Steering Committee for the Rights of the Child (CDENF)

CONCEPT NOTE

Feasibility, timeliness and pertinence of elaborating a Child rights impact assessment tool on artificial intelligence

Prepared by the 5Rights Foundation and approved by the CDENF during its 10th plenary meeting (Strasbourg; 3 – 5 December 2024)

Background and aims

1. In coordination with the work of the Committee on Artificial Intelligence (CAI) of the Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (the Framework Convention) on a Draft Methodology for the Risk and Impact Assessment of Artificial Intelligence Systems from the Point of View of Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (HUDERIA), the Steering Committee for the Rights of the Child (CDENF) instructed its Secretariat to prepare a "*concept note for future action to be examined at its 10th Plenary meeting on the feasibility, timeliness and pertinence of elaborating a Child rights impact assessment [CRIA] tool on artificial intelligence [AI]*". The recent CDENF Mapping Study on the rights of the child and AI also recommended "*the use of child rights impact and risk assessments, a child rights-based approach to future legal frameworks for AI systems, [and] meaningful engagement with children and young people on these topics*".[1]

2. The predecessor of the CAI, the Ad Hoc Committee on Artificial Intelligence (CAHAI), recognised in its report the need to ensure that "*rights related to vulnerable groups and people in vulnerable situations, including children, are being upheld throughout the lifecycle of artificial intelligence systems*"[2] The Framework Convention provides that in its implementation parties should "*take due account of any specific needs and vulnerabilities in relation to respect for the rights of persons with disabilities and of children*",[3] and its explanatory report specifies that in view of "*the specific risks that [artificial intelligence] poses to children, [...] the Drafters considered the obligations set forth in [...] General comment No. 25 to the UNCRC on children's rights in relation to the digital environment.*"[4] The HUDERIA being negotiated by the CAI also recognises the need to take into account the vulnerability of specific groups, such as children.

3. This note aims at providing (i) a brief context analysis regarding existing standards and tools relevant to children's rights and AI; (ii) an analysis on the tools that may be needed for States to uphold and fulfil all children's rights in relation to AI, including notably a CRIA on AI; (iii) considerations regarding the feasibility, timeliness and pertinence of an instrument on AI and children's rights; and (iv) tentative elements that such a tool should include as a minimum, as well as a tentative work programme.

Context analysis

4. There is widespread and growing recognition of the risks and impacts of AI systems on children. A consensus is consolidating that more should be done to protect the vulnerable, particularly children, from the potential impact of AI, as well as ensure that they can also benefit from the potential and life improvements that AI systems can offer.[5] The recent CDENF Mapping Study[6], for instance, found that there are no legal frameworks addressing AI in the context of children's rights and a general view that existing frameworks may not suffice to uphold children's rights in relation to AI.[7] The Lanzarote Committee

---

[1] Mapping study on the rights of the child and artificial intelligence: Legal Frameworks that address AI in the Context of Children's Rights, prepared by the Alan Turing Institute and approved by the CDENF during its 9th plenary meeting (May2024) para 7.
[2] CAHAI(2021)09rev, para 28.
[3] Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (CETS 224), art. 18.
[4] Explanatory Report to the Framework Convention, para 118.
[5] An overview, among many other publications, available in: Joint Research Centre: Charisi, V., Chaudron, S., Di Gioia, R., Vuorikari, R., Escobar Planas, M., Sanchez Martin, J.I. and Gomez Gutierrez, E. (2022) Artificial Intelligence and the Rights of the Child : Towards an Integrated Agenda for Research and Policy
[6] Mapping Study on the rights of the child and artificial intelligence: Legal Frameworks that Address AI in the Context of Children's Rights.
[7] CDENF(2024)04, para 7.

also recognised the specific harm caused by artificially generated and altered child sexual abuse material, and called on States to consider criminalising the use of AI to create such materials.[8]

5. Children have specific needs due to their evolving capacity and vulnerability,[9] which intersect with other aspects of their identity and circumstances. This is particularly true of cases involving AI, where children are at heightened risk of *inter alia* commercial exploitation, disinformation or algorithmic discrimination,[10] as well as sexual exploitation and sexual abuse facilitated by technology. When AI systems interact with or impact children, there is a higher level of risk, given their specific vulnerabilities. Children cannot be expected to understand or act against automated decision-making or algorithmic unfairness. It is unlikely that they have developed the capacity, knowledge or resources to understand the subtle, cumulative or acute nudges and impacts those automated systems have on their online experience. Many children may not understand that an algorithm could be responsible for e.g. suggesting them a 'friend', nor do they necessarily have the capacity or the age-appropriate tools to prevent automated suggestions of e.g. harmful material or in turn benefit from an AI application that is not devised to be understood by them.[11] Therefore, due to AI-specific features (e.g. opacity, complexity, data dependency, autonomous behaviour[12]), AI systems that are not designed based on child-centred principles, trained on appropriate data sets and tested to ensure neutral or positive outcomes for children can have significant negative impacts on children's rights, safety, privacy,[13] cognitive development, health and educational outcomes, social relationships, economic well-being and freedoms.

6. This situation and the risk-based approach taken by key legal frameworks seeking to regulate AI,[14] suggest the need for a child-centric tool to understand the impact of AI systems on the whole spectrum of children's rights, and thus analyse and mitigate such risks and impacts. Several national, regional or multilateral frameworks on AI governance, use and development in relation to human rights recognise the need to consider vulnerabilities when assessing AI-related risks.[15] This is critical from the perspective of children's rights, taking into account their evolving capacities and specific vulnerabilities. As chief example, the risk of harm being inflicted on children is identified as a key global concern, *inter alia* in the last AI Risk Global Pulse Check.[16]

7. Existing frameworks to govern the lifecycles of AI systems, including the EU AI Act and Framework Convention, generally recognise some specificity of children's rights in relation to AI. The Committee of the Parties to the Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse has also recalled that offences remain criminalised whatever the means used to commit them, even if the text of the Convention does not refer to technologies, this appears to apply to sexual offences facilitated by AI.[17] However, that does not translate into specific regulatory or compliance implications when AI systems impact children and/or sufficient practical detail to reflect such specificity in actions or practices that can be undertaken by public authorities or private actors responsible for ensuring compliance of AI

---

[8] Declaration on the protection of children against sexual exploitation and sexual abuse facilitated by emerging technologies, adopted by the Lanzarote Committee at its 43rd meeting (6-8 November 2024). .

[9] Laurenty, M. (2024). The Future of Child Development in the AI Era: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives Between AI and Child Development Experts.

[10] UNICEF (2021) Policy guidance on AI for children.

[11] *Cf* 5Rights Foundation (2023), *Disrupted Childhood: the Cost of Persuasive Design*; (2022) *Risky by Design*; and (2021) *Pathways: How digital design puts children at risk*.

[12] Lievens, E., Children & AI: Opportunities, Risks & Rights, Flanders AI Academy (VAIA), Ghent University.

[13] *E.g.* US Federal Trade Commission, 31 May 2023 FTC and DOJ Charge Amazon with Violating Children's Privacy Law by Keeping Kids' Alexa Voice Recordings Forever and Undermining Parents' Deletion Requests

[14] Framework Convention; Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 on harmonised rules on artificial intelligence "AI Act"

[15] Guidance on AI systems in relation to human rights include *inter alia* the instruments and frameworks mentioned in Annex I.

[16] *Cf.* UN (2024) *Governing AI for Humanity*, para 28-29.

[17] Lanzarote Committee Interpretative Opinion on the applicability of the Lanzarote Convention to sexual offences against children facilitated through the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs)

systems with applicable laws and standards.[18] This means that they do not make the given principles, guidance or – if any – legal obligations operational from a children's rights perspective through applicable and practical processes and technical standards for authorities, businesses and other stakeholders to evaluate and possibly address AI impacts on children.

8. For instance, frameworks that do not provide such level of detail and guidance include:

   • UNICEF's Draft Policy Guidance on AI for Children,[19] designed to promote children's rights in government and private sector AI policies and practices, which raises awareness of how AI systems could uphold or undermine these rights and considers the ways in which they impact children. However, in practice this document has yet to translate into action on the part of states or most notably industry.

   • The Framework Convention does not require states to apply the obligations to private actors unless companies are acting on behalf of the public sector, and only mandates states to consider children's rights in the *implementation* of the convention, rather than as general obligation or principle, providing no further detail.

   • The draft HUDERIA currently refers to vulnerable groups throughout its process and methodology, recognising some specificity related to children (notably related to their prioritisation within the Stakeholder Engagement Process and the dedicated question on severity of potential impacts in the Impact Assessment). It might not however fully include children's rights in the Appendices and Tables that underpin the methodology and project of the impact assessment and its Context-Based Risk Analysis. Therefore, it does not at present provide sufficient analysis, tools or resources to help State parties understand the specificities of impacts of AI on children, or how given characteristics or uses of AI systems can link to specific risks for children.

   • The EU AI Act recognises children's rights, mentioning the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and its General comment No. 25 in recitals; it bans AI systems that exploit any of the vulnerabilities of a specific group due to their age (art. 5); foresees age as a possible vulnerability to categorise systems as high-risk (art 7); and provides that the risk management for high-risk AI systems should consider if these may adversely impact minors (art. 9). However, there currently is no consideration of children's rights in the classification of AI as "high-risk", which are subject to a fundamental rights impact assessment, nor are risks to children considered among "systemic" ones posed by general purpose AI, which implies additional due diligence obligations and guidance to be drafted for these models.

   • The European standardisation body CEN-CENELEC is drafting technical standards to comply with the EU AI Act, and the IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers) have a global Initiative on the ethics of autonomous and intelligent systems, as well as draft work items on '*Recommended Practice for using Safety by Design in Generative Models to Prioritize Child Safety*' and '*Standard for Child and Student Data Governance*'. Other private organisations are also developing principles and commitment, but these initiatives are typically limited in scope to specific AI systems and/or to a specific use/application/risk.[20]

9. Similarly, existing instruments related to the rights of the child in the digital environment, including CRIA tools, do not cover with sufficient practical guidance or detail the specific potential impacts that AI

---

[18] *Id.*at 4; more comprehensive overviews available *inter alia* at IAPP' Global AI Law and Policy Tracker; OECD's Live Repository of National AI policies & strategies; or AI's Map of Global AI Regulations
[19] UNICEF (2021) UNICEF's Policy Guidance on AI for Children
[20] *E.g.* Thorn (2024) Safety by Design for Generative AI: Preventing Child Sexual Abuse

systems pose to children's rights and how to address them in practice.[21] The upcoming UNICEF work on Child Rights Impact Assessments in Relation to the Digital Environment, for example, will not address specifically AI, but only provide best practice and baseline expectations for CRIAs in the digital environment and including them into broader human rights assessments.[22]

10. The main Council of Europe frameworks on children's rights in the digital environment,[23] in particular, expressly refer to AI. However, such mentions mainly and only acknowledge the specific potential risks and benefits of the technology as related to children's online experiences,[24] and/or the need to further develop understanding thereof,[25] to ensure that existing frameworks and approaches remain relevant and effective.

11. The need for standards and tools for AI to cater for a differential impact on children and other vulnerable groups is thus emerging as a gap at the intersection of AI governance frameworks and other policies, legislation and instruments related to children's rights in the digital environment, including CRIAs. Research from the Alan Turing Institute indeed found that there is increasing focus on children's rights in relation to AI, but it remains an under-researched area as well as a matter that affects them on which children's views are not duly considered. In particular, authorities that could use existing frameworks report a lack of understanding on AI as it relates to children, as well as a lack of guidance on regulatory and governance requirements or concrete actions to take, also in view of the increasing number of frameworks relating to AI with some focus on children and/or relating to children online with some focus on AI.[26]

Needed tools to support States in upholding children's rights in relation to AI

12. In this context, for States to ensure children's needs and rights in relations to AI are addressed, a comprehensive and practical instrument that focuses on their unique circumstances with regard to AI appears necessary. What seems to be needed to fill this gap is a tool that provides both: an overview of fundamental principles and standards that AI systems should respect with regards to children; as well as detailed and concrete guidance including possible concrete methodologies, actions and steps for States, companies and other stakeholders in the AI value chain to comply with their obligations and commitments related to children's rights and AI technologies.[27]

13. States that wish to fulfil children's rights in the context of the spread of AI systems should plan how to govern the design, development, deployment and governance of this technology from the start, and how to duly integrate into both the technology and its governance the needs and rights of children. Without such effort, a key shortcoming of governance and regulation in the digital environment in general, of which we are seeing the dramatic impacts – de facto treating all child users like adults, without consideration of their vulnerabilities, needs and evolving capacities, and thus exposing them to risks of harm or missing out on the benefits that the digital world could bring them – may be replicated and amplified with the uptake and diffusion of AI.[28]

---

[21] *Cf* Alan Turing (2023) AI, Children's Rights, & Wellbeing: Transnational Frameworks, on *i.a.* UNCRC; UNICEF Policy Guidance on AI and Children; OECD Recommendations on children in the digital environment; WEF Artificial Intelligence for Children toolkit; Report of the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy: Artificial intelligence and privacy, and children's privacy

[22] UNICEF (2024) Child Rights Impact Assessments in Relation to the Digital Environment

[23] CM/Rec(2018)7 Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member States on Guidelines to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of the child in the digital environment and its supporting Handbook for policy makers on the rights of the child in the digital environment (2020); Decl(28/04/2021) Declaration by the Committee of Ministers on the need to protect children's privacy in the digital environment, in the context of the Strategy for the Rights of The Child (2022-2027)

[24] Handbook for policy makers on the rights of the child in the digital environment, at 75-80

[25] Strategy for the Rights of The Child (2022-2027), at 29-30

[26] *Cf* CDENF(2024)04, para 97 and Alan Turing (2023).

[27] Cf. 5Rights Foundation (2022) Shedding Light on AI: a framework for algorithmic oversight

[28] Id. at 10.

14. States that want to comply with existing AI governance and regulatory frameworks may have to adopt a principled, rights and risk-based approach, which underpins the most advanced instruments – the Framework Convention and the EU AI Act. Against this backdrop they would need to consider children as a high-risk group, as anyone under 18 is at heightened risk due to their evolving understanding and maturity. Moreover, children with specific vulnerabilities may be at further heightened risk if they belong to a protected or specific age group or have protected characteristics, for instance children living with disabilities, of national minorities etc. Developing tools to understand and address such heightened risks, as well as to ensure that children can access AI systems that contribute to fulfilling all their rights, should be a priority for States.

15. While many of the aforementioned principles/instruments on AI are largely applicable also to children, their unique rights and characteristics require a nuanced, and dedicated approach. There currently is limited knowledge and detail on how AI may impact children specifically, and references to children and their rights in those instruments tend to be linked mainly or only to some sectors or issues, chiefly education, health or social services. For instance, many AI ethics frameworks do not approach broader principles like fairness, inclusiveness or equity contextualising them for children. Without a child-centred perspective on principles as well, recognizing the diversity of children, their chance to be protected from risks and access AI systems that uphold their rights and best interests may be diminished.

16. There is also limited focus on ensuring that those AI principles and standards are realised from a children's rights perspective. There currently are no strategies or processes under development for assessing and addressing the risks and impacts that children face when interacting with AI, beyond those applicable to everyone, or to consider and maximise their specific rights to participate in the potential benefits of AI – and not only be protected from or educated about it. Children are diverse and in development, thus have developmental needs that must be considered. They typically are also less likely and/or able to understand that they are interacting with AI, what this interaction implies, and may lack the personal and/or legal autonomy to participate in existing or emerging governance or risk assessment processes or seek redress if needed. AI systems should thus be safe by design but also provide age-appropriate interactions.

17. Streamlined existing standards and principles as well as analysis and methodologies are thus needed to understand how AI affects children specifically, particularly their social, cognitive and emotional development. This could take the form of a tool to assess, avoid or mitigate risks and impacts on child rights, as well as to inform design and development of AI, notably by considering children's needs, rights and vulnerabilities in the process and through their participation to design choices. An instrument responding to this need could be a sort of "CRIA+", i.e. a flexible, practical and broad CRIA tool tailored for AI systems properly framed by a comprehensive overview of how existing principles, standards and instruments apply as regards AI impacts on children's rights.

Feasibility, timeliness and pertinence of a CRIA on AI to respond to this need

18. A CRIA+ on AI would provide an opportunity and a catalyst to streamline and develop existing research, to provide practical guidance for authorities and businesses to understand and uphold in practice the rights of the child in the context of AI, filling a knowledge and participation gap for actors who do not have experience or expertise in considering children in their activities (market/safety authorities, developers, engineers, etc.). It would also be an opportunity for children, parents/carers and other stakeholders (e.g. teachers) to engage with the process, helping bridge the current participation gap that presents a barrier to the realisation of children's right to participate in matters affecting them, and to have their best interests taken into account.

19. A CRIA+ on AI would be timely and pertinent, following the development of HUDERIA and the start of the implementation and enforcement phase of other frameworks that may become global references (e.g. the EU AI Act), and the parallel development of several others in key markets (e.g. the UK and US) or organisations (UN and agencies; G7; African Union; and others), which could therefore refer to the CRIA+, instead of perpetuating an ongoing multiplication of different frameworks and instruments. Additionally, in the context of the Council of Europe, the CRIA+ could also inform or be referenced in the work of the Steering Committee on Education on a legal instrument that ensures the ethical, equitable and effective use of AI systems in educational settings.

20. To be pertinent, CRIA+ should be interoperable and self-sufficient: operate both in the context of HUDERIA as well as a self-standing instrument compatible with other existing or upcoming frameworks. It should serve for States and companies to check AI systems against all risks to all children's rights under the UNCRC and its General comment No. 25,[29] as well as other key instruments enshrining them like the Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers on Guidelines to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of the child in the digital environment,[30] and follow the highest standards and best practices on processes and criteria for organisations to undertake child rights impact assessments.[31]

21. Like the HUDERIA, to serve as a repository of knowledge, it would need to analyse and streamline risk typologies for children's rights stemming from AI, notably those that regard the specific rights of children that are additional to the human rights they are based on, as well as those risk that would not be risks for others (e.g. linked to cognitive or developmental issues, or to unawareness that they are interacting with an AI system, impossibility to seek redress or see the impact remedied). It should explain the risks stemming from AI to children's rights, based on existing international instruments, and match them to practical consequences in terms of the lifecycle of the AI system that may pose the risk. It would have to consider risks and impacts for children as a group but also those that may be heightened due to intersectional vulnerabilities (age, evolving capacity, specific context, personal characteristic).

22. Similarly to HUDERIA, it should be usable in practice by different organisations and in different contexts. It should thus be addressed to all types of organisations, public or private, from all sectors, covering all AI systems and their lifecycle (development, integration, adoption and deployment, update and retirement). It should include in its development the participation of delegates of standardisation organisations active on AI, notably ISO, IEEE and CEN-CENELEC. It should provide practical guidance for each stage of the lifecycle of an AI system, in the form of a process requiring certain actions, level of expertise and questions to be answered by the given organisation. Also, in line with HUDERIA, the process should recommend instances of participation for children and other relevant stakeholders, as appropriate in each phase of the process.

23. Similarly to HUDERIA, the tool should be flexible and modular. It should add to, rather than substitute other eventual requirements specific to a sector or set out by law or other instruments. It should cover every stage of an AI system's lifecycle – from its inputs, through the design of its algorithms and purposes, to its development, deployment, update and retirement – and allow for its application to different stages in varying order (notably as these are typically dynamic and iterative processes, whereby an AI system is constantly updated, re-used, re-purposed, etc.).

24. To be future proof, it should take a principled approach, providing an overview of key requirements, principles, resources, inputs, outputs and outcomes of the CRIA, but include elements that remain open to be updated dynamically, notably as regards unknown or emerging risks and harms. That is, it would

---

[29] E.g. the so-called "5Cs" framework being widely adopted at EU level.

[30] CM/Rec(2018)7

[31] E.g. 1. the activities and tasks of section 7.3 of CEN-CENELEC CWA 18016 (covering team organisation, planning, stakeholder and children participation, and ways to identify, document and record all relevant risks and impacts) or the risk self-assessment tool of the UK ICO Children's Code.

need to help organisations ask the right questions, by providing principles, criteria, best practices, technical standards, processes and resources needed to answer them, which may evolve over time.

25. In line with the universal aspiration of the Framework Convention, it is recommended that the tool is developed with a global and holistic approach, consulting to the extent possible experts from diverse disciplines and geographies on best practices and highest available standards from global, regional or national rules for children's engagement with AI systems, as appropriate. This is needed to cater for children across different geographical, cultural, educational or developmental contexts.

26. In view of limited time and resources available, the process to develop a CRIA+ should make the most of coordinating with other ongoing and related initiatives. A tentative workplan that the CDENF could commit to in developing the CRIA+ could include:

Activity	*Tasks/goal*	*Dates*
Presentation and finalisation of the concept note.	Proposing tool to plenary and incorporating first comments.	December 2024
Discussion on key elements of the CRIA+ and work programme	Agreement on workplan, experts to be involved and timeline.	January 2025
Interdisciplinary session in the context of mid-term evaluation of the Children's Rights Strategy	Receive expert contributions and positions on the key elements of the CRIA+	April 2025
First draft of CRIA+	Incorporating input into working draft from experts.	June 2025
Targeted survey among child and youth engagement groups	Contact of the Advisory Council on Youth (CCJ) and child rights civil society organisation's youth engagement programmes for comments on 1st draft.	Summer 2025
Comments deadline (delegates, experts, child/youth engagement groups/representatives)	Including comments on 1st draft	Q3 2025
Final draft	Presentation to CDENF plenary for approval and adoption	Q4 2025

Main elements of a CRIA+

27. As a self-contained instrument for regions/countries where no standards exist but that can also support any existing standards and regulation, it would need to include firstly an overview of all relevant frameworks that it draws from, notably related to children's rights in the digital world, AI governance and CRIAs in general.

28. It should include key principles and standards drawing from existing frameworks and best practices, as well as processes and methodologies for its application – which ideally would apply entirely and by design and default, but also be self-contained in modules, applying to all stages of development, as required by context.

29. The tool should cover as a minimum the following elements:
- A General part including (i) an introductory recognition and explanation of children's rights in relation to AI systems; and (ii) streamlined principles and standards of AI governance from a children's rights perspective.
- Definition of scope regarding children likely to be impacted by an AI system (i.e. their data is part of what the AI system is built or trained on; an AI system engages with them or shapes their experience; or a system's outputs/outcomes impact them).

- Definition of relevant stakeholders and actors to which the various elements of the tool are directed to, and ways for their participation throughout the process.

- Mapping of key frameworks to be used to carry out the assessment, notably relevant technical standards on children's rights in the digital environment such as IEEE 2089 or CEN-CENELEC CWA 18016 on age-appropriate design,[32] as well as other upcoming standards under the same standardisation group.

- Recommendations and guidance on ideal resources, roles, responsibilities and planning of organisations involved in the AI value chain.

- A matrix and/or case-studies to interlink known risks with corresponding AI features or uses matched against all rights of the child – considering safety and protection but also how AI could positively contribute a child's development and empowerment.

- Requirements and best practices with regards to participation of children and other relevant stakeholders throughout all pertinent phases of the process.

- Recommendations on making it an interactive and ongoing exercise, i.e. structuring feedback loops related to assessing impacts and possible ensuing measures in each phase of the system's lifecycle.

- Requirements related to transparency *of* and *about* the process.

- Recommendations related to ongoing evaluation and review, including elements related to redress, remedy and/or withdrawing of AI systems.

***

---

[32]IEEE 2089.2021 Standard for an Age Appropriate Digital Services Framework Based on the 5Rights Principles for Children; CEN-CENELEC CWA 18016 on Age-appropriate digital services framework.

Annex I – Key References

Main AI governance frameworks and instruments (global)
- UN AI expert group Interim Report: Governing AI for Humanity (2023)
- UN High-Level Advisory Body on AI Report – Governing AI For Humanity (2024)
- UN General Assembly resolution on artificial intelligence (2024)
- UNICEF's Policy Guidance on AI for Children (2021)
- Report of the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy: Artificial intelligence and privacy, and children's privacy (2021)
- World Economic Forum (WEF) Artificial Intelligence for Children (2022)
- UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI (2021)

Main AI governance frameworks and instruments (regional/national)
- European Union Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence "AI Act" (2024)
- The White House Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights and Executive Order on the Safe, Secure and Trustworthy Development and Use of AI (2023)
- G7 Hiroshima Process International Guiding Principles for Organizations Developing Advanced AI Systems (2023)
- Seoul Declaration for Safe, Innovative and Inclusive AI (2024)
- OECD AI Principles (2019, amended 2024)
- African Union AUDA-NEPAD Artificial Intelligence Roadmap for Africa (2024)
- Cumbre Ministerial y de Altas Autoridades de América Latina y el Caribe Declaración de Santiago (2023)
- The Bletchley Declaration by Countries Attending the AI Safety Summit (2024)
- Australian Government Australia's AI Ethics Principles (2019)
- European Commission's Joint Research Centre Artificial Intelligence and the Rights of the Child : Towards an Integrated Agenda for Research and Policy (2022)

Main children's rights online frameworks
- UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) and its General Comment 25 on children's rights in relation to the digital environment (2021)
- Global Digital Compact (2024)
- UN General Assembly Resolution on the Rights of the Child (2023)
- International Telecommunications Union Guidelines on Child Online Protection (2020)
- UNICEF's Children's Rights and Business Principles (2012)
- OHCHR Child Rights-Based Approach to Implementing the UNGPs in the Digital Environment (2024)
- Council of Europe Guidelines to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of the child in the digital environment (2018) and its supporting Handbook for policy makers on the rights of the child in the digital environment (2020)
- Council of Europe Declaration by the Committee of Ministers on the need to protect children's privacy in the digital environment (2021)
- OECD Recommendation on Children in the Digital Environment (2021) and its Companion Document (2022)
- African Union Child Online Safety and Empowerment Policy (2024)

Other useful documents/instruments
- UNICEF, Children's Rights in Impact Assessments Guide (2013)
- Council of Europe, Mapping Study on the rights of the child and artificial intelligence: Legal Frameworks that Address AI in the Context of Children's Rights (2024)
- Council of Europe, Emerging Technologies: threats and opportunities for the protection of children against sexual exploitation and abuse – Background Paper for the Lanzarote Committee (2024)
- Dutch Ministry of Interior and Kingdom Relations Impact and legal analysis for the development of the CRIA (2024)
- United Kingdom's Information Commissioner's Office, Children's Code Self-Assessment Risk Tool (2023)
- OECD, Children in the digital environment: Revised typology of risks (2021)
- IEEE 2089-2021 Standard for Age Appropriate Digital Service Framework (2021)
- CEN-CENELEC Workshop Agreement 18016 on Age-appropriate digital services framework (2023)