitoring or data collection that violates their right to privacy, freedom of thought and opinion.' [39]
5. Carry out further study on the long-term impact of the use of digital tools and solutions on child or adolescent neuro-development including the impact of interacting with AI systems.

[38]Gordon, F. (2021). Online Harms Experienced by Children and Young People: 'Acceptable Use' and Regulation. Full Report. London: Catch22, p.114

[39]United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, 'General Comment No. 25 (2021)' at [18].

[40] Mukherjee, S., Pothong, K., & Livingstone, S. (2021). Child Rights Impact Assessment: A tool to realise child rights in the digital environment. London: 5Rights Foundation.

[41] 5Rights, Eurochild, MCE, ECPAT, EPA, MHE, TdH, Net & Me. (09 May 2022). Joint letter on AIA.

[42] UNICEF (2020). Policy guidance on AI for children. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: London, UK.

- 6.** Children's rights impact assessments (CRIA) must be a standard methodology for the use or regulation of technology in child justice. There have been calls for ex-ante CRIA to become standard practice in relation to technology.[40],[41] As an example, UNICEF released a policy guidance in September 2020, setting out principles and a policy toolbox for child-centred AI.[42] After the decision on the deployment of digital solutions, the relevant bodies (eg. court administration, victim support service) should conduct CRIA in collaboration with the stakeholders responsible for the technical development of the solution. In particular, the requirement that fairness and non-discrimination for children is prioritized in the development and implementation of AI and other technological solutions is central for the child justice system. This assessment must be an ongoing effort, subject to regular and continuous review to reflect the ongoing advances in technology. Child participation in the CRIA process is imperative to ensure that children can exercise their right to express their views, opinions and perspectives on deploying digital technology in the justice context.
- 7.** Regulation and scrutiny must extend to the private sector, and non-compliance should be subject to legal consequences. Given that much of the use of technology is developed by private sector innovation which is then adopted by the state actors, it is vital that both state and private sector act in accordance with best practices in international human rights law.
- 8.** When deploying digital tools, including AI tools within the justice settings, institutions must adopt responsible, transparent and child-centred AI & data governance, ensuring compliance with the applicable legal provisions, relevant policies, and best practices and integrate children's rights into these governance structures to ensure the identification and elimination of risks to children and potential breaches to their rights.

[40] Mukherjee, S., Pothong, K., & Livingstone, S. (2021). Child Rights Impact Assessment: A tool to realise child rights in the digital environment. London: 5Rights Foundation.

[41] 5Rights, Eurochild, MCE, ECPAT, EPA, MHE, TdH, Net & Me. (09 May 2022). Joint letter on AIA.

[42] UNICEF (2020). Policy guidance on AI for children. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: London, UK.



The i-ACCESS project is co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Contact



[@with_initiative / @tdh_org](#)



[Global Initiative on Justice With Children / Terre des hommes-Lausanne Foundation](#)



info@justicewithchildren.org / info@tdh.org



justicewithchildren.org / tdh.org

