



भारत सरकार
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
राष्ट्रीय बाल अधिकार संरक्षण आयोग
NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR PROTECTION OF CHILD RIGHTS
नई दिल्ली-110 001
NEW DELHI - 110 001

F.No.24/NCPCR/2008-09/CRC/Prog.
Dated: 10th June, 2014.

Office Memorandum

Subject: Working Group on "Safeguarding the rights of children in contact with Railways" - regarding -

Please find enclosed a copy of the minutes of the 1st Meeting of the Working Group held on 15.04.2014 at New Delhi for perusal and records.

2. The minutes will come up for confirmation in the second meeting of the Working Group scheduled to be held on 13th and 14th June, 2014 in New Delhi.

(Asheem Srivastav)
Member Secretary

Encls: Minutes (Pages 1-17)

To

All Members of the Working Group

National Commission for Protection of Child Rights

Minutes of First Meeting of Working Group on "Safeguarding the Rights of Children in Contact With Railways"

April 15, 2014

Maple Room, India Habitat Centre, Lodhi Road, New Delhi

10:30 A.M – 4:00 P.M

Session I: Welcome of Participants and Introduction - Ms Kushal Singh, Chairperson, NCPCR

Ms Kushal Singh welcomed the participants expressing her satisfaction over the august gathering of people working at the grassroots level. She further mentioned that the process began because Khushboo Jain approached the NCPCR with concerns about the SOP circulated by Railways, following the High Court Order in "Khushboo Jain Versus Ministry of Railways & Others" Case. Ms Singh further stated while policies for interventions exist for street children, needs of platform children are specific, and hence the need to evolve a policy for children in contact with the railways based on the experience of people's interventions with that group.

Session II: Conceptualising the Framework: 'Rights of Children Coming in Contact with Railways' - Dr Ramanath Nayak

Dr Ramanath Nayak presented a brief overview on the making of NCPCR Guidelines, which was an outcome of the NCPCR's consultation with various stakeholders, especially the civil society organizations who are involved in safeguarding the rights of children in contact with railways. After an informal consultative process from August 2008 - March 2009, NCPCR formalized a Working Group in March 2009. The Working Group formulated the recommendations by holding multiple consultations with experts/ different stakeholders working on the issue of children at Railway Stations. The recommendations for 'Safeguarding the Rights of Children in Contact with Railways' was issued on 31.03.2010 to the Ministry of Railways and Ministry of Women and Child Development.

Further the Secretary, MWCD wrote a letter to Chairman, Railway Board (dated 11th August 2011), to which s/he received a response (dated 30th August 2011). The reply claimed that



Railways has taken initiative to constitute Child Welfare Committees at the Divisional level, headed by the Sr. Divisional Security Commandant, which has been changed to Child Protection Committee in the SOP recently issued.

As one of the respondents to the Writ Petition by Khushboo Jain, NCPCR organized various consultations and had a meeting with the Chairman, Railway Board on 5 December 2012. During the meeting with the Railway Board, it was agreed that the Railway Board and NCPCR will work together to ensure the safety, care and protection of children who are unaccompanied and distressed. For this purpose, NCPCR agreed to develop a Protocol for smooth transition of the children with their parents/guardians or to the child care institutions through the Child Welfare Committees.

In order to review the existing guidelines (in relation to ICPS) and develop a protocol for the production of children before the Child Welfare Committees, NCPCR constituted a small Working Group and developed a draft Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) emphasizing the roles and responsibilities of RPF, GRP and other Railways Officials – Station Master, Train Ticket Examiner (TTE), and allied systems –Special Juvenile Police Unit (SJPU), Childline and also the fellow passengers.

The Writ Petition was disposed of after the hearing on February 13, 2013. Afterwards NCPCR kept on writing to the Railway Board to comply with the Court Order and also conveyed its possible support, if required, in implementing NCPCR guidelines. Not receiving any response from the Railway Board, NCPCR shared the draft SOP and expressed its desire to interact with few DRMs, Station level Officers, GRP and RPF personnel and NGOs working on Railway platforms to deliberate upon the draft SOP and to receive feedback on the same.

Thereafter, the Railways issued their own SOP in Dec 2013, without sharing with or taking into confidence NCPCR. Dr Nayak mentioned while the SOP was a welcome step, there were gaps and concerns expressed by the civil society groups. To address these concerns and develop a holistic understanding on the issue of children in contact with the railways, NCPCR constituted a Working Group for developing a framework for a National Policy towards safeguarding the rights of children in contact with Railways.



**Session III: Setting forth the agenda: Children vis-à-vis Railways - Issues & Concerns –
Khushboo Jain**

Khushboo Jain started with the premise of issues with the SOP circulated by the Railways. She mentioned while tremendous amount of work is happening across the country with children in contact with railways, the SOP issued by the Railways overlooked the existing intervention practices including those in which railways itself has played a major role. The task before the group was to bring all these experiences on one table, of NGOs, and of Railways itself, of interventions done with children in contact with the railways. She further said that the policy making process needs to be more representative as children in contact with railways are not only most often runaway children arriving fresh on the station or staying in and around station premises but also children from the communities who live in slum areas and visit stations often or are from itinerant groups that live around railway stations, or children whose parents may be vendors at the stations or in the trains, or children from homeless families.

She further pointed out concerns arising with children in contact with the railways.

1. Overemphasis on Child Protection and a neglect of children's agency and capacity for autonomous decision-making. In instances that a child has decided to work on the station and is not ready to leave, of which numerous examples exist, how then can the railway station space be made safer for the child?
2. Working towards convergence of all plans and policies and maintaining a balanced role between state and civil society.
3. Having sustainable models for ownership by the state.
4. Concerns facing older children who grow up in and around stations, or return from institutional care after attaining adulthood at 18 years. The 'kinship' networks that children form with other children at the station becomes important for them. Need to understand what children in that network provide to each other. But instead the current practice is to break up these networks and groups, labelling them 'gangs'.
5. The several favourable Court Orders and judgments across the country which need to be collected in one place and made use of. For example: the High Court order in Odisha for providing compensation for injury of a child in the Railway.



6. The Railways are mainly concerned with fresh arrivals as per the SOP. But the major issue is that they produce children from adjoining communities before CWC who come back to the station. This issue hasn't been dealt with at all.
7. There is no focus on why girls are mostly missing from the street while data can substantiate large numbers of girls are running away. There is a need to explore the reasons for this, especially the assumption that girls get into wrong hands and thus fail to come into the protective system.
8. ICPS Open Shelters meant primarily for children like the ones that stay in and around stations. However, in the existing centres, drug addicted children are not allowed inside. Therefore, there is an urgent need to re-examine existing practices and challenges faced.

Khushboo Jain further said that it is time to bring Child's perspective to the fore and integrate children's voices in the policy framing process. It is also time to do a critical evaluation of our own work, of all existing models, policies and programs and look into the gaps. Since the 2010 NCPCR recommendations, the atmosphere has been positive and much more has been translated on the ground, with Railways also being more positive. Therefore instead of restricting ourselves to SOP alone, it is time to capitalize and build on history - towards broader policy concerning Railway Children - implemented by a broader set of stakeholders. There is also a need to listen to the Railways themselves - what is their understanding of the issue and concerns faced by them while implementing their own SOP.

Session IV: Discussion on the Agenda – Roundtable

The session was moderated by Dr Bharti Sharma and Advocate Anant Asthana. The house was opened for initial comments from Working Group members.

Ms Kavita Ratna congratulated the concept note for focusing on Agency of Children, an area she feels is seriously lacking in policy discourses. Furthermore, understanding the coping mechanisms children have in place, acknowledging the fact that many children fear the system and going to the law, and that these fears needs to be understood. Also she noted that it is not a homogeneous group, and asked how we can recognize they are unique individuals and that there are children seeking options other than what is being being provided or that may be currently imagined. She also expressed concern about issues related to older children, even in the age



group of 14-18 years and issues relating to gender, sexuality, livelihoods, children with disability, child sexual abuse, etc. She further emphasized the need for understanding safe spaces from the child's perspective. Kavita Ratna also stated that the implicit linkage with Juvenile Justice is an area where we all despair and there is need for forward-backward linkages. The need is to focus on the mandate of this process, and building this mandate in the Action Plan with Ministries and Departments.

Ms Preet Verma stated the need to begin from the perspective of the needs of children that haven't been fulfilled given every SOP or Policy, etc. What is required is to look at gap areas and see where the policy has to be strengthened, which should then be taken up with MWCD. There are several Departments but there should be one nodal department which will keep pulling the process through.

Father G Kollashany said it is important to keep in mind that in this process of getting together to create a policy, the policymakers are also themselves changing, with a new focus on children's voice and perspective. The need is to look at that process of change, how we are changing and widening our perspectives. Children on railway station should not be looked at as 'runaway' children 'in conflict with the law'. The child's action of leaving home should be seen as intrinsic to her/his growing up and adolescence which finds expression in this manner. The focus should be on creating resilient support systems for the child and look beyond one-time interventions. He further said that in all locations where collection of information is taking place, railways and other authorities should be brought in. There should be a process of ownership by the Departments and Ministries.

Dr Bharti Sharma emphasized the need to focus on the 6 month timeline all the time. She further said it is important to understand who the children in contact with the railways are and at what developmental stages they belong to. There is an absolute need to re-examine the protective mechanisms on offer and to explore whether the children actually want those mechanisms. She suggested that in this exercise we must collate our experiences of working with children and most importantly, that the voices of children are heard and recorded but not through the medium of existing intervention agencies.



Adv. Anant Asthana suggested that the Action Plan of the Delhi meeting organized by Chetna on 22 January 2014 needs to be circulated amongst the group, so the group is aware of the discussions on the SOP and the issue. The first question he posed is how we look at the act of running away. He further stated that it is clear that the existing laws and policies are not fulfilling the needs of this particular group. The Juvenile Justice Act heavily compromises the child's agency. The JJ Act has built into it a procedure for differential treatment of children in conflict with the law depending on their nature of offence, whether they are first-time offenders or not, etc. The JJ Act recognizes diversity among children in conflict with the law. However, there is only one uniform approach to children in need of care and protection. While the police can dispose of petty offences in cases of JCL, for CNCP, children have to be produced before CWC. There is no diversion and no approach or understanding of different kinds of CNCP's. This needs to be looked into and kept in mind. He emphasized that it is the right time to bring diversity in process for extending support to CNCP. It is time to acknowledge at the policy level that running away is not a problem but a part of the growing up process. To get into legal reform, the National Policy for Children 2013 needs to be revisited.

At this point, discussion was initiated by Mr Aseem Srivastava about whether the current J J System interferes with children in contact with the railways to which Mr Sanjay Gupta said children are caught between laws. There are different laws at the station, for example, different for GRP, RPF, etc.

Mr Sanat Sinha stated, at least 90 percent of children in contact with railways are CNCP. He opined that the role of railways was less compared to that of the Child Welfare Committees. The CWCs often have limited options to help children in terms of referral organisations and CWCs do not have a magic stick to solve all problems. There should be diverse facilities to help the CWC carry out its duties. He further stated that frequently children are produced before Railway Magistrate instead of Juvenile Justice Board. He was of the opinion that all children in contact with railways should be brought under JJ system. The priority, he suggested, is to see what the systems might be that would ideally be put in place.

Sr. Jacinta Pinto said while policies are framed, the implementation at grassroots levels do not happen and most often, the system is very inhuman. There is need to devise systems for step-by-step implementation at the grassroots level. The role of government and railways needs to be



defined. She further opined that there is a total lack of child friendly systems. The Police especially are not child friendly at all. There is no clarity as to what is the role of the Railways in the implementation of the SOP. She observed that there are families as well on platforms, and child rescue happens continuously, but due to poverty, migration of families to cities continues. She highlighted how there is conflict and redundancy amongst NGOs, and that there was no networking amongst NGOs.

Sr. Clara observed that there were positive responses from a few regions of railways, but no response from most. She said CWCs and implementing agencies views should be collected in this process. Also, drugs and crime among children are major issues affecting children and have to be looked into. She highlighted that in many states, there was no JJ infrastructure. For example, in Madhya Pradesh, there were only three Government Homes for children, one for girls and two for boys. The State should be made responsible to develop more homes, and Homes run by NGOs should be recognized with fund releasing systems in place. She also noted that CWCs are often insensitive.

Mr Sachin Sachdeva said that the issue should be looked at afresh. He pointed out that it was important to get organisations' perspectives about what they want to do with the children, with a horizon of 5-10 years. There was also a need to collect evidence on what can be done especially in areas like drug addiction. He stated the need for extensive research on children. Furthermore, there was a critical need to look at the girls in the stations and explore their 'invisibilisation'. The policy needs to have an eye on the tension between child agency versus protection for the child (by adults). Further enquiry and understanding is needed on existing practices like whether putting the children in a Child Care Institution or back to the family indiscriminately is a successful strategy that helps children, or what should be the role of CWC once the child has been restored back to the family. He also stressed the need to identify and work with groups and networks of children and adults on the station premises.

Prof Shekhar Sheshadri said it is crucial for a social worker who meets the child for the first time to understand the situation of the child, the state in which the child is at the moment of contact, and thereby to respond appropriately. This is an important skill which cannot be emphasized enough. However, the psycho-social component of working with children is not given due importance or is non-existent and the focus is only on the state legal component. It is



important to realise that just 'being there' with the child helps. There should not be any intervention with the child without adequate staff capacity. There is a need for some specificity on what kind of intervention is beneficial at that point and not just structuring the process. He further pointed out that it wasn't clear whether the SOP's vision of the railway situation is a 'transitory and brief contact' with the child or a 'long-term engagement'. A range of issues need to be kept in mind when formulating policy: the child who has spent some time on the station vs. the new child, the fresh arrival, issues of rights enablement of the child vs. rights violation in the name of her/his protection; how to look at personhood and agency issues especially with regard to sexuality of the child and drug use; has the child faced trauma or has the child symptoms of ADHD. The study done by NCPCR on substance abuse should be referenced. Training is required on how to approach and work with children, what is the kind of child you are working with. The question as to what makes platforms safe or unsafe is very important. Is the platform 'unsafe' in essence? The nuances of categories of children and specificity of child should be captured and channelized. There is a need to capture processes. The ideal attitude could be 'watchful expectancy and masterly inactivity'.

Mr Masroor Khan (Butterflies) stated that children are suffering from many behavioural problems which need to be addressed, and highlighted the need for follow up.

Mr Navin Sellaraju said there is need to look at the 'universe' of children in contact with railways. Need to consider the number of children not ready to 'go home'. He expresses alarm about what happens to the child after they turn 18 years as suddenly they are off the radar. He wondered if we have any perspective on our engagement with young adults on the streets/railway stations. He mentioned that skills to engage with children is crucial to working with them and subsequently there was a need to invest in skills building. He gave the example of different tools developed by their partner organizations like art and sports-based psychosocial support, tools for education, etc.

Mr Pramod Kulkarni (Sathi) suggested two documents should come out at the end. First should explain the existing practices, and the other should be an operational action plan for the next 5-6 years to be done with all children in contact with railways.



Mr Sanat Sinha (Bal Sakha) said there is no system for children arriving fresh at the stations. Also, society's reaction towards older children is very negative.

Mr Dunu Roy (Hazard Centre) highlighted the need to have some coherence in the Working Group and suggested three questions for deliberation and integration of the discussions. (1) Are we talking about all children - or a specific group of children? In his view, if it is about children who have left home, then are they being seen as vulnerable children or are they resilient kids who have made a choice moving away from vulnerability when they come to the stations. (2) Understanding the difference between protecting the Rights of Children and Protecting Children, because they may be contradictory. For RPF and others, for example, it means protecting the child from crime. What does it imply when we say protect the children from crime? (3) The policy needs to be discussed with children and their feedback on what they think is their rights should be focused upon.

Ms Shachi Singh (Ehsaas) asked if everybody could deal with the child and emphasized the need for skilled engagement with children. Which agencies are skilled to deal with children? There should be clarity of roles between multiple agencies working with children. What is the policy of the Railways against 'abusers' on the railway platforms, like people selling drugs or committing crimes in its premises? Railway stakeholders need to be actively involved in policymaking. There should be support systems in cities for the children but we should also look at the root causes of the children coming to stations, there should be interventions in source areas linked to interventions on the station.

Ms Heenu Singh (CIF) said the existing SOP's should be reviewed. There should be a process document like a Compendium of Best Practices. There are three categories of children, fresh arrivals, older children and the ones who have been part of the station for a long time, alongside children from local communities. There should be a proper risk analysis for children at the stations in view of child protection systems and gaps.

Mr Deep Purkayastha (Praajak) discussed the concept of "the best interest of the child," wherein he said the specificity of child means the specificity of best interest. He feels JJ Act is very constricting to deal with realities of children in contact with railways. He questioned if decision of a child to stay on the Railway station is recognized in JJ Act. Many children are not



coming into NGO interventions at all and have their own survival and protection systems. Sometimes, existing children accessing existing centres also create barriers to other children from accessing these services. The agency of a child can be equated with the choice of a child not to go home. He emphasized that getting children's voices in the policy process should not be done by NGO's, but rather by researchers trained for it. He further said that in all smaller stations, there are small community agencies (funded by communities themselves) or individuals with whom children stay. Though these are not centralized or recognized interventions, they are effective for those children. Such voices, i.e. interventions that fall outside of intervention structures of state or NGO's needs to be brought in.

Mr Sanjay Gupta (Chetna) said we need to focus not on problems but on solutions and how we can sell those solutions to stakeholders like railways. We need to look at what is "safe" space from the point of view of stakeholders so as to sell the concept to them. A vision for protection of Railway children and a proper action plan needs to be developed. He also highlighted the point of abusers at the station who are apparently popular with and protective of children, whom he referred to as 'Protective abusers'.

Ms Arlene Manoharan (CCL-NLSIU) started with the premise that children are here as duty-bearers where the State and the family have failed, and the response of JJ Act to this group of street children is a complete failure. She flagged some major concerns that have to be looked upon: (1) Focus of the Working Group is on children in contact with the Railways, but ramifications are huge because of the very wide range of services that these children need to have access to - medical attention, drug de-tox facilities, protection, access to justice for sexual abuse, violence from the police, shelter - in a sense talking about the entire JJ Act, POCSO, NDPS, Child Labour Act, RTE, Right to Food, Schemes like NREGA, ICPS, etc.; (2) Role of the State and its perspectives about the child - how does the state view railway children and see its own role vis. a vis. Railway Children especially when it wants clean stations without children; how does the state respond to this unique category of citizens - children and communities living on the street - criminalization of poverty? How do we ensure State Accountability to Railway Children and their families in the existing scenario of police abuse, etc. From the point of view of the Railways, these children are a nuisance, thieves, drug addicts, free labour to pick up dead bodies, Juvenile in Conflict with Law. In producing children before CWCs, there is a need for balancing Right to Participation and the Right to Protection, and enabling Best Interest



determinations. How are the core principles of Protection and Autonomy reflected in our approaches - and what value is given to each of them in the various kinds of interventions for each and every child. The contested area of 'crime' and livelihoods have to be explored. Also, need to explore how existing models fit into the JJ system. She cautioned against getting caught in the purely protective and the purely participative approach to determine best interest of child; (3) Role of Civil Society - What will be the role/responsibility for citizens/passengers/communities on the stations in this policy; (4) Need to look at the root causes - mapping of migration of families, women survivors of violence, and children on their own. Family support may be more important than setting up Child Care Institutions; (5) Evidence - data to back recommendations on a range of laws and policies concerning children (6) Role of NCPCR in process of law reform of the JJ Act - strong resonance between both these processes. The insights in the working group should be linked to the JJ amendment initiative.

Dr Sarada Balagopalan (CSDS) spoke about the tension between prescriptive and descriptive where the prescriptive goes against the narrative of descriptive; for example, prescriptive impulses of the state are problematic for children. Children are not a homogenous group. This has to inform all discussions. There are many perspectives - of gender, age, neglect of older children. Children's every day practices, their coping mechanisms, need to be seen as part of a future they are trying to build. There is need to see protection more broadly, with the RTE and other laws wanting to re-address the idea of protection of children. Children in contact with railways should not be looked at as a category or an 'isolated group'. She emphasized how the children's rights agenda is structurally homogenizing children. She suggested that the group involves various Ministries who will address these children in the long run, and that the protection of Railway Children is not separate from the other policies.

Session II: Evolving an Action Plan for Further Work – Roundtable

Khushboo Jain moderated this session. The agenda for the meeting was discussed point by point.

Agenda 1: Documentation and enumeration of various existing initiatives taken by Government and Non-Government Organizations for safeguarding the rights of children in contact with Railways.

It was decided that all Members will provide available information with respect to eight broad themes identified by Ms. Khushboo Jain by 30.04.2014. A Sub-Group was also constituted comprising of Shri Navin Sellaraju, Dr. Sarada Balagopalan, Dr. Bharti Sharma, Ms.



Khushboo Jain, Shri Anant Asthana and Ms. Arlene Manoharan to analyse the information received from different Members.

Khushboo Jain pointed out that the members of the Working Group were selected based on zones, so they could facilitate collection of data in their respective zones.

North Zone - Chetna, Ehsaas, Butterflies

South Zone - Sathi

West Zone - Bal Prafula

Central Zone - Jeevodaya Society

East and North East Zone - Praajak and Bal Sakha

To be able to segregate information which should be shared with the group, she suggested certain broad themes:

1. List of NGO's working in the respective zones
2. The intervention models, IEC material, Evaluation Studies, etc.
3. Reports, data, research on other stakeholders' participation, linkages with JJ System, challenges and issues faced.
4. State policies, CWC Orders, Standing orders, SOP's, Court Orders in any respective cases done by NGO's etc.
5. Issues to be covered - missing children, trafficking of children, children in and around railway stations, drug de-addiction, children and sexuality, JCL cases, Children and work, railway children in institutions, running away of children, forward-backward linkages-identification of source areas and routes of children, children with disabilities, gender breakdown and any specific intervention and issues with girl children, children from itinerant groups, local slums, children with families on the street.
6. Issues/Experience with existing policies and legal structures vis. - vis. children in contact with railways
7. Suggestions on how the State including Railways should play a part.
8. Experience with ICPS open shelters, and how railways can be a part of ICPS, and how children might envisage an open shelter

The group after long deliberation agreed to source secondary source materials and share them with the working group by April 30, 2014. A **Subgroup for data analysis** was formed comprising of Navin Sellaraju, Sarada Balagopalan, Dr Bharti Sharma, Khushboo Jain, Anant



Asthana and Arlene Manoharan, who would do the first initial screening of the documents collected, identify themes and cluster data according to themes.

Agenda 2: Compilation and analysis of various administrative and judicial orders, longstanding or new, concerning the rights of children coming in contact with Railways, their status of implementation and overall impact.

It was decided that since National Law College, Delhi (NLUD) was already conducting a study on the legal aid to railways children, they will do the compilation of all orders of CWC and JJB. The National Law School of India University (NLSIU), Bangalore also agreed to share the available information and coordinate with NLUD in compilation of the requisite data. Since the representative from TISS was not present in the meeting, the Working Group decided to approach TISS with the request to make necessary contribution in this endeavour.

Agenda 3: “Understanding the views of railways children and involve them in the participatory system with a view to find viable solution to their problems.”

It was agreed that the existing Participatory Assessment Tool prepared by Prof. Shekhar Seshadri should be suitably modified and pilot-tested in Karnataka within six weeks’ time in coordination with NGO ‘Concerned with Working Children’. The pilot testing will be done by a Sub-Group comprising of Prof. Shekhar Seshadri, Father George Kollashany and Ms. Arlene Manoharan of ‘Concerned with Working Children’. After field testing and finalization of the Participatory Assessment Tool, Childline will train its field staff in the country to collection information using this tool. For this purpose, the Childline will use NIC Video Conferencing facility available in all States.

Agenda 4: How the Framework needs to be taken up simultaneously with concerned Ministries and Departments.

It was decided that the second meeting of the Working Group will be held only after the initial data collection, analysis and documentation and pilot testing etc. [Agenda 1 - 3] is completed. The tentative dates suggested for the meeting were 6th and 7th June, 2014.

Meeting ended with Concluding Observation by Mr Asheem Srivastava.

Next Working Group meeting: June 6 and 7, 2014, Delhi

- 13 -



Action Plan and Important Dates

S.No	Task	Dateline	Members
1.	Documentation and enumeration of various existing initiatives taken by Government and Non-Government Organizations	By April 30, 2014	All NGO members, Childline, PHF and RC
2.	Compilation and analysis of various administrative and judicial orders	By April 30, 2014	TISS, CCL-NLSIU and NLUD
3.	Sub Group for data analysis - first initial screening of the documents collected, identify themes and cluster data according to themes	May 2014	Mr S. Navin Sellaraju, Dr Sarada Balagopalan, Dr Bharti Sharma, Khushboo Jain, Arlene Manoharan, Adv. Anant Asthana
4.	Sub Group on Child Participation - development of Participatory Assessment Tool to get children's voices and the pilot in Karnataka	April-May 2014	Arlene Manoharan, Concerned for Working Children, Prof Shekhar Seshadri and Fr George Kollashany
5.	Two days Consultation of the Working Group in Delhi for analysis of all the data collected and making further Plan of Action for local and region specific consultation as well as data collection by researchers across identified zones in the country.	June 6-7, 2014	Working Group Members



List of Participants

S. No.	Name & Designation	Contact No. & E-Mail ID
1.	Mr Harsh Malinga Ministry of Labour & Employment Shram Shakti Bhawan, Rafi Marg, New Delhi-110001	Tel. 9968120190
2.	Mr. P. Khakha A.D. (ICPS) Department of Women and Child Development, GNCTD 1 Canning Lane, K.G. Marg, New Delhi	Tel. 23070378, 23073459 Mobile- 9968319611 adicps.delhi@gmail.com dirwcd.delhi@nic.in
3.	Dr Sarada Balagopalan Centre for Study of Developing Society (CSDS) Associate Professor, 29, Rajpur Road, Delhi 110054	011- 23942199 saradab@csds.in
4.	Fr. George Kollashany E-Mandala, Communities of Knowledge & Practice	Contact: +919868798728 georgekollashany@gmail.com
5.	Ms. Kavita Ratna Director-Advocacy The Concerned for Working Children (CWC) 303/2, L.B. Shastri Nagar, Vimanapura Post, Bangalore - 560 017	Tel. 080 - 25234611/25234270 Email: cwc@pobox.com www.concernedforworkingchildren.org
6.	Prof. Shekhar P. Seshadri Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry NIMHANS, Hosur Road Bangalore - 560029	Tel. 080-26995351 shekhar@nimhans.kar.nic.in
7.	Dr. Bharti Sharma Former Chairperson, CWC, Delhi	9811390630, bharti41@gmail.com
8.	Adv. Anant Asthana Advocate, Delhi	M- 9212117105, anant.asthana@gmail.com
9.	Ms Khushboo Jain Research Scholar, University of Delhi	9818411650, Email: khusheejain@gmail.com
10.	Ms. Arlene Manoharan Fellow and Programme Head – Juvenile Justice Centre for Child and the Law (CCL)	Tele/Fax: 080-23160528, ccl@nls.ac.in , arelenemanoharan.ccl@gmail.co



	National Law School of India University Nagarbhavi, Bangalore 560072	m
11.	Prof. Srikrishna Deva Rao Registrar, National Law University, New Delhi Sector 14, Dwarka, New Delhi-78	Phone: 011-28034993, 28034257 Email: info@nludelhi.ac.in
12.	Ms. Heenu Singh Head, North Region Childline India Foundation, New Delhi	M- 09811051331, heenu@childlineindia.org.in
13.	Mr Deep Purkayastha, Director, Praajak, 468-A, Block K, New Alipore Kolkata - 700 053, West Bengal	Tel: 033-24000455, 24000592, Mobile- 09831492209 Email: praajak@yahoo.co.in
14.	Ms Sachi Singh Secretary, Ehsaas 2 nd Floor, Thakur Transport Building, Opp. Deen Upadhyaya Vatika, A.P Sen Road, Charbagh, Lucknow - 226020	Tel: 0522 – 4068752, 09451249058, ehsaaslko@gmail.com ,
15.	Mr. Masroor Khan Butterflies, U-4 Green Park Extension New Delhi-16	Tel: 011-26163935, 26191063, 46471000 Email: butterflies@vsnl.com
16.	Mr Dunu Roy Director, Hazards Centre 92 H, 3rd Floor, Pratap Market, Munirka, New Delhi-67	Ph: 011-26187806, 26714244 hazardscentre@gmail.com
17.	Mr. Sanat Sinha, Director, Bal Sakha Janta Rest House, Jamal Road Patna – 800001, Bihar	Tel: 0612-2227871, 2270043 balsakha@yahoo.com
18.	Mr. Pramod Kulkarni SATHI- society for assistance to children in difficult situation # 36, Ratna Forever building, 4 th Floor, 1 st Cross, Model Colony, Above New Bescom Office, Yeshwanthpur, Bangalore– 560022.	Ph: 080 - 23573088. 09845456767 pramodkulkarni4@gmail.com , sathi.admin@gmail.com
19.	Sr. Jacinta Pinto Bal Prafulta, Andheri (East), Mumbai St. Dominic Savio School Campus M.C. Road, Andheri (East), Mumbai - 400 093.	Tel: 022- 28265618, 28255889, balprafulta@gmail.com
20.	Sr. Clara, Director, Jeevodaya Society Behind Janta Talkies, Nehruganj,	Telefax: 07572-236191, Mobile: 09425040188 jeevodaya1999@rediffmail.com



	Itarsi-461111, Madhya Pradesh	
21.	Mr. S. Navin Sellaraju Country Director Railway Children India	Tel: 9818710704 navin@railwaychildren.org
22.	Mr. Sanjay Gupta Managing Trustee and Director Childhood Enhancement through Training and Action (CHETNA) Manohar Kunj, Ground Floor, Gautam Nagar, New Delhi – 110049	Tel:011-41644471, Telefax:41644470 chetnacncp@gmail.com
23.	Mr. Sachin Sachdeva Director-India Paul Hamlyn Foundation New Delhi	Tel- 011-26207344 ssachdeva@phf.org.uk

National Commission for Protection of Child Rights		
S.No.	Name	Designation
24.	Ms. Kushal Singh,	Chairperson
25.	Mr. Aseem Srivastava,	Member Secretary
26.	Ms. Preet Verma,	Advisor to CP
27.	Mr. Jagat Singh Sajwan	Consultant- Program
28.	Dr. Ramanath Nayak	STE(JJ)
29.	Mr. J. B. Oli	TE(JJ)
30.	Mr. Rohit Anand	Account Assistant
31.	Ms. Rekha	DEO (JJ)
32.	Mr. Karunik Dhiriya	MTS
33.	Mr. Chandra Komal Hajarika	MTS

