



COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

T-ES(2015)17\_en

7 October 2015

## **LANZAROTE COMMITTEE**

Committee of the Parties to the Council of Europe  
Convention on the protection of children against sexual  
exploitation and sexual abuse (T-ES)

.....

### **Report**

#### **12<sup>th</sup> meeting**

Strasbourg, 15-17 June 2015

Prepared by the Secretariat of the Lanzarote Committee

1. The Committee of the Parties (hereinafter referred to as “the Lanzarote Committee” or “the Committee”) to the Council of Europe Convention on the protection of children against sexual exploitation and sexual abuse (hereinafter referred to as “the Lanzarote Convention” or “the Convention”) held its 12<sup>th</sup> meeting in Strasbourg on 15-17 June 2015. The agenda of the meeting, as adopted, appears in Appendix I. The list of participants appears in Appendix II.

## **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND UPDATE ON RATIFICATIONS OF THE LANZAROTE CONVENTION**

2. Mr GUÐBRANDSSON (Iceland), Chairperson of the Lanzarote Committee, opened the meeting by welcoming the entry into force of the Convention in Cyprus and Poland. The Lanzarote Convention has now 36 State Parties.

3. The Committee took note of the progress in the ratification process<sup>1</sup> of the Lanzarote Convention by the Czech Republic, Hungary and Liechtenstein as well as the attention drawn to the Convention by Tunisia.

## **2. MONITORING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LANZAROTE CONVENTION**

### ***2.1 Conclusion of the analysis of replies to Question 14 of the Thematic Questionnaire: “Child-friendly investigations and procedures”***

4. Mr GUÐBRANDSSON recalled that the Committee did not have time, at its previous meeting, to finalise the examination of the points raised by Ms CASTELLO-BRANCO (Portugal), Rapporteur on Question 14 (child-friendly justice) (Articles 30§2, 32 and 36§2 of the Convention).

5. Ms CASTELLO-BRANCO therefore completed the presentation of the observations resulting from her analysis of the replies to Question 14. She asked States Parties to verify if their replies could be supplemented with any possible specificities linked to the circle of trust, since most replies were of a general nature.

6. Mr GUÐBRANDSSON thanked Ms CASTELLO-BRANCO for her efforts in exploring in detail such a wide issue. He however stressed the need for the implementation report to be focused on the main elements raised in Question 14 with regards to the sole perspective of the circle of trust.

7. The Committee agreed that comments on the observations prepared by the Rapporteur should be submitted to [lanzarote.committee@coe.int](mailto:lanzarote.committee@coe.int) by 15 July 2015.

### ***2.2 Examination and adoption of the revised draft 1<sup>st</sup> implementation report on “The protection of children against sexual abuse in the circle of trust: the legal and judicial frameworks”***

8. The Committee continued its examination of the draft 1<sup>st</sup> implementation report.

---

<sup>1</sup> Information on new signatures/ratifications is regularly published in the news headlines of the Lanzarote Convention web page ([www.coe.int/lanzarote](http://www.coe.int/lanzarote)). An up-to-date table of signatures/ratifications and list of declarations and reservations to the Lanzarote Convention is available on the Council of Europe’s Treaty Office web page (<http://conventions.coe.int>).

9. It agreed with the proposed structure of the document. It also agreed on the overall approach, namely that each thematic section provides a comparative overview of the situation in the 26 Parties monitored, whilst a country specific summary of the information is appended to the report in the form of a table; highlights promising practices identified by the Committee to effectively implement the Convention; pinpoints the shortcomings identified and recommends steps that Parties should take to improve or reinforce the protection of children against sexual abuse in the circle of trust.

10. The Committee also decided to use three different verbs in its recommendations to Parties. The use of the verbs to “urge”, “consider” and “invite” corresponds to different kinds of recommendations that the Lanzarote Committee addresses to Parties, depending on the levels of urgency, for bringing their legislation and/or practice into compliance with the Convention.

11. The Committee agreed, with a few minor changes, on the text of the introduction and decided that it should not re-discuss this text at a later stage.

12. The Committee approved the general approach followed in the part of the report on criminalisation of sexual abuse of children in the circle of trust. Several members of the Committee provided clarifications and made comments on specific aspects of this part. The Committee noted, in particular, that some countries would provide further information to demonstrate that the recommendations brought against them should be removed (by providing, for example, legal texts or courts’ decisions).

13. The Committee started to assess the part of the report on collection of data on child sexual abuse committed in the circle of trust but could not complete it for lack of time.

14. The Committee could not examine the rest of the report for lack of time.

15. It agreed that amendments to the existing text of the report (including its appendices) should be submitted to [lanzarote.committee@coe.int](mailto:lanzarote.committee@coe.int) by 15 July 2015. It asked the Secretariat to finalise the draft report on the basis of these amendments, of any additional information received in due time before the following meeting, and of the outcome of the discussions held on the Rapporteurs’ observations examined during the present and previous meetings. The Committee stressed that the report as a whole should be adopted during its following meeting and noted that the Indicative Time-Table of the 1<sup>st</sup> monitoring round should be amended accordingly (see Appendix III).

### **3. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION, EXPERIENCE AND GOOD PRACTICE**

#### ***3.1 Continuation of the examination and adoption of the draft Opinion on Article 23 of the Lanzarote Convention and its explanatory note: Solicitation of children for sexual purposes through information and communication technologies (Grooming)***

16. The Chairperson recalled that, at its previous meeting (11<sup>th</sup> meeting, 17-19 March 2015), the Committee agreed on the text of the opinion except for one paragraph and had no time to consider its draft explanatory note.

17. The Committee resumed its examination of the remaining paragraph and, because no consensus was found, proceeded to votes.

18. Mr POUTIERS, Secretary to the Lanzarote Committee, recalled the voting procedures as they appear in the [Rules of Procedure](#). He reminded the Committee, in particular, that only the 36 members of the Lanzarote Committee could vote, that voting requires a quorum and that decisions of the Lanzarote Committee are taken by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast (casting in favour or against; members who abstain being regarded as not having cast a vote) (see Rule 18).

19. According to these voting rules, the inclusion in the opinion of option 1<sup>2</sup> was rejected (15 votes in favour, 12 votes against and 4 abstentions; out of 27 votes casted, the two-third majority being 18).

20. Option 2 was the object of an amendment submitted by Belgium. The Committee voted first on the amendment (Rule 14§2) which was adopted (22 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 6 abstentions; out of 25 votes casted, the two-third majority being 17). The Committee then voted on the inclusion of the text of option 2 as amended<sup>3</sup> in the Opinion. This inclusion was approved (24 votes in favour, 2 votes against and 5 abstentions; out of 26 votes casted, the two-third majority being 18).

21. The Committee then examined in-depth the explanatory note to its Opinion on Article 23.

22. Finally, it adopted by acclamation the text of the whole Opinion and its explanatory note as they appear in Appendix IV.

### **3.2 Presentation of the results of the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Working Group on Trends in Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse**

23. Ms DE CRAIM (Belgium), member of the Working Group on Trends in Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, presented the results and outcomes of the first meeting of the Group (18 May 2015). The Working Group identified the following seven trends: Self-generated images and material; Sexual coercion and extortion; Live distant child abuse and exploitation; Sex chatting / sexting; Bad hosting; Anonymity and encryption of data / use of darknet; Commercial child sexual exploitation. The Working Group started to analyse each of these trends, their consequences for children and how best they could be tackled. It decided that it will have to consider, at its next meeting, if and how each of these trends are covered by the Lanzarote Convention and the EU Directive on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography. The Group also intends to identify good practices and actions which could be taken to tackle these phenomena.

24. Ms DE CRAIM added that the Working Group requested from the Committee the possibility to invite the European Commission to its next meetings since it considered essential to take EU views on board in this field. The Working Group also asks to be able to hold a third meeting in early 2016 (the second meeting of the Working Group being already scheduled for 8 September 2015) after the publication in December 2015 of two important studies by the European Commission (on the transposition of the EU Directive by member States) and by Europol and International Watch Foundation.

---

<sup>2</sup> Which read as follows: “States may consider criminalising also the solicitation, through information and communication technologies with the intent to commit a sexual offence, by an adult of a person he or she believes to be a child.”

<sup>3</sup> Which read as follows: “States may consider encouraging law enforcement to prevent the commitment of sexual offences, including online grooming, against children through information and communication technologies.”

25. The Chairperson thanked Ms DE CRAIM and the Working Group for the already important work carried out and the stimulating perspectives on topical issues of great relevance for the protection of children in the digital world. The Committee approved the holding of a third meeting of the Working Group in early 2016 and agreed to invite the European Commission to the coming meetings.

### **3.3 Presentation of activities by international governmental and non-governmental organisations**

#### **3.3.1 Exchange of views with Ms Marta SANTOS PAIS, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General on Violence against Children**

26. The Committee heard a presentation from and exchanged views with Ms SANTOS PAIS, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General on Violence against Children. She insisted in particular on the very positive influence both the Lanzarote Convention and the ONE in FIVE Campaign have on countries around the world. She also pointed to the study prepared recently by her Office [Releasing Children's Potential and Minimizing Risks - ICTs, the Internet and Violence against Children](#). Finally, she encouraged the Committee to join hands with her Office in supporting the target of ending all violence against children as a priority in the Post 2015 Global Agenda, which the Committee agreed.

27. The Chairperson thanked Ms SANTOS PAIS for her motivating presentation and emphasised the Committee's support to her work. He reminded participants that they were invited to attend the [5<sup>th</sup> High-Level Cross-Regional Round Table on Violence against Children](#) held just after the meeting (18-19 June 2015). He recalled that this Round Table, convened by Ms SANTOS PAIS, gathers each year regional organizations and institutions to discuss and promote progress in the prevention and elimination of all forms of violence against children.

#### **3.3.2 Presentation by Ms Turid HEIBERG, Head of the Children at Risk Unit of the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) of the CBSS activities related to the protection of children against sexual exploitation and sexual abuse**

28. The Committee heard a presentation from and exchanged views with Ms HEIBERG, Head of the Children's Unit at the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) Secretariat. Ms HEIBERG highlighted in particular the [ROBERT Project](#) which intends to make online interaction safe for children and young people. She stressed that CBSS is ready to cooperate with the Lanzarote Committee on this issue of common concern and is interested in participating more actively in the work of the Committee.

29. The Chairperson thanked Ms HEIBERG for sharing the work carried out by CBSS which, with no doubt, was in line with the Lanzarote Committee mandate. The Committee decided to invite CBSS as an observer to its forthcoming meetings.

### **3.4 Exchange of views with Mr Matthew McVARISH on the statute of limitations (Article 33 of the Lanzarote Convention)**

30. The Committee heard a presentation from and exchanged views with Mr McVARISH, a child sexual abuse survivor and an activist, who started his awareness raising activities in 2008 when he wrote a play called 'To kill a kelpie', inspired by his experience of being sexually abused by his uncle. He also explained his [Road to Change](#) project for which, from May 2013 to February 2015, he walked 10,000 miles across Europe and encouraged every European

government to abolish their statute of limitations on reporting child sexual abuse. He stressed that in order to press charges, victims must first overcome their psychological trauma and then surmount a variety of obstacles in their environment, which make speaking about sexual abuse extremely difficult. He considered that the statute of limitations was therefore a reporting threshold which the vast majority of victims would never reach. He therefore asked the Lanzarote Committee to reconsider Article 33 of the Lanzarote Convention<sup>4</sup> which deals with this issue.

31. The Chairperson thanked Mr McVARISH for his very valuable and moving contribution to the work of the Committee. Ms SCAPPUCCI, Executive Secretary to the Lanzarote Committee, suggested that the Committee could consider the follow-up to this exchange at a forthcoming meeting, which the Committee agreed. She also reminded participants that they were invited to the screening of the film made out of the play "To Kill a Kelpie", followed by a debate with Mr McVARISH, on 17 June 2015 evening.

### **3.5 Update on the ONE in FIVE Campaign initiatives**

32. Ms FATALIYEVA, General Rapporteur on Children of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and Representative of the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development, informed the Lanzarote Committee that the Network of Contact Parliamentarians to stop sexual violence against children held its 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting (23 April 2015), jointly with the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media, on the theme of sex and relationship education as a means of preventing sexual violence against children and its 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting (20 May 2015, in Chisinau, Moldova) on the theme of strategies and mechanisms to protect children from sexual abuse, trafficking and sexual exploitation. Interviews with the experts and detailed reports of the meetings can be found on the ONE in FIVE website<sup>5</sup>.

33. Ms FATALIYEVA also provided an update on the Cyprus project, which has entered into a year-long training programme for key stakeholders, in particular professionals of different backgrounds (judges, prosecutors, police, social services etc.).

34. In the context of the follow-up to the ONE in FIVE Campaign, the Committee was also informed that the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe agreed on 12 May 2015 on a European Day on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse. This Day will be celebrated each year on 18 November in every member state of the Council of Europe through awareness-raising activities with the strong involvement of civil society.

### **3.6 Participation of the Lanzarote Committee in outside events: debriefings**

35. The Committee postponed this item to its next meeting for lack of time.

---

<sup>4</sup> Article 33 of the Lanzarote Convention reads: "Each Party shall take the necessary legislative or other measures to ensure that the statute of limitation for initiating proceedings with regard to the offences established in accordance with Articles 18, 19, paragraph 1.a and b, and 21, paragraph 1.a and b, shall continue for a period of time sufficient to allow the efficient starting of proceedings after the victim has reached the age of majority and which is commensurate with the gravity of the crime in question."

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/children/1in5/PACE/Meetings\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/children/1in5/PACE/Meetings_en.asp)

#### **4. PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

##### **4.1 *Review of the Rules of procedure of the Lanzarote Committee***

36. The Committee postponed this item to its next meeting for lack of time.

##### **4.2 *Appointment of Rapporteurs for Questions 3, 5, 8, and 9b of the Thematic Questionnaire***

37. The Committee postponed this item to its next meeting for lack of time.

#### **5. DATES OF THE NEXT MEETING**

1-4 December 2015<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> This date was decided after the meeting in replacement of 13-15 October 2015. Indeed, since the Committee should adopt its 1st monitoring report during its 13th meeting, it was possible to add an additional day to the next meeting and to postpone it to 1-4 December 2015 (4 days) to have sufficient time to finalise, examine and adopt the full draft.

## Appendix I

### Agenda

- 1. Opening of the meeting, adoption of the agenda and up-date on ratifications of the Lanzarote Convention**
- 2. Monitoring of the implementation of the Lanzarote Convention**
  - 2.1 Conclusion of the analysis of replies to Question 14 of the Thematic Questionnaire: “Child-friendly investigations and procedures”
  - 2.2 Examination and adoption of the revised draft 1<sup>st</sup> implementation report on “The protection of children against sexual abuse in the circle of trust: the legal and judicial frameworks”
- 3. Exchange of information, experience and good practice**
  - 3.1 Continuation of the examination and adoption of the draft Opinion on Article 23 of the Lanzarote Convention and its explanatory note: Solicitation of children for sexual purposes through information and communication technologies (Grooming)
  - 3.2 Presentation of the results of the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Working Group on Trends in Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
  - 3.3 Presentation of activities by international governmental and non-governmental organisations
    - 3.3.1 Exchange of views with Ms Marta SANTOS PAIS, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General on Violence against Children
    - 3.3.2 Presentation by Ms Turid HEIBERG, Head of the Children at Risk Unit of the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) of the CBSS activities related to the protection of children against sexual exploitation and sexual abuse
  - 3.4 Exchange of views with Mr Matthew McVARISH on the statute of limitations (Article 33 of the Lanzarote Convention)
  - 3.5 Update on the ONE in FIVE Campaign initiatives
  - 3.6 Participation of the Lanzarote Committee in outside events: debriefings
    - 3.6.1 Mr Bragi GUÐBRANDSSON – [31<sup>st</sup> International Child Abuse Symposium](#), 23-26 March 2015, Huntsville, Alabama



- 3.6.2 Mr Stevan POPOVIC – Seminar on the promotion of safe and healthy sport environments, project “Pro Safe Sport for Young Athletes”, 28 April 2015, Minsk
- 3.6.3 Ms Tiziana ZANNINI – Closing Conference of the project “Pro Safe Sport for Young Athletes”, 4 May 2015, Rome
- 3.6.4 Ms Ina VERZIVOLLI – 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Committee of Experts on the Council of Europe Strategy for the Rights of the Child 2016-2019 (DECS-ENF), 12-13 May 2015, Strasbourg
- 3.6.5 Ms Maria José CASTELLO-BRANCO – Congress of the International Catholic Child Bureau (BICE) on “The protection of children against sexual abuse”, 20 May 2015, Paris

#### **4. Procedural matters**

- 4.1 Review of the Rules of procedure of the Lanzarote Committee
- 4.2 Appointment of Rapporteurs for Questions 3, 5, 8, and 9b of the Thematic Questionnaire

#### **5. Dates of the next meeting**

## Appendix II

### List of participants

#### 1. MEMBERS / MEMBRES

##### STATE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION / ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION

###### ALBANIA / ALBANIE

Ms Ina VERZIVOLLI  
Chairperson  
State Agency on protection of Children's Rights  
Ministry of Social Welfare and Youth

###### ANDORRA / ANDORRE

Mme Rebeca ARMENGOL ASENJO  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Psychologue  
Département responsable de l'aide sociale à  
l'enfance et à la famille  
Ministère de la Santé et du Bien-être social

Mme Aurembiaix SEMIS FOIXENCH  
Travailleur social  
Département responsable de l'aide sociale à  
l'enfance et à la famille  
Ministère de la Santé et du Bien-être social

Mme Cristina CANALES CERVERA  
Travailleur social  
Département responsable de l'aide sociale à  
l'enfance et à la famille  
Ministère de la Santé et du Bien-être social

###### AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE

Ms Martina KLEIN  
Public Prosecutor  
Public Prosecution Service Vienna

###### BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

Ms Christel DE CRAIM  
Acting Head of Service  
Service for Criminal Policy  
Ministry of Justice

###### BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / BOSNIE- HERZEGOVINE

Ms Tijana BOROVIČANIN-MARIĆ  
Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees

###### BULGARIA / BULGARIE

Ms Petya DIMITROVA  
State Expert  
State Child Policy Directorate  
State Agency for Child Protection

###### CROATIA / CROATIE

Ms Sanja NOLA  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Assistant Minister  
Directorate for Criminal Law  
Ministry of Justice

Ms Ana KORDEJ  
Head of Sector  
Directorate for Criminal Law  
Ministry of Justice

###### CYPRUS / CHYPRE

Ms Hara TAPANIDOU  
Head of Department for Family and Child Affairs  
Social Services  
Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs

###### DENMARK / DANEMARK

Ms Malene DALGAARD  
Head of Section  
Criminal Law Division  
Ministry of Justice

###### FINLAND / FINLANDE

Ms Satu SISTONEN  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Legal Officer  
Legal Service  
Unit for Human Rights Courts and Conventions  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Mr Janne KANERVA  
Counsellor of Legislation  
Law Drafting Department  
Ministry of Justice

###### FRANCE

M. Francis STOLIAROFF  
Adjoint au chef de la mission pour les négociations  
Direction des affaires criminelles et des grâces  
Ministère de la justice

###### GEORGIA / GÉORGIE

Ms Maka PERADZE  
Head of Project Management Division  
International Relations Department  
Ministry of Internal Affairs

**GREECE / GRÈCE**

Mr George NIKOLAIDIS  
Director  
Department of Mental Health and Social Welfare  
Centre for the Study and Prevention of Child  
Abuse and Neglect  
Institute of Child Health

**ICELAND / ISLANDE**

Mr Bragi GUÐBRANDSSON  
(*Chairperson / Président*)  
General Director  
Government Agency for Child Protection

**ITALY / ITALIE**

Ms Tiziana ZANNINI  
Head of the Division for General and Social Affairs  
Department for Equal Opportunities  
Presidency of the Council of Ministers

**LATVIA / LETTONIE**

Ms Indra GRATKOVSKA  
Director  
Department of Criminal Law  
Ministry of Justice

**LITHUANIA / LITUANIE**

Ms Asta ŠIDLAUSKIENĖ  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Expert  
Child Division  
Family and Communities Department  
Ministry of Social Security and Labour

**LUXEMBOURG**

M. Claude JANIZZI  
Conseiller de direction 1<sup>re</sup> classe  
Service des droits de l'enfant / Service des  
relations internationales  
Ministère de l'Éducation nationale, de l'Enfance et  
de la Jeunesse

**MALTA / MALTE**

Mr Charlie AZZOPARDI  
Systemic Psychotherapist, Couple & Family  
Therapist  
Institute of Family Therapy

**REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA / REPUBLIQUE DE  
MOLDOVA**

Ms Tatiana ȚURCAN  
Head of the European Integration Policies  
Development Unit  
General Department for International Relations  
and European Integration  
Ministry of Internal Affairs

**MONACO**

Mme Justine AMBROSINI  
Secrétaire des Relations Extérieures et de la  
Coopération  
Chef de Section  
Direction des Affaires Internationales  
Ministère d'Etat

M. Gabriel CHABERT  
Représentation Permanente de la Principauté de  
Monaco auprès du Conseil de l'Europe

**MONTENEGRO**

Ms Svetlana SOVILJ  
Senior Adviser for Child Protection  
Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare

**NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS**

Mr Erik PLANKEN  
Policy Advisor  
Law Enforcement Department  
Ministry of Security and Justice

Mr Jonathan CHOUDHURY  
Law Enforcement Department  
Ministry of Security and Justice

**POLAND / POLOGNE**

Mr Kuba SEŹKOWSKI  
Legal Counsel  
Chief Specialist  
European Criminal Law Unit  
Legislative Department  
Ministry of Justice

**PORTUGAL**

Ms Maria José CASTELLO-BRANCO  
Legal Adviser  
International Affairs Department  
Directorate-General for Justice Policy  
Ministry of Justice

**ROMANIA / ROUMANIE**

Ms Alina ION  
Legal Adviser  
Department for Drafting Legislation  
Ministry of Justice

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE**

Mr Evgeny SILYANOV  
Director  
Department of the State Policy in the sphere of  
children rights protection  
Ministry of Education

Mr Denis SHARAY  
Advisor  
Department of the State Policy in the sphere of  
children rights protection  
Ministry of Education

Ms Anastasia ATABEKOVA  
Expert  
People's Friendship University

Ms Olga AGRINENKO  
Deputy to the Permanent Representative  
Permanent Representation of the Russian  
Federation to the Council of Europe

#### **SAN MARINO / SAINT-MARIN**

Mme Sylvie BOLLINI  
Direction des Affaires Juridiques  
Département des Affaires Etrangères

#### **SERBIA / SERBIE**

Mr Stevan POPOVIĆ  
Independent adviser  
Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social  
Policy

#### **SLOVENIA / SLOVÉNIE**

Mr Miha MOVRIN  
(*Apologised / Excusé*)  
Senior Advisor  
Ministry of Justice

#### **SPAIN / ESPAGNE**

Ms Silvia NEGRO ALOUSQUE  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Head of Service  
Ministry of Justice

#### **SWEDEN / SUÈDE**

Ms Jessica GOZZI  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Coordination on the Rights of the Child  
Division for Family and Social Services  
Ministry of Health and Social Affairs

Mr Erik KARLSSON BJÖRK  
Deputy to the Permanent Representative  
Permanent Representation of Sweden to the  
Council of Europe

#### **SWITZERLAND / SUISSE**

Ms Anita MARFURT  
Juriste Droit pénal international  
Unité Droit pénal international  
Office fédéral de la justice - OFJ  
Département fédéral de justice et police - DFJP

#### **“THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA” / « L’EX-REPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE DE MACEDOINE »**

Mr Dusan TOMSIC  
(*Apologised / Excusé*)  
Ministry of Labour and Social Policy

Ms Elka TODOROVA  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Ministry of Labour and Social Policy

#### **TURKEY / TURQUIE**

Mr Hüseyin Serkan YILDIZ  
Rapporteur Judge  
Ministry of Justice

#### **UKRAINE**

Ms Svitlana ILCHUK  
Head of Division  
Legal Support and Monitoring of the  
Implementation of the UN Convention on  
Children's Rights  
Ministry of Social Policy

## **2. PARTICIPANTS**

### **2.1 COUNCIL OF EUROPE MEMBER STATES NOT PARTY TO THE CONVENTION / ETATS MEMBRES DU CONSEIL DE L’EUROPE NON PARTIES À LA CONVENTION**

#### **ARMENIA / ARMÉNIE**

Ms Karine SOUDJIAN  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Head of Human Rights and Humanitarian Issues  
Division  
International Organizations Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

#### **AZERBAIJAN / AZERBAÏDJAN**

Ms Jeyran RAHMATULLAYEVA  
Head of the Department of the Regional  
(Children & Family Support) Centres  
State Committee on Family, Women and  
Children Affairs

#### **CZECH REPUBLIC / RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE**

Ms Barbora RAMPASOVÁ  
International Cooperation Department  
Ministry of Justice

**ESTONIA / ESTONIE**

Ms Joanna PAABUMETS  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Children Rights Adviser  
Department of Children and Families  
Ministry of Social Affairs

**GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE**

Ms Garonne BEZJAK  
Judge  
Division II A 7  
Criminal Law (Criminology, Prevention and  
Offences against sexual self-determination)  
Federal Ministry of Justice and Consumer  
Protection

**HUNGARY / HONGRIE**

Ms Dóra KECSKÉS  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Political Advisor  
State Secretary for Family and Youth Affairs  
Ministry of Human Capacities

**IRELAND / IRLANDE**

No official nomination / Pas de nomination  
officielle

**LIECHTENSTEIN**

M. Claudio NARDI  
Office pour les Affaires Etrangères

Ms Monika BÜCHEL  
Judge  
Princely Court of Liechtenstein

**NORWAY / NORVÈGE**

No official nomination / Pas de nomination  
officielle

**SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE**

No official nomination / Pas de nomination  
officielle

**UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI**

Mr Wayne JONES  
(*Apologised / Excusé*)  
Safeguarding Policy Advisor  
Safeguarding and Public Protection Unit  
Home Office

**2.2 COUNCIL OF EUROPE OBSERVER  
STATES / ETATS OBSERVATEURS  
AUPRES DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE****HOLY SEE / SAINT-SIÈGE**

Mme Alessandra AULA  
Secrétaire Générale  
Bureau international catholique de l'enfance  
(BICE)  
Genève, Suisse

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA / ÉTATS-UNIS  
D'AMÉRIQUE**

No official nomination / Pas de nomination  
officielle

**CANADA**

No official nomination / Pas de nomination  
officielle

**JAPAN / JAPON**

No official nomination / Pas de nomination  
officielle

**MEXICO / MEXIQUE**

No official nomination / Pas de nomination  
officielle

Ms Lorena BARRERA  
Permanent Mission of Mexico to the Council of  
Europe

Ms Salomé DELAY-GOYET  
Permanent Mission of Mexico to the Council of  
Europe

**2.3 STATE HAVING REQUESTED  
ACCESSION TO THE CONVENTION /  
ÉTAT AYANT DEMANDÉ D'ADHÉRER  
À LA CONVENTION****MOROCCO / MAROC**

M. Mohamed AIT AAZIZI  
(*Apologised / Excusé*)  
Directeur  
Direction de la Protection de la Famille, de  
l'Enfance et des Personnes Agées  
Ministère de la Solidarité, de la Femme, de la  
Famille et du Développement Social

M. Youssef EL ASSAFI  
Chef de Service  
Division de l'Enfance  
Direction de la Protection de la Famille, de  
l'Enfance et des Personnes Agées  
Ministère de la Solidarité, de la Femme, de la  
Famille et du Développement social

Mme Naoual JOUIHRI  
Vice-Consule  
Consulat Général du Royaume du Maroc  
Strasbourg

## **2.4 NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIPS / PARTENARIATS DE VOISINAGE**

### **JORDAN / JORDANIE**

Mr Mohamed MOQDADI  
Deputy Secretary General  
National Council for Family Affairs

### **TUNISIA / TUNISIE**

Mme Faouzia CHAABANE JABEUR  
Directrice Générale de l'Enfance  
Ministère de la Femme, de la Famille et de  
l'Enfance

## **2.5 INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS / ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES**

### **EUROPEAN UNION / UNION EUROPÉENNE**

Mr César ALONSO IRIARTE  
(*Apologised / Excusé*)  
Unit A.2: Fight against organised crime  
DG Home Affairs  
European Commission

Ms Ewa SIERACZYNSKA  
Trainee - Legal Affairs Advisor  
European External Action Service  
EU Delegation to the Council of Europe

### **EUROPOL**

Ms Katarzyna STACIWA  
Strategic Analyst  
Focal Point Twins  
EC3  
European Cybercrime Centre and fight against  
child sexual exploitation

### **INTERPOL**

Mr Robert SHILLING  
(*Apologised / Excusé*)  
Coordinator – Operations  
Crimes against Children  
Human Trafficking and Child Exploitation  
Lyon, France

### **UNICEF**

Ms Anne GRANDJEAN  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Child Protection Specialist  
UNICEF Regional Office for Central and Eastern  
Europe and Commonwealth of Independent  
States (CEE/CIS)

### **INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION (ITU)**

Ms Carla LICCIARDELLO  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Strategic Planning and Membership Department

## **2.6 COUNCIL OF EUROPE INSTITUTIONS AND BODIES / INSTITUTIONS ET ORGANES DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

### **PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE / ASSEMBLÉE PARLEMENTAIRE DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

Ms Sevinj FATALIYEVA  
Parliament of Azerbaijan  
General Rapporteur on Children  
Committee on Social Affairs, Health and  
Sustainable Development

### **CONGRESS OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL AUTHORITIES OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE / CONGRÈS DES POUVOIRS LOCAUX ET RÉGIONAUX DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

Mr Johan van den HOUT  
(*Apologised / Excusé*)  
Congress Thematic Spokesperson on Children

### **COUNCIL OF EUROPE COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS / COMMISSAIRE AUX DROITS DE L'HOMME DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

(*Apologised / Excusé*)

**GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE OF THE EUROPEAN SOCIAL CHARTER AND THE EUROPEAN CODE OF SOCIAL SECURITY (T-SG) / COMITÉ GOUVERNEMENTAL DE LA CHARTE SOCIALE EUROPÉENNE ET DU CODE EUROPÉEN DE SÉCURITÉ SOCIALE (T-SG)**

Mme Jacqueline MARECHAL  
Chairperson / Présidente

**STEERING COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS (CDDH) / COMITÉ DIRECTEUR POUR LES DROITS DE L'HOMME (CDDH)**

Mr Joan FORNER ROVIRA  
Expert Member of the CDDH  
Government Agent to the ECtHR  
Deputy Permanent Representative  
Permanent Representation of Andorra to the Council of Europe

**EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON CRIME PROBLEMS (CDPC) / COMITÉ EUROPÉEN POUR LES PROBLÈMES CRIMINELS (CDPC)**

No official nomination / Pas de nomination officielle

**EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON LEGAL CO-OPERATION (CDCJ) / COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE COOPÉRATION JURIDIQUE (CDCJ)**

Mr Francisco Javier FORCADA MIRANDA  
(*Apologised / Excusé*)  
Member  
Legal Advisor  
Directorate-General  
International Legal Co-operation and Interfaith Relations  
Ministry of Justice  
Madrid, Spain

Ms Zuzana FIŠEROVÁ  
Member  
Ministry of Justice  
Prague, Czech Republic

**CYBERCRIME CONVENTION COMMITTEE (T-CY) / COMITÉ DE LA CONVENTION CYBERCRIMINALITÉ (T-CY)**

Ms Cristina SCHULMAN  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
T-CY Vice-chair  
Legal Adviser  
Directorate International of Law and Judicial Cooperation  
Ministry of Justice  
Romania

**ADVISORY COUNCIL ON YOUTH / CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR LA JEUNESSE**

Ms Fanny CHARMÉY  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
National Youth Council of Switzerland (CSAJ)

**CONFERENCE OF INGOS OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE / CONFERENCE DES OING DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

Mme Anna RURKA  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Présidente de la Conférence des OING

Mr Geert PRIEM  
President  
Federal Police ANPV, The Hague  
Member of the European Council Police Unions, INGOS with participatory status and member of the Conference of INGOS of the Council of Europe

**3. OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS**

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS / INSTITUTIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES**

**ECPAT INTERNATIONAL**

Ms Katlijn DECLERCQ  
Vice-Chair  
ECPAT International Board of Trustees

**eNACSO (European NGO Alliance for Child Safety Online)**

(*Apologised / Excusée*)

**MISSING CHILDREN EUROPE**

Mr Francis HERBERT  
(*Apologised / Excusé*)  
Legal Counsel

**INHOPE (The International Association of Internet Hotlines)**

Ms Samantha WOOLFE  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Projects Coordinator

Ms Sarah Jane MELLOR  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Strategic Communications

#### **4. SPECIAL GUESTS / INVITES** **SPECIAUX**

Ms Marta SANTOS PAIS  
Special Representative of the Secretary-General  
on Violence against Children  
United Nations

Ms Elda MORENO  
Director of the Office SRSG on Violence against  
Children  
United Nations

Ms Turid HEIBERG  
Senior Adviser & Head of the Unit for Children at  
Risk (CAR)  
Council of Baltic Sea States (CBSS)

Dr Matthew McVARISH  
Actor, Playwright and Activist against sexual  
abuse of children  
Road to Change

#### **5. COUNCIL OF EUROPE** **SECRETARIAT / SECRETARIAT DU** **CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

##### **Secretariat of the Parliamentary Assembly /** **Secrétariat de l'Assemblée parlementaire**

##### **Committee on Social Affairs, Health and** **Sustainable Development / Commission des** **questions sociales, de la santé et du** **développement durable**

Ms Maren LAMBRECHT-FEIGL  
Secretary to the Committee on Social Affairs,  
Health and Sustainable Development /  
Secrétaire de la commission des questions  
sociales, de la santé et du développement  
durable

Ms Jannick DEVAUX  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Project Manager / Chargée de Projet  
Network to stop sexual violence against  
children / Réseau contre la violence sexuelle à  
l'égard des enfants

##### **Secretariat of the Congress of Local and Regional** **Authorities / Secrétariat du Congrès des pouvoirs** **locaux et régionaux**

##### **Current Affairs Committee / Commission des** **questions d'actualité**

Ms Sedef CANKOCAK  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)

##### **Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights /** **Bureau du Commissaire aux droits de l'homme**

Ms Françoise KEMPF  
(*Apologised / Excusée*)  
Adviser / Conseillère

##### **Directorate General of Democracy / Direction** **Générale de la Démocratie**

##### **Directorate of Human Dignity and Equality /** **Direction de la Dignité humaine et de l'Égalité**

##### **Equality and Human Dignity Department /** **Service de la dignité humaine et de l'égalité**

Mr Gianluca ESPOSITO  
Head of Department / Chef de Service

##### **Equality Division / Division de l'Égalité**

Mr Emmanuel BARON  
Projects Officer / Chargé de projets

##### **Children's Rights Division / Division des droits des** **enfants**

Ms Regína JENSDÓTTIR  
Head of Division / Chef de Division

Ms Gioia SCAPPUCCI  
Executive Secretary of the Lanzarote Committee /  
Secrétaire exécutive du Comité de Lanzarote

Mr Mikaël POUTIERS  
Secretary to the Lanzarote Committee / Secrétaire  
du Comité de Lanzarote

Ms Lauren HOLDUP  
Administrative Support Assistant / Assistante  
administrative d'appui

Ms Corinne CHRISTOPHEL  
Assistant / Assistante

##### **Interpreters / Interprètes**

Ms Rebecca BOWEN  
Ms Rémy JAIN  
Ms Bettina LUDEWIG



## Appendix III

### 1<sup>ST</sup> Monitoring Round - Indicative Time-Table

<b>Committee meeting</b>	<b>Replies to questions on the agenda of the meeting</b>
8-10 April 2014	Overview of the replies to the General Overview Questionnaire (GOQ) - at a minimum of questions: 1, 3, 5 and 6
<b>1<sup>st</sup> sub-theme / 1<sup>st</sup> part of the implementation report</b>	
9-11 September 2014	Preliminary assessment of replies to the following questions of the Thematic Questionnaire (TQ), including of the replies to the GOQ to contextualise such replies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10 (criminal law offence of sexual abuse)</li> <li>- 11 (corporate liability)</li> </ul>
2-4 December 2014	Preliminary assessment of replies to the following questions of the TQ, including of the replies to the GOQ to contextualise such replies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 (data collection)</li> <li>- 9.a (legal safeguards to assist and protect the victim)</li> <li>- 12 (aggravating circumstances)</li> <li>- 13 (best interest of the child in investigation and criminal proceedings)</li> <li>- 14 (child friendly investigations and proceedings)</li> </ul>
17-19 March 2015	Continuation of the preliminary assessment of replies to the following questions of the TQ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 (data collection)</li> <li>- 14 (child friendly investigations and proceedings)</li> </ul> Assessment of the draft implementation report on the 1 <sup>st</sup> sub-theme
15-17 June 2015	Continuation of the preliminary assessment of replies to question 14 (child friendly investigations and proceedings) of the TQ Assessment of the draft implementation report on the 1 <sup>st</sup> sub-theme
<b>1-4 December 2015</b>	<b>Finalisation and adoption of the report on the 1<sup>st</sup> sub-theme</b>
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> sub-theme / 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the implementation report</b>	
March 2016	Preliminary assessment of replies to the following questions of the TQ, including of the replies to the GOQ to contextualise such replies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 (children's education)</li> <li>- 4 (awareness raising strategies)</li> <li>- 6 (participation by children in the development and implementation of policies, programmes)</li> <li>- 7 (preventive and intervention programmes)</li> </ul>
June 2016	Preliminary assessment of replies to the following questions of the TQ, including of the replies to the GOQ to contextualise such replies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3 (recruitment and screening)</li> <li>- 5 (specialised training)</li> <li>- 8 (reporting)</li> <li>- 9.b (denial of exercise of the professional or voluntary activity)</li> </ul>
November 2016	Assessment of the draft report on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> sub-theme
<b>March 2017</b>	<b>Finalisation and adoption of the report on the 2<sup>nd</sup> sub-theme</b>

## Appendix IV

### Opinion on Article 23 of the Lanzarote Convention and its explanatory note

#### Solicitation of children for sexual purposes through information and communication technologies (Grooming)

As adopted by the Lanzarote Committee on 17 June 2015

1. Bearing in mind that children are increasingly using information and communication technologies to communicate and form relationships, which may, in some cases, bring them into contact with sexual offenders;
2. Acknowledging that the Internet has created entirely new opportunities for sexual offenders to target, groom and harm children;
3. Recalling that Article 23 of the Lanzarote Convention requires Parties to criminalise the intentional proposal of an adult to meet a child for the purpose of committing unlawful sexual activities against him or her. This intention is organised and expressed through the means of information and communication technologies and has to be followed by material acts leading to such a meeting;
4. Recalling that sexual activities are deemed unlawful when practiced by an adult with a child who has not reached the legal age for sexual activities, which is set by national law and differs throughout the Parties to the Lanzarote Convention;
5. Noting that children who solicit other children with sexual intent are not covered by Article 23;
6. Noting also that the “solicitation of children for sexual purposes” is part of a practice more commonly known as “grooming”;
7. Concerned that, while online grooming may lead to an adult proposing to meet a child in person with the intent of committing a sexual offence, it is also possible for sexual offences to be committed exclusively online, nonetheless causing harm to the child;
8. Bearing in mind that children may be exposed to some of the same risks online as offline, such as being persuaded to engage in real or simulated sexually explicit conduct, being recruited or coerced to participate in pornographic performances, or caused to witness sexual abuse or sexual activities;

9. Noting that if the sexual abuse of the child is committed exclusively online, there are no material acts leading to a meeting in person, which represents a constitutive element of the criminal offence set forth by Article 23;
10. Considering moreover, that manipulating the child corresponds to a process which is sometimes extremely difficult to detect as the offender's motivation may change over the course of an interaction, and specific grooming behaviours may not actually exist from the outset;
11. Concerned that the acts leading to the sexual abuse committed exclusively online may not be adequately recognised as criminal and therefore remain unpunished;
12. Recognising that investigating an online interaction, which may or may not result in a meeting between an adult and a child, raises many challenges;
13. Bearing in mind that the emergence of cases where adults solicit children online can attract large scale media coverage, and that this may convey the impression that state authorities have not taken adequate action and expressing concern that as a result, "anti-Paedophile activism" aimed at tracking down and exposing alleged sexual offenders outside the confines of due legal process has emerged;

**The Committee holds that:**

14. The unlawful behaviours covered by Article 23 are the acts leading to sexual abuse of a child who has not reached the legal age for sexual activities (Article 18§1.a) and the production of child pornography (Article 20§1.a).
15. Article 23 of the Lanzarote Convention does not require the offences mentioned above to be actually committed but aims at criminalising the adult's preparation of the offences.
16. States may consider encouraging law enforcement to prevent the commitment of sexual offences, including online grooming, against children through information and communication technologies.
17. The solicitation of children through information and communication technologies does not necessarily result in a meeting in person. It may remain online and nonetheless cause serious harm to the child. The sexual offences which are intentionally perpetrated during an online meeting through communication technologies are often linked to the production, possession and transmission of child pornography.
18. Although under Article 23 only the production of child pornography is referred to (as Article 23 only refers to Article 20§1.a), Parties are reminded that other unlawful behaviours that may take place online are covered and criminalised under other provisions of the Convention:

Article 20§1 of the Convention also criminalises the intentional conduct of:

- b. offering or making available child pornography;
- c. distributing or transmitting child pornography;
- d. procuring child pornography for oneself or for another person;
- e. possessing child pornography;
- f. knowingly obtaining access, through information and communication technologies, to child pornography.

Article 21§1 of the Convention criminalises the intentional conduct, of:

- a. Recruiting a child into participating in pornographic performances or causing a child to participate in such performances;
- b. Coercing a child into participating in pornographic performances or profiting from or otherwise exploiting a child for such purposes;
- c. Knowingly attending pornographic performances involving the participation of children.

Article 22 of the Convention criminalises the intentional causing for sexual purposes of a child to witness sexual abuse or sexual activities, without even having to participate.

Article 24§2 of the Convention establishes as criminal offences, when committed intentionally, attempts to commit the offences established in accordance with the Convention.

19. In the light of the difficulties and issues recalled above, the requirements inherent to Article 23 of the Lanzarote Convention may not meet today's and, more importantly, tomorrow's challenges with regard to online grooming.

20. The overall phenomenon of online grooming evolves in parallel to information and communication technologies. Its understanding should therefore not restrict itself to the way online grooming was committed when the Convention was drafted, but should be understood and tackled according to how it is being committed today and could be committed tomorrow. As no static definition of online grooming is possible, Parties should consider extending its criminalisation also to cases when the sexual abuse is not the result of a meeting in person, but is committed online.

21. The responsibility for the investigation and prosecution of online grooming should remain with law enforcement authorities and the criminal justice system. When appropriate, assistance may be requested from specialised NGOs, but neither these nor the public should become the de facto agency of law enforcement.

22. In this respect, Parties should, without prejudice to national law, make sure that making private information on alleged sexual offenders public, is not permitted.

23. In order for the investigation and prosecution of online grooming to be effective, there is a great need to ensure that training and resources are allocated to all authorities responsible for the investigation of cases, prosecution of offenders and protection of victims of online grooming.

24. Civil society also plays a key role in protecting children and young people who have been victims of sexual abuse and exploitation. Adequate means should therefore also be allocated to these.

25. Children should be empowered to enjoy the advantages of information and communication technologies. They should be taught about the risks and dangers inherent to the digital world, especially those generated by the over-sexualisation of society. The opportunities and risks of information and communication technologies should be included in all school curricula.

### EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. The Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse, hereinafter the “Lanzarote Convention”, was the first international instrument to criminalise the solicitation of children for sexual purposes through information and communication technologies (ICTs).

#### **Article 23: Solicitation of children for sexual purposes**

“Each Party shall take the necessary legislative or other measures to criminalise the intentional proposal, through information and communication technologies, of an adult to meet a child who has not reached the age set in application of Article 18, paragraph 2, for the purpose of committing any of the offences established in accordance with Article 18, paragraph 1.a, or Article 20, paragraph 1.a, against him or her, where this proposal has been followed by material acts leading to such a meeting.”

#### **Explanatory report:**

155. Article 23 introduces a new offence in the Convention which is not present in other existing international instruments in the field. The solicitation of children for sexual purposes is more commonly known as “grooming”. The negotiators felt it was essential for the Convention to reflect the recent but increasingly worrying phenomenon of children being sexually harmed in meetings with adults whom they had initially encountered in cyberspace, specifically in Internet chat rooms or game sites.

156. The term “grooming” refers to the preparation of a child for sexual abuse, motivated by the desire to use the child for sexual gratification. It may involve the befriending of a child, often through the adult pretending to be another young person, drawing the child into discussing intimate matters, and gradually exposing the child to sexually explicit materials in order to reduce resistance or inhibitions about sex. The child may also be drawn into producing child pornography by sending compromising personal photos using a digital camera, web-cam or phone-cam, which provides the groomer with a means of controlling the child through threats. Where a physical meeting is arranged the child may be sexually abused or otherwise harmed.”

157. The negotiators felt that simply sexual chatting with a child, albeit as part of the preparation of the child for sexual abuse, was insufficient in itself to incur criminal responsibility. A further element was needed. Article 23, therefore, requires Parties to criminalise the intentional “proposal of an adult to meet a child who has not

reached the age set in application of Article 18 paragraph 2” for the purpose of committing any of the offences established in accordance with Article 18 paragraph 1 a or Article 20 paragraph 1 a against him or her. Thus the relationship-forming contacts must be followed by a proposal to meet the child.

158. All the elements of the offence must be committed intentionally. In addition, the “purpose” of the proposal to meet the child for committing any of the specified offences needs to be established before criminal responsibility is incurred

159. The offence can only be committed “through the use of information and communication technologies”. Other forms of grooming through real contacts or non-electronic communications are outside the scope of the provision. In view of the particular danger inherent in the use of such technologies due to the difficulty of monitoring them the negotiators wished to focus the provision exclusively on the most dangerous method of grooming children which is through the Internet and by using mobile phones to which even very young children increasingly now have access.

160. In addition to the elements specified above the offence is only complete if the proposal to meet “has been followed by material acts leading to such a meeting”. This requires concrete actions, such as, for example, the fact of the perpetrator arriving at the meeting place

2. As recalled in the Explanatory Report with reference to Article 23 of the Convention (§156), the concept of an “online solicitation” is part of a practice more commonly known as “grooming”, and covers an increasingly worrying phenomenon of children being sexually harmed by adults whom they had initially encountered in cyberspace. Although the act of grooming is not a new tactic, the fact that it can now be done online offers offenders new possibilities to solicit children in a faster and more anonymous way and in higher numbers.

3. The adult can incur criminal responsibility under Article 23 if he/she proposes to meet a child through ICTs. Paramount for criminal responsibility to be incurred, the proposal needs to be followed by material acts leading to such a meeting. As an example, the adult arriving at the meeting place is what can be considered as a material act (§160).

4. The drafters of the Convention deliberately chose to limit the scope of Article 23 to the situation where the intentional proposal of an adult to meet the child with the aim to sexually abuse her or him is expressed through ICTs and is followed by material acts leading to such a meeting. It is however increasingly acknowledged that sexual offences against children may be committed exclusively online. In such cases, by definition, no material acts leading to a meeting in person exist and thus the situation cannot be prosecuted within the scope of Article 23.

5. In this context, the Committee of the Parties of the Lanzarote Convention (hereinafter referred to as “the Lanzarote Committee”), agreed that it had to reiterate the scope of application of Article 23. Additionally, it agreed that with respect to the challenges raised by the above mentioned new situation, it should provide some guidance to Parties wishing to go beyond the requirements of Article 23.

6. The objective of this opinion is therefore twofold:
- (a) to recall the requirements of Article 23 and its scope of application and
  - (b) to provide guidance to those Parties that would wish to go beyond the requirements and scope of Article 23.

### **The scope of Article 23**

7. To ensure compliance with Article 23, Parties must criminalise the intentional proposal of an adult wanting to meet a child for the purpose of committing the offences specified in Article 18§1.a (Engaging in sexual activities with a child) and 20§1.a (Producing child pornography). The concrete steps taken by the adult in order to meet the child in person constitute an essential element of the offence.

8. The understanding of the term “intentional proposal” is paramount to the overall application of Article 23. The drafters of the Convention agreed that “simply sexual chatting with a child, albeit as part of the preparation of a child for sexual abuse, [is] insufficient in itself to incur criminal responsibility (§157 of the Explanatory Report).

9. Grooming children online may be achieved through a “screen-to-screen” chat conversation or by communicating through webcams. In both cases, the grooming process can be heavily facilitated through the use of mobile phone applications. Initial contact between a child and an adult may take place in various online environments, such as through social networking platforms and online games. Thus, it is not necessary for the adult to meet the child in person to sexually abuse her or him.

10. While communicating online, the adult although not physically present, can cause the child to witness, watch or take part in the production of child pornography. This material can not only be watched by the offender but can also be circulated online. Once circulated online, it can be extremely difficult to delete and thus creates further and long lasting abuse and harm to the child.

### **The relevance of other provisions of the Lanzarote Convention**

11. Article 23 is not the provision to rely on when criminalising sexual abuse which has remained only online.

- If the adult’s manipulation has remained online and resulted in him or her succeeding to lure the child into acts such as sharing sexually explicit photos or performing sexual conducts in front of the webcam the adult may be charged with the criminal offences set out in Article 20§1.a (Production of child pornography).
- If the adult’s manipulation was not limited to the production of child pornography, the adult may be charged under another sub paragraph or the entirety of Article 20 (producing, offering or making available, distributing or transmitting, procuring and possessing child pornography, knowingly obtaining access to child pornography).

12. Additionally, Parties are reminded that recruiting and coercing a child into participating in pornographic performances is criminalised under Article 21 and that the intentional causing for sexual purposes of a child to witness sexual abuse and activities, even without the child having to participate, is criminalised under Article 22.

13. Finally, Article 24§2 is also relevant, as it requires Parties to “establish as criminal offences, when committed intentionally, attempts to commit the offences established in accordance with the Convention”.

**Difficulties in investigating and in prosecuting online grooming when it occurs beyond the scope of Article 23 and guidance to Parties wishing to go beyond Article 23**

14. Parties should consider extending criminalisation of online grooming also to cases when the sexual abuse is not the result of a meeting in person, but is committed online.

15. To counteract online grooming, appropriate means and specific training for the relevant authorities must be ensured by the Parties.

16. Prosecutors, law enforcement authorities and other professionals should have or continue to have, access to training on the challenges of prosecuting cases in which a child has willingly engaged virtually or in person, in sexual activities, with an adult.

17. Parties may also consider encouraging law enforcement to prevent the commitment of sexual offences, including online grooming, against children through ICTs.

***a. The case of anti-paedophile activism***

18. Child sexual abuse and exploitation may be difficult to detect and may only come to the attention of law enforcement authorities when a victim comes forward and discloses the abuse, or as a result of investigations conducted by the competent authorities. Offences may therefore stay unrecognised and unknown.

19. As a consequence, certain individuals, and even some NGOs and media have taken or may take the initiative to track down and expose alleged sexual offenders outside the confines of due legal process. Parties should make sure that these are discouraged from taking the role of law enforcement.

20. In some specific cases however, a collaborative work between specialised NGOs and law enforcement may prove valuable. Such collaboration should be strictly supervised by competent authorities.



**b. *The impact of the over-sexualisation of society***

21. Another facilitating factor for online grooming is the fact that children have the impression that it is acceptable to exchange/circulate sexual images of themselves via the social media, etc. (so called “sexting”). In other words, children can be more inclined to sending and exchanging sexually explicit messages or photos to their friends or even to people they have just met online without considering the risks involved.

22. Parties are reminded that even if the child has participated in the grooming process by willingly sharing sexually explicit pictures of themselves with the offender, this shall not in any way alter the criminality of the adult’s behaviour.

23. The best interest of the child is a dynamic concept that encompasses various issues which are continuously evolving. Prevention of online grooming should be based on the understanding of the inappropriate nature of certain relationships (adult-children-who have not reached the legal age for sexual activities) rather than on all relationships.

24. There is a determined and compelling need to build the capacity of children to live in a digital world. Parties have the obligation to prevent sexual violence against children. Children, parents and care takers should have access to information and counselling services on the risks and dangers inherent to the digital world. The opportunities and risks of ICTs should be included in all school curricula.