



THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE ■



Global Kids Online: Children's rights in the digital age

Network meeting report

21-22 March 2016

London School of Economics and Political Science



Table of contents

1. Aims and scope of the network meeting	2
2. Interactive discussions	3
2.1. Challenges with risk – from ethics to politics.....	3
2.2. Questions of inclusion and research with marginalized groups	5
2.3. Policy, stakeholder engagement, and research uptake	8
3. Future directions – Next steps, dissemination and plans for networking	11
Appendix 1: Meeting agenda	13
Appendix 2: Participants in the meeting.....	15

1. Aims and scope of the network meeting

[London School of Economics and Political Science \(LSE\)](#)'s Department of Media and Communications and [UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti](#) convened the second [Global Kids Online](#) network meeting at LSE on 21 and 22 March 2016. The meeting brought together close to 40 academics, researchers, and UNICEF staff from 14 different countries, including Argentina, Bulgaria, Ghana, India, Montenegro, the Philippines, Serbia, and South Africa, as well as representatives of [EU Kids Online](#) the UK Home Office, and WeProtect.

The aim of the workshop was to present the lessons learned from international research findings on children's internet use and developed research and policy recommendations for the launch of the toolkit in late 2016. Specific goals of the workshop included:

- Discussing the project overview, fieldwork developments, and initial findings.
- Planning the final stages of the [Global Kids Online](#) project.
- Engaging in a number of interactive debates focused around:
 - *methodology and toolkit adaptation and reflections on fieldwork experiences, challenges and lessons learned;*
 - *Challenges with risk – from ethics to politics;*
 - *Questions of inclusion and research with marginalized groups;*
 - *Policy, stakeholder engagement and research uptake.*
- Exploring the options for the expansion of Global Kids Online – hearing from new countries interested in joining Global Kids Online, as well as criteria for future members.
- Knowledge exchange with WePROTECT and discussion of future directions.
- Discussing future directions – next steps, dissemination, and plans for networking.

The meeting started with an update from the countries involved in piloting the research toolkit that has been developed by Global Kids Online, building on the [EU Kids Online](#) research toolkit. The research teams from Argentina, Serbia, South Africa, and the Philippines shared their experiences of using the toolkit, the challenges they encountered while carrying out the fieldwork and preliminary results and findings. The country presentations were followed by a series of group discussions aimed at gathering and addressing the reflections on fieldwork experiences, uses of the research toolkit, challenges, and lessons learned and kick-starting some cross-country comparisons. The country findings will be published on the project website www.globalkidsonline.net and the information collected during the discussions will be used to refine the GKO toolkit, drawing on the experiences from the pilot research conducted by partner countries, as well as considering the needs and interests of prospective partners. Key issues in revising the toolkit relate to the aims of the research tools, the level of flexibility, the needed support and guidance, and anticipated challenges.

During the meeting, the participants also heard from the countries that are interested in joining the Global Kids Online network in the nearest future, including Montenegro, Bulgaria, India, and Ghana. The discussions addressed the issues arising from the specific local contexts that are likely to influence children's online experiences. In the light of these conversations, the

participants also discussed the proposed criteria for GKO network membership, as well as the steps for joining.

Finally, the participants discussed issues surrounding data sharing, the next steps of the project and the pilot countries, as well as plans for the dissemination of research findings, the fostering of future networking opportunities, and further funding-seeking opportunities.

The report focuses on the interactive discussions held throughout the network meeting, which aimed to foster dialogue in three key areas: (1) challenges with risk – from ethics to politics; (2) questions of inclusion and research with marginalized groups; (3) policy, stakeholder engagement, and research uptake. Finally, we discuss the future directions of the Global Kids Online network including next steps, dissemination and plans for networking.

2. Interactive discussions

The aim of the interactive discussions was to consolidate the lessons from the pilot fieldwork and think about the future development of the Global Kids Online toolkit, gathering research expertise, case study material, and ideas for future development and use. The discussions focused on key issues arising from the different stages of the Global kids Online research process.

2.1. Challenges with risk – from ethics to politics

Chair: Gabrielle Berman, UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti, Global Kids Online Expert Group

Gabrielle Berman presented some of the ethical considerations that require reflection as part of the planning process. Given that ethical issues are context-dependent and are impacted by local variations in, for instance, culture, politics, and legislation, it is difficult to provide answers that apply in each specific context. The primary goal in discussing ethical concerns is thus not to provide definitive answers but rather to give a sense of the sorts of questions that need to be asked. By fostering a culture of sharing these issues, we can avoid a situation in which it is one country working through ethical problems in isolation. Innovative responses to ethical issues developed in one context may work well in others, permitting researchers to be better prepared, with greater support for lessons learned around collecting data with children. Two key requirements around ethics relate to ensuring contractors are sufficiently prepared to address any issues and facilitating external ethical review. For those undertaking the project within UNICEF, this latter is a fundamental requirement.

In the planning phase, there are a number of key questions that must be asked. In the first instance, one must be clear on who is going to be recruited to participate in both the pilot and broader research, where this will take place, and how it will be achieved. Alongside this initial consideration, it is also important to be absolutely clear about expectations around researcher and participant roles. We should also be asking in this formative phase what sorts of ethical issues are likely to arise at various stages of the research and who will be responsible. One possibility is to create a protection protocol, which could consist of a list of possible issues as

well as a set of examples of how to respond. Being absolutely clear on who is responsible is a useful tool for starting conversations around any ethical issues that may arise. When it comes to facilitators, interviewers, and field researchers, some initial questions to consider are whether they have experience working with children. It is also important that those who will be having direct contact with participants have been trained not to provide information regarding issues that might be sensitive, for example, their religious and political affiliations.

The people with direct contact with participants will be the ones dealing with ethical issues, but ensuring informed consent also means ensuring the consent of the communities involved. This may mean getting consent from political and religious leaders within the relevant communities. This, however, should always be in addition to ensuring consent or assent from all those who are directly participating in the research. Receiving consent from community leaders and other relevant persons should never replace consent or assent from those involved including children. A further complication that may arise in securing assent/consent is that a community may also be divided. It is, therefore, imperative that any such divisions are given full consideration such that consent is received from all appropriate leaders. Contextual factors such as community cohesiveness draw attention to the fact that the GKO toolkit and instruments need to be adequately adapted to the local context.

Data security and privacy are further considerations of fundamental importance. If privacy cannot be ensured, then it is possible that participants will be put at risk or that people may simply refuse to complete the survey. Data storage is also a key consideration. Researchers need to be able to confidently assure participants that their data is confidential. Particularly when conducting research on technology, it is a reasonable expectation that researchers will be able to fully grasp issues of confidentiality and security around technology. Key questions relate to: where is data going to be stored? How will it be transmitted? This is important not just during the research process itself, but also once the project is completed. What happens to the data then, and who will have access to it?

The writing and dissemination of reports pose a further set of ethical issues. With the writing of reports, we should think about the possibility of confirming findings with participating communities. This is not just about respect for those communities but also making sure that their voice is accurately reflected in the final report. Before any dissemination or communication of findings, you need to ensure that the data has been sufficiently cleaned and the report and any publically available information ensure that no respondents are identifiable. This cleaning process also entails ensuring that no particular persons are referenced within quotes. Consideration should be given to who will be receiving the reports, what exactly is going to be made publicly available, and the likely impact of this dissemination. A final consideration is a possibility of producing child-friendly reports. What do participating children get from the process? Creating accessible evidence of their contributions and the research findings is a great way of giving back.

The follow-up discussion also raised a number of important issues related to: payment and coercion; mandatory reporting and communicating with legal stakeholders; comparability; consent and young people's independence and autonomy; ethics of enumerator safety.

Information about further issues can be found in the expert methodological guide on Ethical Considerations by *Gabrielle Berman* available from www.globalikidsonle.net.

2.2. Questions of inclusion and research with marginalized groups

Chair: Cristina Ponte, New University of Lisbon, Global Kids Online Steering Group

The forms of inclusion or exclusion that children experience in different countries vary considerably. The purpose of this discussion was to identify helpful case studies to be included in the research toolkit and to guide and inform future researchers.

During the discussion the participants focuses on issues of inclusion and exclusion related to gender, disability, socio-economic status, social norms, beliefs and societal expectations, ageism, poverty, ethnicity, urban/rural divide, family, background, education, living situation (in care, on the streets), conflict and emergency areas and belonging to the LGBT community as possible forms of exclusion that affect children's rights in different countries. The research teams and experts discussed how these inequalities have been addressed during the pilot stage and in previous research projects.

These inequalities can interact with digital technologies in a number of ways. Therefore, the following risk and opportunities can arise:

- Opportunities: alternative learning; earlier access; socialization with family and friends; access to information and support; democratisation; participation and opportunity to be heard;
- Risks: reinforces the digital divide - gender, ethnicity, class, urban/rural; abuse or violence; barrier for participation.

These forms of exclusion or marginalisation in childhood give rise to multiple methodological challenges related to: budgeting, formulating a good research question, access to marginalised groups, sampling, capturing disability, staff training, sensitive administering of the survey and having a research framework that is inclusive, equality-sensitive, and participatory.

These challenges arise alongside a number of policy and practice related difficulties including: stigmatisation, respecting the principle of "do no harm", ethics, understanding the context, building trust and ensuring transparency, making sure the feedback mechanism is in place, being clear about the expectations and the objectives of the research, communicating with media and ensuring the integrity of the research.

In addition, it has to be remembered that different forms of inequality have different effects on children's rights in relation to digital technologies and, therefore, have to be explored individually.

When one looks at the new Global Kids Online research framework it is evident that inclusion was reinforced at several levels:

Individual level:

- Child's identity and resources include children's demographic (age, gender, SES, etc.), psychological characteristics, and measures for other capacities, interests, motivations, life experiences or vulnerabilities
- Access: locations, devices, levels of connectivity, limited or problematic
- Both (identity and access) are considered as questions for future research

Social level:

- Family and educators: "Community as extended social networks - local, religious, ethnic or other forms of belonging – further source of socialization of the child to cultural values and practices"

Country level:

- Societal (digital) inclusion – additional dimensions of inequality, besides socioeconomic inequality: ethnicity, urban concentration, linguistic differences, systematic racism/exclusion of minority groups or marginalized groups, (such as the ones with) cognitive and/or physical disabilities.

Further challenges and concerns relate to the following issues: how can young people's practices inform policy; access is an issue, particularly since so much work is located in communities where there may be limited access to different media forms, equipment, and online access; sustainability is also an issue – results may have been fascinating but there may be little long-term impact;

Key points raised during discussion

One of the key discussion questions was how to be inclusive and to ensure issues of inclusion are considered not only for survey but also the research more generally as there are limitations in combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. As mentioned on several occasions and by the representatives of a number of countries, one of the largest difficulties in the Global South is linked to more the 50% of the population not being internet users. Therefore, it is important to decide whether these people should be included in the research or excluded from it. Eventually, the majority of these children are likely to get access but it is unclear what kind of access it will be and to what extent it will differ from the type of access others currently have. This issue is particularly evident in India and Ghana.

The questions related to the type of access children have, as opposed to the mere absence or presence of that access, are also important to address. For example, in Brazil in 82% of cases internet is accessed via a mobile package rather than Wi-Fi. In the Philippines, there is a certain degree of discrimination in terms of access. It varies depending on how much money a person can spend on it. This makes a difference between, for example, 5 minutes of access and unlimited access. The opportunities vary accordingly.

The research teams reflected on the approaches they used for ensuring diversity, for example the team from the Philippines discussed not excluding out-of-school youth who would have

internet access but would at the same time have different experiences as compared to school youth. The rural/urban divide also seems to be an issue in the Philippines. Children who live in remote rural areas don't have much access to ICTs, but if only children are exposed to the internet are included in the study the data will be limited and non-representative.

The Serbian team arranged to have one focus group with in-school children with learning difficulties and a group of Roma children who tend to be marginalised in the Serbian society. These groups were reached through schools. For the quantitative part of the study, children were recruited through schools as it is hard to make a representative sample through households. This once again raises questions about the inclusion of children who do not attend school.

The project team from India also has a number of difficulties due to the size of the country and the diversity of the population. In addition, the information about children's internet use is rather limited and superficial. After performing the gap analysis the team is now thinking about what kind of research to be done to better understand the online use, risks, abuse; using more of a digital citizenship framework, differences between boys and girls; differences between mega-cities, towns and villages, etc. To address this, the team is exploring various ways of gathering data. In terms of sampling, it is easy to use internet cafe as a recruiting ground in India as boys tend to go there very often. It would also be possible to gain insights into their practices but there might be some gender bias.

In Brazil there are two issues related to sampling. Firstly, it is often difficult to include people who live in slums into the sample. Many interviewers are reluctant to go into slums to conduct interviews saying that that the area is too violent. Therefore, people who live there are often marginalised and left out. Theoretically, these populations should be included in the sample but most of the time it is difficult to accomplish. Secondly, migrant families who are relatively new in Brazil are rarely included in the research. In fact, until this year research only considered Brazilian respondents. However, they are gradually starting to include migrants as long as they can communicate in the local language. Very often in migrant families children can speak some local language while their parent cannot.

Further information and analyses of marginalised/disadvantaged children can be found in:

- **Livingstone et al., (2011) *Disadvantaged children and online risk*. LSE, short report** (Parents with lower secondary education or less, children whose parents don't use the internet and children who use the internet less than once per week) - These children tend to encounter slightly fewer online risks than their peers in Europe; they tend to be more upset if they experience them. Online skills are noticeably below the European average.
- **d'Haenens, Leen & Christine Ogan, 2013. *Internet-using children and digital inequality: a comparison between majority and minority Europeans*. *Communications. The European Journal of Communication Research*, 38, 41-60**
European ethnic majority children: more experience with receiving sex-related images and messages as well as with face to face meetings with online contacts than Turkish minority children and Turkish children residing in Turkey. Meanwhile, Turkish diaspora children were found to have more experiences with cyberbullying.

- **Bosman, J., et al. (2015). "Children's Digital Media Practices within the European Family Home: Does Perceived Discrimination Matter?" *Journal of Children and Media* 9(1): 77-94.**

Majority children who are suffering from discrimination behaviours, according to their parents: More exposed to all online risks under study. Acting as cyberbully also tends to be more frequent. They were found to use more proactive coping strategies. Consistently restrictive and close monitoring practices from their parents.

2.3. Policy, stakeholder engagement, and research uptake

Chair: Jasmina Byrne, UNICEF Office of Research –Innocenti, Global Kids Online Steering Group

The child rights framework orients towards the 3 Ps: provision, protection, and participation. However, children are sometimes viewed as victims, agents, means, or criminals, not as holistic human beings. In the development of policies, it is important to consider the different aspects that may be relevant for the holistic implementation of the rights of the child. Taking into account the fact that different policymakers sit in different ministries and departments, one needs to be able to deal with multiple stakeholders, and be aware that some conflicting findings may emerge from the research, which will need to be interpreted in the right context.

There are some key issues to consider in terms of articulating policy objectives. When it comes to guiding policy, good evidence is often lacking. Even where we do have evidence, it does not always offer sufficient explanation of what the real problem is or its nature. Narrowly defined objectives are also a problem. We, therefore, need to think in terms of a broad range of objectives. This can also be related to the misuse of evidence, as evidence can likewise be mobilised for limited policy objectives, and not always in the best interests of the child. In that regard, we should focus not just on online policy but also offline.

The theorised model of the policymaking process views it as a cycle flowing from agenda setting through policy formulation and policy implementation to policy evaluation, with the cycle thus starting again. However, this model disguises the fact that the policymaking cycle is much more complex in practice, consisting of an interactive process drawing in cabinet, legislature, ministries, media, international organisations, the private sector, civil society, and donors.

The best approach to influence policy with research is to put in the groundwork in order to understand the nature of the policy process, including incentives and disincentives, as well as the role of beliefs, values, and ideologies. Looking at who values whom and the links these relationships imply is also important. The good quality evidence is thus only a small part of the wider process. Good timing is something that flows from this broader picture, and this involves knowing not just when to raise an issue, but also when it is too late or when to avoid it. Knowing when issues are on the agenda is a key factor in generating policy impact but the demand side is just as important. The impact here must be thought of in terms that go beyond peer-reviewed journals and citation analysis.

Come in at the end of the research process and simply pitch the findings is not going to produce great policy impact – the partners and stakeholders must be engaged throughout the research

process. Yet, this does not happen automatically, so careful consideration must be afforded to budget, timing, and human factors. The supply of evidence is not sufficient and one must also think in terms of demand and capacity, bearing in mind that research to policy is only one form of impact and implementation, likewise, needs to be addressed.

Key points raised during discussion

Policy priorities may shift dramatically as national governments change, and with these political shifts might come the need to adapt policy recommendations to context. However, it can also be difficult to work with policymakers who are struggling to see where research and findings fit into the mandates of specific ministries and departments. What is valuable about the GKO approach is that through a focus on both the rights (opportunities) and protection (risk) perspectives, we can show how these issues cut across the mandates of various ministries, although this is something that requires great caution.

The pilot stage has been really helpful in highlighting some of the key challenges faced by researchers working on children's online risks and opportunities. In South Africa, for example, engaging with one department can be a six-month process to ensure they are fully engaged. This begins with individual conversations, sharing the work with them in order to get their buy-in, then proceeding to garner their engagement around draft findings. This requires further consideration of how to bring the right people together, not just departments and ministries, but also private sector and civil society organisations. It is important to compose a balanced set of stakeholders and to bring them together to produce a platform for action.

UNICEF India is engaging in an assessment of the online child ecosystem in India in order to get a general understanding of what it is, how it works, and to identify the gaps and disconnects. A core aim is to identify key interventions to strengthen this ecosystem. Some areas are now known much better than others. For instance, there is a strong understanding of the child protection system but not of online forensics. One key problem is that nobody really understands the system as a whole, and most people think it is much simpler than it actually is. There have been attempts to get people on board with the project, for instance in advance of the 2014 WePROTECT summit, but there is very little political momentum to get involved. The current approach involves offering a piece of analysis to a few interested parties within the system who see the need to invest more, although there is no interaction with senior policymakers. It is hoped that some high-priority interventions can be identified and agreed upon and that these can then be presented to the government. However, in a country the size of India, it is difficult to have leverage. A core issue then is to be convincing, but building key relationships is also fundamental. A great deal of thought was put into how best to produce policymaker engagement, and it was decided that starting with primary research with children would not be a straight road to policy.

In Serbia, three government ministries are interested in the GKO project – Ministry of the Interior, of Education, and of Communication are all eager to see the first results and so are the Serbian media. Although this does not entail complete ministries, there are some key people responsible who want to be seen as leaders in these initiatives, and the researchers are seen as

important partners in this. Montenegro noted a similar situation to the one in Serbia. With the EU-accession process underway, the government is aware of certain criteria that it must fulfill and are committed to achieving concrete action in this field. Various ministries are thus open to co-operation, which provides a useful entry point. In the UK, too, the Prime Minister David Cameron has been extremely helpful by providing funding for the WePROTECT initiative.

The ways in which the media use research findings is something that must be given proper consideration. It is possible for the media to selectively use some of the findings to create panic, but it is equally possible for the media to misinterpret those findings. How can the media be engaged as a link in the process, and how can they be trained to participate effectively? Although the cherry-picking of evidence is always a danger, journalists can be incredibly helpful partners. In Argentina, for instance, the UNICEF team is working with a journalist who is widely recognised in the field of technology and ICT and who has been very helpful in presenting results to the public and who has been involved at all stages of the project. UNICEF Argentina plans to get him to co-chair public presentations as well and to assist in the building of relationships with other stakeholders because his high visibility, popularity and public trust allow him to increase the positive impact of the project. Further issues on the agenda in Argentina relate to the lack of efficient legislation in cases of grooming (currently punitive) and academics not wanting their research to be manipulated for that purpose.

This issue of communicating findings also applies when dealing with policymakers, where one of the key struggles is attenuating the message of the findings for various audiences. It is here that keeping risks and opportunities together becomes extremely important in order to avoid the kind of responses where parents might simply say “Let’s just take away the technology.”

In Bulgaria, for example, the team has been working with teachers for introducing technology to children. They have been focusing on the relationship between access to technology and the development of essential digital skills, ensuring children have the capacity to deal with any risks they may encounter.

Brazil offered the example of their strategy for engaging key stakeholders from academia, government, NGOs, and other areas. This involves working closely with stakeholders from the beginning of the planning phase and the design of the questionnaire. A wiki has been created where stakeholders can critique the questionnaire design. Something that has come out of this process is the idea that the Brazilian survey should focus more on excessive exposure to advertising, with stakeholders participating in devising new questions to study this particular issue. The approach has been impactful, with the Ministry of Justice trying to bring findings to key policymakers and the Ministry of Education working with local government to develop programs for teacher training on ICT skills. This level of legitimization of the programme and the survey has been further helpful in approaching households.

Sonia Livingstone noted that a standard argument when speaking of internet governance spaces that are not specifically concerned with child protection is the ways in which this research can go wrong, with evidence of the need for child protection getting taken up as a call for censorship. In this regard, research is open to misuse.

In the Philippines, there is difficulty in linking with industry partnerships due to legislative blocks and the lack of a regulatory body that would facilitate such partnerships. This is a weakness that the GKO survey could help to deal with. A key goal is to look for an approach to legislation that is more preventive as opposed to punitive, which fails to recognise the need of a child to exercise their rights within the modality of the internet.

Key approaches to increasing the impact were highlighted including highlighting uniqueness of the evidence this research provides, as well the methodological rigor through which it is produced. The network members are already engaged in quite a task to both work with and educate stakeholders so that they understand what evidence is and what it can and cannot offer. There are inflated expectations around what evidence can actually do, as well as expectations that evidence can be expanded (at no cost). There is also a good deal of unreliable work being done in this field, yet it is important to keep doing it and to proceed with rigor. People change and teams change, but accurately framing what we can do and what we cannot be an ever-present subtext to our ongoing work.

Further information about policy-making can be found in the expert methodological guide on Using research findings for policy making by Jasmina Byrne, Kerry Albright and Daniel Kardefelt-Winther available from www.globalkidsonline.net. This is one of a series of methodological guides to be offered in the context of developing the research toolkit and is designed to provide tips on how researchers should engage with policymakers.

3. Future directions – Next steps, dissemination and plans for networking

Chair: Sonia Livingstone, London School of Economics and Political Science, Global Kids Online Steering Group

This session featured a discussion of plans for the next steps in the GKO process at the level of individual country projects and GKO as a whole, as well as plans for the dissemination of research findings and the fostering of future networking opportunities. A key next step is launching the GKO toolkit website which will host tools for researchers and research results. This website is designed to serve as a hub that both focuses attention on the research being done by at country level and as a site for coordination. It will also feature photographs and biographies recognising those who have contributed to country reports. The steering group is also keen for the website to feature photographs of people doing actual research, demonstrating that this is a truly global project.

The plans for the next steps in the GKO process at the level of individual country projects and GKO as a whole include:

Reporting

- Reflections on lessons learned from the pilot studies – collecting and adding to expert reports as appropriate;
- Finalising country reports with findings and methodological reflections;
- Consult partners about draft synthesis report and draft the report;

- Creating a data dictionary for the country reports and the and synthesis report, as well as a syntax file for easier data comparability;

Research toolkit

- Continue developing and uploading content to the toolkit;
- Draw on pilot country reports to advance the toolkit elements and adaptability;
- Create mechanisms for periodic review of the toolkit based on new evidence.

Consultation

- Hold consultation with the International Advisory Group before final launch and dissemination;
- Set up a mechanism for on-going consultation on GKO expansion and tool revision.

Expansion and Networking

- Finalise the criteria for expansion of Global Kids Online;
- Keep in contact with the new countries interested in joining Global Kids Online;
- Collaborate with existing research networks working on children's rights in the digital age.

Dissemination

- Consult partners about dissemination plans;
- Engage experts and International Advisory Group in dissemination process;
- Develop plans for the dissemination of research findings and the fostering of future networking opportunities.
- Develop press release and other publicity for launch;
- Engage partners in launch of toolkit;

Appendix 1: Meeting agenda

<p style="text-align: center;">Day 1: Monday 21st March 2016 <i>London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)</i> <i>Venue: 32 Lincoln's Inn Fields, Room B07 (32L.B07) [map]</i></p>	
9.30 – 10.00	Registration and Coffee
10.00 – 10.15	Welcome and introductions Sonia Livingstone and Jasmina Byrne
10.15 – 11.00	Project overview and developments Sonia Livingstone and Jasmina Byrne
11.00– 13.15	<p>Country presentations, session 1– chaired by Daniel Kardefelt-Winther (with break) Reports from partner countries on fieldwork process and findings.</p> <p>#Argentina (20 mins)</p> <p>#The Philippines (20 mins)</p> <p># South Africa (20 mins)</p>
13.15 – 14.15	Lunch
14.15 – 15.00	<p>Country presentations, session 2– chaired by Daniel Kardefelt-Winther</p> <p># Serbia (20 mins)</p>
15.00– 17.00 32L.G.01 & 32L.B07	<p>Afternoon group discussions on methodology (with break) Reflections on fieldwork experiences, uses of the research toolkit, challenges and lessons learned, cross-country comparisons – <i>to help refine the GKO toolkit.</i></p>
17.00 – 17.30	<p>Recap of Day 1 The work groups report on the methodology discussions via Google Docs.</p>
19.00	<p style="text-align: center;">Dinner organised by LSE <i>Coopers Restaurant & Bar, 49 Lincoln's Inn Fields London WC2A 3PF [map]</i></p>

<p align="center">Day 2: Tuesday 22nd March 2016 <i>London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)</i> <i>Venue: 32 Lincoln's Inn Fields, Room B07 (32L.B07) [map]</i></p>	
9.00 – 9.30	<p>Global Kids Online results and outputs – chaired by Sonia Livingstone Focus on writing the country reports and the synthesis report.</p>
9.30 – 10.30 32L.LG.08 & 32L.B07	<p>Interactive Discussions 1– chaired by Gabrielle Berman First of 3 interactive sessions to discuss country experiences of the research process– <i>to gather case studies for the GKO toolkit</i>. Each session will start with a short introduction of 10 minutes followed by discussion.</p> <p><i>#1Challenges with risk – from ethics to politics</i></p>
10.30 – 11.00	<p><i>Coffee break</i></p>
11.00 – 12.00 32L.LG.08 & 32L.B07	<p>Interactive Discussions 2 – chaired by Cristina Ponte <i>#2Questions of inclusion and research with marginalized groups</i></p>
12.00 – 13.00	<p>The expansion of Global Kids Online – chaired by Jasmina Byrne Hearing from new countries interested in joining Global Kids Online, as well as criteria for future members.</p>
13.00 – 14.00	<p><i>Lunch</i></p>
14.00 – 15.00	<p>Interactive Discussions 3– chaired by Kerry Albright <i>#3Policy, stakeholder engagement and research uptake</i> <i>Kerry Albright and Jasmina Byrne UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti</i></p>
15.00 – 15.30	<p>WePROTECT - Ernie Allen, Chair of WePROTECT Advisory Board</p>
15.30 – 16.30	<p>Future directions – chaired by Sonia Livingstone Next steps, dissemination, and plans for networking.</p>
16.30 – 16.45	<p>Closing of the meeting – Sonia Livingstone and Jasmina Byrne</p>
19.00	<p><i>Optional dinner for interested participants</i> <i>The Old Bank of England, 194 Fleet Street, London, EC4A 2LT [map]</i></p>

Appendix 2: Participants in the meeting

Name	Affiliation
Kerry Albright	UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti Global Kids Online Expert Group
Ernie Allen	Chair of WePROTECT Advisory Board
Maria Margarita Ardivilla	UNICEF Philippines
Veronica Avati	UNICEF Ghana
AlexandreBarbosa	Regional Center for Studies on the Development of the Information Society (Cetic.br) Global Kids Online Expert Group
Farida BassioniStamenic	UNICEF Serbia
Stephen Bell	UK Home Office
Gabrielle Berman	UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti Global Kids Online Expert Group
Patrick Burton	Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention, South Africa
Jasmina Byrne	UNICEF Office of Research –Innocenti Global Kids Online Steering Group
Alexandra Chernyavskaya	London School of Economics and Political Science Global Kids Online Steering Group
Nada Djurovic	UNICEF Montenegro
Leonardo Estacio	University of the Philippines, Manila
EllenHelsper	London School of Economics and Political Science Global Kids Online Steering Group
Daniel Kardefelt-Winther	UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti Global Kids Online Steering Group
Dorothea Kleine	Royal Holloway University of London Global Kids Online Expert Group
Eloise Konieczko	UK Home Office
LezanneLeoschut	Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention, South Africa
Sonia Livingstone	London School of Economics and Political Science Global Kids Online Steering Group
SinahMoruane	UNICEF South Africa
Joyce Odame	UNICEF Ghana
KjartanOlafsson	University of Akureyri Global Kids Online Steering Group
Nienke Palstra	UNICEF UK
Zoran Pavlovic	University of Belgrade, Serbia

Gemma Pearson	Royal Holloway University of London
JelenaPerovic	UNICEF Montenegro
DaliborPetrovic	University of Belgrade, Serbia
Joanne Phyfer	Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention, South Africa
LucindaPlatt	London School of Economics and Political Science Global Kids Online Steering Group
CristinaPonte	New University of Lisbon Global Kids Online Steering Group
Dragan Popadic	University of Belgrade, Serbia
Maria Jose Ravalli	UNICEF Argentina
LuizaShahbazyan	EU Kids Online Bulgaria
Neelam Singh	UNICEF India
Clara Sommarin	UNICEF HQ New York
Maria Eugenia Sozio	Regional Center for Studies on the Development of the Information Society (Cetic.br)
MariaStoilova	London School of Economics and Political Science Global Kids Online Steering Group
Merle Tan	University of the Philippines, Manila
Joachim Theis	UNICEF India
Michelle Ylade	University of the Philippines, Manila