Subject: Appointment of the Steering Group - "Evaluation of the impact of the EU instruments affecting children's rights with a view to assessing the level of protection and promotion of children's rights in the EU".

Following the Procurement procedure JLS/2008/FRAC/PR/1006 (JLS/2009/D4/006), the Public Policy and Management Institute (Lithuania) has been selected to implement the Project. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Assess the impact of EU actions on children's rights,
- Assess the extent to which the Communication COM (2006)367 is contributing to promote the Rights of the Child within and outside the EU,
- Analyse national policies of the 27 Member States on children's rights.

The evaluation should take overall stock of the different actions of the EU at international and European level in the area of the Rights of the Child until the year 2008 and will cover legislative actions, non-legislative actions, funding and significant case law of the European Court of Justice affecting children rights; Member States national policies on Children rights.

The purpose of the Steering Group is to steer the evaluation all along its process.

I hereby appoint the following persons as members of the Steering Group for the abovementioned evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the Committee</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td>JLS.D.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>JLS.D.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>JLS.A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>RELEX.B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELARG.B.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first meeting of the Steering Group will be held in the third week of December. The exact time and venue will be communicated subsequently.

Yours sincerely,

C.C.: [Redacted]
EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE EU INSTRUMENTS AFFECTING CHILDREN'S RIGHTS WITH A VIEW TO ASSESSING THE LEVEL OF PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF CHILDREN'S RIGHTS IN THE EU

Subject: Minutes of the kick-off meeting
Brussels, 15 December, 14:30-16:30

Present: [Redacted] - JLS.D1, [Redacted] - JLS.D.1,
[Redacted] - JLS.A1, [Redacted] - JLS.F.2,
PPMI, [Redacted] - PPMI

1. INTRODUCTIONS

[Redacted] congratulated PPMI for their proposal and explained the context of the project. They highlighted that a key objective for the next months is the adoption of the Commission Communication on the rights of the child in December 2010. The present evaluation will feed into the Communication along with the following: the recently adopted Stockholm Programme, public consultation to be carried out in early 2010, Eurobarometer Qualitative study looking into the views of children on the rights of the child which will be conducted in early 2010, meeting of experts on the topic of violence against children (bullying and cyber-bullying) and the most vulnerable groups of children (the "invisible children") to take place in February and March 2010. In addition, [Redacted] pointed out that one of the priorities of the future Barroso Commission is the attention to evaluation particularly of policies and legislation. [Redacted] mentioned some of the structures in place as from the adoption of the 2006 Commission Communication "Towards an EU Strategy on the Rights of the Child", such as the children's rights co-ordinator, the EU Forum on the rights of the child, which brings together many different stakeholders from this area, the steering group and the inter-service group. The launching of the website on children's rights which will be dedicated to children and is planned for 2010 was also mentioned.

2. UNDERSTANDING OF THE ASSIGNMENT

1. Balance between the external and internal dimension

[Redacted] pointed out that the evaluation should encompass both internal and external dimension of the EU actions. [Redacted] also raised the main concerns sent by email by [Redacted] who could not be present at the meeting. It was
agreed that the evaluator should contact [redacted] in order to better identify the areas to be evaluated

2. The entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty as well as the recent adoption of the Stockholm Programme should be kept in mind.

3. **METHODOLOGY**

   [redacted] underlined the overall good quality of the methodology proposed. Methodology in the inception report will just have to be fine-tuned/strengthened.

   The Steering group members also welcomed the general intention of the contractor to integrate the OMC approach in the methodology as much as possible.

1. Terminology

   [redacted] pointed out that due regard should be given to the appropriate use of terminology. For example, for the Commission the phrase "impact assessment" refers more to ex-ante evaluation. So, for the sake of clarity, the evaluator should use a different term to denote an ex-post evaluation ("assessment of results", for example).

2. Child participation

   Children's voices should be incorporated in the evaluation. Due to time constraints and limited resources, the evaluator can choose to use the existing sources including the findings of the Eurobarometer qualitative study looking at the views of children about the rights of the child, which will be carried out by JLS in early 2010.

   [redacted] expressed a desire to observe the discussion in one of the focus groups.

3. Inception report:

   The inception report should clearly present the link between the evaluation questions, indicators and evaluation tools used in order to answer the questions (including sources of information). The questions to be addressed at the interview should be defined and the indicators used to answer the evaluation questions should be further reworked. The inception report should therefore provide a good skeleton of interviews and questionnaires.

   - **Fine tuning of the methodology**

   The inception report should include the reconstruction of the intervention logic of the strategy on the rights of the child. [redacted] also mentioned that the impact assessment of the 2006 Commission Communication should also be taken into account.

   - **FRA study on indicators**

   [redacted] expressed a wish that this study be taken into account and the indicators used to the degree possible. [redacted] will send the evaluator the final and complete report of the study once it is finished. For now, the evaluator can consult the summary report on the FRA webpage.
• Finding the right indicators/case studies

expressed doubt that the indicators proposed will give the right answer to the evaluation questions – which are good and pertinent. He proposed that case studies be used to show whether the situation has changed in reality, beyond what the people interviewed might say. The contractor should propose case-studies and justify their proposal in the inception report. Case studies would show whether real progress has been achieved, or not, and whether the Communication has worked, or not. expressed understanding of the comments and said they needed to think about how this approach would be re-assessed.

• Using understandable language and definitions

Reports (interim and final) should not be long and should be readable by a large public (the evaluator can consider to annex all the technical parts of the study)

• The base-line for evaluation

said that the evaluation criteria must be specific in explaining the basis against which the situation is evaluated.

As a general remark, pointed out that it would be important to see not only real change in how different stakeholders act, but also how ideas/behaviours are changing as a consequence of the EU actions. But the biggest obstacle in measuring such impacts is time, because changes are gradual and slow. Due to the short time frame which is under evaluation (2006 - up until the present) some impacts may not be adequately proved ("hard proof") or properly assessed. Many of the results will thus be qualitative. agreed and pointed out that she sees this evaluation more as an "interim" evaluation. If the evaluation shows that there is a willingness to change, and that things have started to change, this would already be an indicator of impact. The same goes if the evaluation shows that there has not been any change whatsoever.

4. Evaluation of the Member States' actions

explained that this part of the task is important because we need to understand better how to strengthen co-operation with the Member States, how children's rights are mainstreamed in individual MS, how the communication between the ministries works etc. How are the trends in the Member States in the area of children's rights connected to the trends at the EU level? What is the situation in the area of implementation of the EU actions by the Member States? What structures and legislations are in place in order to implement a children's rights policy in each MS?

4. Conclusion

expressed some concern connected to the time frame for the evaluation. expressed confidence and explained that the evaluator should present to the Commission proposals of what is feasible to be done properly in the given amount of time. will be a contact point in JLS for information and for any questions or concerns the evaluator might have. A slightly modified timetable for future steps in the evaluation process has been agreed (see Annex). Finally, the Commission
underlined the tight deadline of the overall project but clarified that deliverables should be sent according to the attached timetable.
Dear colleagues,

The European Commission, DG Justice has signed a contract with the Lithuanian Public Policy and Management Institute to carry out a project for 'The Evaluation of the Impact of the EU Instruments Affecting Children’s Rights with a View to Assessing the Level of Protection and Promotion of Children’s Rights in the EU'.

The aim is to assess the impact of EU actions on children’s rights, the extent to which the Communication COM (2006)367 "Towards an EU Strategy on the Rights of the Child" is contributing to promote the Rights of the Child within and outside the EU, and analyse national policies and structures of the 27 Member States on children’s rights. The evaluation covers EU actions i.e. legislative actions, non-legislative actions (e.g. communication, green paper, reports, etc.), funding, and significant case law of the European Court of Justice affecting children rights.

Your contribution will help to gain a better understanding and provide deeper explanation of how the main types of EU instruments operate in different areas of children’s rights. Case study analysis will be based on documentary analysis, interviews and survey.

Within the next few days, you will be receiving a questionnaire in the mail from the Public Policy and Management Institute (PPMI). This questionnaire is a part of the evaluation of the impact of the EU instruments affecting children’s rights.

You have been selected as a Forum member to give your opinion about the effectiveness of the European Forum on the Rights of the Child, launched by the European Commission. You will be asked about the effectiveness of the Forum in mainstreaming children’s rights, and creating a platform for exchange of the information and good practice.

Your input will be used to help the European Commission to improve the Forum as a policy consultation mechanism.

We would greatly appreciate your cooperation and time in filling out and returning the questionnaire. Thank you in advance for your help.

The person responsible for the survey at the PPMI: [Redacted] but do not hesitate to contact me for any further clarification

Best regards,

[Redacted]

European Commission
DG JUSTICE "Fundamental Rights and Rights of the Child"