The Youth IGF Project 2012 convened a team of four young people from across the UK to attend the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) 2012 in Baku, Azerbaijan.

The 2012 project was the fourth consecutive year of the project. The initial project was founded in 2009 in response to criticisms made in the closing session of the IGF where it was noted that although the rights of children and young people were discussed, they were not present at the conference.

The Childnet team coordinating the project has sought to ensure that the project has continually evolved in response to changes at the IGF and also responding to the work undertaken with the young people who form the Youth IGF project team.

Over the course of the three projects we have seen real growth in youth involvement and the voice of youth at the IGF as well as a change in perception of the presence of youth. The support of Nominet and the UK delegation over the past three years has been tremendous, and has played a very important part in shaping the welcome of the Youth IGF Project at the IGF.

The project has also inspired youth engagement internationally, with the Danish Media Council in particular drawing inspiration from and replicating sections of Childnet’s Youth IGF Project.

The Childnet Youth IGF Project Team are happy to answer any questions about the project or to engage with partners interested in running similar projects.

Contact us at: youthigfproject@childnet.com

Read more about the project: www.youthigfproject.com

Follow us on Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/youthigfproject
Overview of project structure and rationale (2012)

Recruitment: The four young people in the Youth IGF Project Team 2012 were recruited from the IGF 2012 team to enable the project to build on their knowledge and the experience that they gained at the IGF 2011, and to facilitate a deeper and new level of engagement at the IGF 2012. Childnet facilitated the first workshop at an IGF chaired by youth participants and it was very well received. Because of the content they chose to speak about and the high quality of the workshop, the young people were invited to feed back as an official part of the Main Session, where they clearly communicated the messages delivered in their workshop.

Chaperones: It was agreed that the team would be able to travel without additional external chaperones to Baku, a change to the previous year, but that the team would be accompanied by four chaperones (three female, one male.) This was agreed as the minimum number of chaperones necessary for the project, and covered the gender balance.

Planning: Thorough planning and preparation was central to the success of the project, both logistically and also in ensuring that the youth participants were able to take part confidently and eloquently in the discussions in Baku where for the first time the young people chaired their own workshop.

Logistics: As in previous years, taking youth delegates from across the UK to an international conference required extensive logistical preparations. This included arranging internal UK travel for the youth participants, communication between the schools, youth participants and their primary careers (covering accommodation and travel arrangements, visa and passport information etc.), risk assessments, accommodation and hotel bookings both for the preparatory youth camp in London and also for travelling to and in Baku to attend the IGF, and subsequent onward connections.

Youth camp: Childnet’s preparations included thorough and detailed planning for the academic components of the youth camp to support the meaningful engagement of the young people at the IGF. A comprehensive timetable was designed to cover the necessary information to equip the delegates not only to engage with and understand the subject matter, but also to help develop their confidence in public speaking and in engaging with adult audiences on topics not familiar to them. Continued and sustained engagement with, and support of the youth participants following the youth camp, aimed to answer any outstanding questions and to provide further materials for support and in thinking about the specific subject matter to be engaged with at the IGF in addition to agreeing the structure of the youth chaired workshop and the panelists for this workshop. The project team at Childnet also worked with youth team to an international survey to inform the workshop and the wider participation of the youth team at the IGF.

Partnership: Similarly to previous years, although the focus of the project was to include young people at the IGF, the project team has always sought to ground the project in the holistic and wider context of the IGF, understanding the other participants, their concerns and priorities and ensuring meaningful ways for the young people to not only have their say but also engage. The project has always recognized the mutual value that partnerships have, and has sought to work in partnership with a range of other organisations, supporting their workshops, inviting them to attend specific youth focused workshops and in discussing issues of common interest. This resulted in a wide range of panelists from industry, civil society and educators on the panel of the youth chaired workshop, and the inclusion of the youth team as panelists in an additional five workshops. Childnet and the youth team were also pleased to work in partnership with the other youth teams present at the IGF, inviting them to be present on the panel of the Youth IGF’s workshop, and also arranging a meal for all the youth participants for the youth participants to discuss their different experiences and to socialise outside of the IGF.
Summary of the Youth IGF Project Research (2012)

874 young people age 11-18 across 40 countries in 6 continents responded to the online survey.

Background: Young people from the Youth IGF Project developed this survey to find out from young people across the world how they felt about freedom of expression and social media. The findings are being explored in the workshop the young people are chairing – Social media, young people and freedom of expression - at the Internet Governance Forum in Baku. The online survey was open between 12 September and 12 October and was disseminated internationally through youth networks. The survey was only available in English.

Findings

Use of social networks: 96% said that they use social networks and the most popular were Facebook (85%), YouTube (56%), Twitter (32%) and Google+ (22%). Many also reported using Club Penguin (4%) despite the fact that the sample was secondary age. A really diverse range of social networks were used by young people - in addition to the 9 social networks we listed, there were 53 other services mentioned, with Instagram, Skype and Hotmail/MSN messenger the most popular.

Right to freedom of expression: Almost two-thirds (65%) of young people said they believe they should be able to say anything they like online, within reasonable limits. 18% believed that they should be able to say anything they like online, while 15.5% did not agree they should be able to say anything they like online. Interestingly, boys were more likely to say they should be able to say anything they want online (27% boys vs 12% girls).

Is behaviour different online vs offline?

1) It is often said that young people are more risky online or more likely to behave in a mean way when they are online. However, we found that 41% are more careful about what they say online, and young people are 3 times as likely to say they are a nicer person online (10%) than not as nice online (3%). In particular, half of girls (47%) said they were more careful about what they say online, compared to less than a third (31%) of boys.

2) There is a real diversity in how young people behave online: nearly half (45%) said they aren’t any different online, a quarter (23%) said they talk to more people online, 1 in 5 (20%) said they are more confident online, 1 in 6 (16%) said they can say things online that they wouldn’t say offline.

   o “It depends. On Facebook I might be more careful about what I say online because I’m not anonymous. But on youtube, I might say things that I normally wouldn’t say offline.” – Female, 17 years, from Hong Kong
   o “I just myself, what’s the point in changing your personality online?” – Female, 13 years, from the UK
   o “Everybody acts differently online.” – Male, 18 years, from Sweden
   o “I am not as shy with other classmates as I am in school.” – Female, 13 years, from Mexico
   o “I actually feel like I can be the real me online more than I can offline.” – Male, 16 years, from Cyprus

3) Half of 11-18 year olds who responded to the survey said they find it harder to identify emotions, like sarcasm, humour or anger, online, while 36% didn’t agree that it is harder.

4) There were a range of opinions from young people about whether anonymity on the internet changes behaviour: 41% of young people felt they were more likely to say what they wanted online if they were anonymous, but 42% did not agree with this, and 17% didn’t know.
5) Just over a third (34%) of young people said they change what they put online depending on their audience, but almost a half (46%) said they did not change what they say because of the audience, and 20% didn’t know.

Mobile access: Almost three-quarters (74%) reported that they use a mobile to go on social networks, but 1 in 6 (17%) find it harder to use privacy settings on a mobile.

Blocking SNS in schools: Almost a third (32%) said they agreed that blocking social networks in schools could help protect young people, while over a half (56%) disagreed. However, one young person commented that the “question would give more accurate answers if you worded it differently because social networking sites are blocked to keep students focused instead of protect them”.

Barriers to reporting on SNS: Reporting tools on social networking sites allow users to report things that worry or upset them. While 28% of young people said nothing would stop them from making a report, many young people face barriers that stop them from reporting. Young people are often worried about the consequences of reporting: over a third (34%) wouldn’t report something because they are worried the person might find out, 18% because they are worried the person might get in trouble, while many are worried that they themselves would get into trouble, either because the report wasn’t seen as justified (18%) or for things they have said (16%). Being worried that the person may find out is a particular barrier for girls, with almost half (47%) saying this worry stops them from reporting, compared to just 1 in 5 (21%) boys facing this barrier. An 11 year old girl from the USA said she was worried “that the person would bully me if I told” and a 14 year old girl from Hong Kong explained her fear was that “the person who you reported finds out that I reported them, then starts spreading bad rumors about me, ruining my reputation.” There are also misconceptions about whether reporting is anonymous. Indeed, one 15 year old girl from Cyprus said she wouldn’t report because “on Facebook it is not anonymous”.

14-16 year olds in Asia were more worried than 14-16s in Europe about the consequences of reporting. More young people in Asia didn’t report things because they were worried that the person might find out (42% v 34%), that they might get in trouble if the report wasn’t seen as justified (22% v 14%) and that the person they reported might get in trouble (25% v 12%), and while over a third (36%) of young people in Europe said nothing would stop them from making a report, less than a quarter (23%) of Asian young people felt the same.

In comparison to those who were worried about negative consequences, nearly a third (31%) were worried that nothing would happen. A 13 year old boy from the UK said that he wouldn’t report something because “the other person won’t get a bad enough punishment and will keep doing it!”

Other young people face barriers because they find the reporting process too difficult: 15% said it would take too long and 10% don’t know how to do it. Some young people are taking their concerns into their own hands, and 1 in 5 (20%) said they would rather just talk to the person in real life.

Young people were asked whether they would like the option, in addition to reporting to the service provider, to anonymously report directly to a friend that something they posted on a social network upset them. Half of young people (52%) would like this option, while a quarter (26%) didn’t want it, and around a quarter (22%) didn’t know.

Education about freedom of expression online: Half (49%) of young people said they had not been taught what is illegal to say online, while 41% said they had been. Young people wanted to learn about what is unacceptable or illegal online from schools (62%), parents (51%), service providers (48%), organisations outside school (28%), friends (21%) and by observing the reactions of the online community (12%). Just 13% said they didn’t think they needed to be educated about this. Interestingly, 14-16s in Asia more likely to say they didn’t want to be educated about this (26%) compared to European 14-16s (18%). They were also twice as likely (18%) to want to learn by observing the reactions of the online community, compared to European 14-16 year olds (9%).
Terms of Use on SNS: To understand what is acceptable on a service, it is important to read the Terms of Use. However, a third of young people (33%) did not find these easy to understand and a third (32%) had never seen the Terms of Use, with only a third (35%) finding the terms easy to understand. Young people in Asia reported more difficulties with this: half (47%) of 14-16s in Asia don’t find the terms easy to understand, compared to less than a third (31%) of 14-16s in Europe. It is therefore important that the terms of use are more understandable and more prominent for young people, and that these are understandable for young people globally.

Summary of Workshop 94:
Social media, young people & freedom of expression.

This workshop was convened as the issue of Social media, young people and freedom of expression is particularly pertinent to the experience of young people.

Background:

Question 4 of Security, Openness and Privacy taken from the programme for the 2012 meeting, sought to question what measures could be taken to ensure freedom of expression, access to knowledge and privacy, including for children. It specifically asked what are the challenges to protect freedom of expression online and what measures can be taken to better empower citizen’s access to information and participation in digital age, alongside considering the roles and responsibilities of user as they relate to openness, privacy and security.

At Childnet, we know from our work in schools in the UK that children and young people are very often among the first adopters of technology and internet services. Social networking services are a key example of this. The Ofcom UK children’s media literacy report highlighted that younger children are increasingly using social networking sites. Indeed, the percentage of 5-7 year olds using social networking sites in the UK increased from 7% in 2009 to 23% in 2010. This is largely driven by sites like Club Penguin and Moshi Monsters rather than age-restricted sites like Facebook. However, Facebook remains enormously popular. 96% of 8-15s with an active social networking site profile use Facebook, and there are a significant number of underage users accessing sites like Facebook which have a minimum user age of 13. In the UK, it seems that starting secondary school at the age of 11 is a key trigger for underage social networking: 28% of 9-10s have an SNS profile compared to 59% of 11-12s. (Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., and Ólafsson, K. (2011). Risks and safety on the internet: the UK report. LSE, London: EU Kids Online. Summary available at bit.ly/M7J4Qy)

As part of workshop 76 (http://bit.ly/WhMfbg) which Childnet chaired at the IGF 2011, the youth panellists were asked whether being online gave them a voice, and if so, how. Their responses included the fact that being online gave them as young people a platform to share their opinions with people who they wouldn’t usually be able to communicate with and the ability to publish their own opinions. The point was also raised that being online itself doesn’t give a person a voice, rather it would give them the opportunity to use their voice, and for a vast number of users who already use their voices, in terms of stating their thoughts and opinions offline, the internet would merely facilitate in a greater way their desire to speak out on matters causing them concern. The internet provides the means for these people, to contact others who are concerned about similar issues, via chat rooms, comment facilities and social networking. It was additionally recognised that the internet also gives a voice to those who are otherwise unable to exercise it including victims of abuse and oppression, those who are house bound due to illness and those who don’t feel confident talking about their opinions to others face to face. For these groups the internet may provide a haven where, perhaps for the first time, they too can discuss their opinions, or seek help from others in similar positions.
Workshop:

At the IGF 2012, the Youth IGF Project’s workshop, further explored the relationship between social media, young people and freedom of expression. This workshop set out to consider what freedom of expression means to young people before considering and the what limitations they find themselves under, be it from the rules/community guidelines set by the service providers, social norms or the rules of schools where many young people access the internet.

The workshop was planned and delivered by four young people. They decided that their focus would be on the measures that can be taken to ensure freedom of expression and privacy for children and young people, particularly on social media sites. At the beginning of the workshop they clarified that as four teenagers from the UK “We feel it’s important to express at beginning that we will on the whole be talking about our experiences and those of our direct peers.” In preparation for the workshop, the Youth IGF Project team designed and developed a survey to find out from young people across the world how they felt about freedom of expression and social media.

The online survey was open between 12 September and 12 October and was disseminated internationally through youth networks. The survey was only available in English. 874 young people aged 11-18 from across 40 countries completed the survey. Closed questions were used to aggregate answers for statistical purposes. Open questions were posed to allow respondents to express themselves and elaborate on the answers provided.

The four co-chairs of the workshop, Rebecca Cawthorne, Nicola Douglas, Matthew Jackman and Jack Passmore were joined by a range other panellists.

Youth panellists:
- Victor Neufeld, eNACSO, Denmark,
- Anna Gransoe, eNACSO, Denmark,
- Wayne Choi, Net Y Ambassador, Hong Kong,
- Natalie Chong, Net Y Ambassador, Hong Kong
- Elmo Kusima, Nordic Youth IGF Delegate, Finland

Industry panellists:
- Richard Alan, Facebook
- Ellen Blackler, Walt Disney
- John Kampfner, on behalf of Google and YouTube

Civil Society panellists:
- Ken Corish, UK Safer Internet Centre, UK
- Philippa Green, Childnet and U.K. Safer Internet Center,
- Dixie Hawtin, Global Partners and Associates,
- Bianca Ho, Net Mission, Hong King
- Larry Magid, Connect Safely, USA
- Janice Richardson, Insafe Network, Brussels

The discussion began with a consideration of different understandings of freedom of expression and reflected a consensus from the co-chairs that they felt their freedom of expression ended where someone else's freedom starts, and that there were limitations to what they would freely expression online and also offline.

The results from the global survey were integrated throughout the session and informed the conversations that were used. At the outset, the co-chairs clarified that 96% of those asked said they used social networks.
The youth panellists were asked what limits their freedom of expression online. Responses included the fact that audience size changes how young people express themselves, particularly a consideration of who is viewing their posts and how this could impact their reputation. Peer Censorship was also raised as a limit to young people freely expressing themselves online, but it was also mentioned that peer censorship can be an effective way for young people to maintain a healthy involvement in freedom of expression. More negatively, verbal attacks and cyberbullying were also mentioned as limits to young people freely expressing themselves online.

The panellists considered whether they acted differently online and offline. Drawing on the results of the global youth survey, the co-chair revealed that of those who responded to the survey 45% percent said that they didn’t act differently online, but 41% said they were more careful about what they say on line, with one in five agreeing that they were more confident online. One of the survey results stated “Everybody acts differently on line” (18 year old male, Sweden) and the co-chair cited this as an example that everyone looking for something different out of the Internet. The co-chair revealed that 41% of respondents to the survey said that they were more likely to say what they want on line if they were anonymous, and questioned whether the Internet changing the way people including young people think, making us more vocal in society and changing persona?

The responses revealed that many young people do act differently online to how they do online. “For me I think I act differently online. Actually, no one can see my face and track with me face to face on the Internet so we don't have direct contact such as eye contact or direct discuss in the Internet .... so I think the online platform without any direct contact with me [lets me] act differently on line.”

Anonymity was an important theme throughout the session. The question was posed in the global youth survey, “are you more likely to say what you want online if you are anonymous?” The results revealed that of those who responded, 41 % felt they were more likely to say what they wanted if they were anonymous but 42% said they were not more likely to say what they want if anonymous. Discussion between the youth panellists revealed that they agreed that anonymity gives power, but that this could be both negative and positive. It could be negative in the sense that people can offend more easily because they don’t have to worry about what people will think about them, but positively, it could afford people a voice who previously would be victimized for their opinion. One panellist state, “assuming anonymity contradicts the purpose of most social networks, the purpose being exposure, like sharing who you are to the world. And I also believe that to form a proper ground for debate, you need to know who it is you are talking to. In that way it also contradicts the purpose with debate, which is the two primary reasons I use the Internet.” Another stated, “I'm going take a middle ground ... To be anonymous is important indeed because exclusion can make people feel less scared of exclusion because they can say what they want, and don't have to worry about what people say. Also I do totally agree that you need to stick with your opinions. If you say something, you should say it with who you are and really show who you are and don't be afraid of it as well. To an extent, being anonymous is very important on the Internet, especially in Finland where we have many forums, for example, which have mainly anonymous users. These forums have been growing in popularity in Finland especially. The younger people can talk more freely without being scared of what elders think on these forums.”

The themes discussed in the first section of the session continued with the discussion with the industry panellists, who defined their understanding as service providers of freedom of expression similarly, “Freedom of express for us is being able to share things with people that you want to share them with. It’s as simple as that, obviously within constraints of the rulings for that platform, I think we'll get on to discuss that.” And “it is the right to express yourself, and it is the right to receive opinions from others including opinions and information that you do not like and that you find difficult as well.”

The discussions here included the parameters and means that different service providers set and provide for users, in addition to the need to ensure that users are aware of and properly informed about community guidelines, terms of services and how to use a service. There is a role of service providers to help ensure that they are presenting these in an accessible way.
Continuing the discussions with the civil society panellists, the workshop considered the role of social media in education. The audience heard that it was the experience of the panelists that currently there is a reluctance to embrace social media in education. In the UK this was often due to concerns surrounding the financial, technical and cultural barriers. There were also concerns for schools regarding their duty of care and social media was blocked in many schools. The experience in the US was similar, but different across Europe, particularly in previously communist countries where there was a historical fear of blocking.

The session heard from that users need to be more self-aware when expressing themselves on-line and that especially among youth there needs to be education about how to be considerate and a discerning user when both expressing and receiving information.

In parallel with the youth panellists, who earlier agreed that there is a role for schools in educating young people about freedom of expression, alongside the need for social media education, there was agreement that schools have a role to play in this. “We need to teach children how to understand the subtleties, not to ban it and create a generation where everybody is so perfect they would never say anything that could never possibly offend anyone, but to help people understand how they can have freedom of express, and at the same time not offend or violate the rights of others as one of our youth panellists said. I think schools have responsibility to do that and in order to do that they have to adopt social media.”

It was also agreed that all users need to be educated as to their rights and how their rights have meaning in practice, rather than being high level principles, and the importance self awareness was reiterated here.

The co-chairs of the session concluded that moving forwards, dialogue and conversation including all stakeholders is vitally important. All stakeholders need support and all have an important role to play in ensuring that users are educated. The survey showed that young people see that schools, parents and service providers all have a role to play in helping to educate young people, but the session revealed that it is important to ensure there is ongoing dialogue between service providers and their users, as well as highlighting the fact that teachers also need support in teaching young people both about social media and freedom of expression.

The Youth IGF Project team is keen to develop some of the themes highlighted in this discussion in further discussions at the IGF 2013. Please contact us at youthigfproject@childnet.com to find out more about the project and to discuss how we could work together for the IGF 2013.

**Youth participant Testimonies (2012)**

“Attending the IGF has been a life changing experience, it has widened my knowledge and view on both IG policy and on the different opinions that go into making the internet the way it is. At such a multi-stakeholder event it is great to be a part and to talk and get points across on a platform that young people wouldn’t normally have. Over the past few years young people options have been increasingly been sourced and listened to, and I have seen changes been implemented that have been discussed over the past few years. This growth of youth involvement is what i hope to see increasing over the next few years as young people are definitely a valuable stakeholder in IG. Being part of the Youth IGF project has given me confidence to not only speak in front of people but has made me more comfortable talking at both university interviews and to officials. The IGF has been an invaluable experience that will never leave me.”

“This year’s IGF in Azerbaijan had, from my perspective, a substantial increase in success from the previous year. Not only was the YIGF projects participation greater than before but the response from everyone at the IGF was affirming the positive impact our contribution was having. … The workshop in which we chaired and planned emphasised the extensive progression the YIGF project has made and has publicised the capability and future of
youth involvement in the IGF. I think our input into the IGF this year has been received and understood, whereas conceivably in the past we would have been seen as symbolic gestures of youth partaking in the conference, this year we were major stakeholders.

As this was my second year of the IGF I felt I understood what was going on and thus could work out where I could make the greatest impact and how I should express my opinions so that they were clear and acknowledged by all participants. I personally feel that this year I was more involved and I contributed in everything I could.

The IGF is something that is so amazing that it’s hard to describe how fortunate I feel to be there. For my part the YIGF has highlighted possible career choices I could take and has opened my eyes to the brilliance of the internet. I find myself through the course of the year seeing different issues and developments on the internet that I want to discuss at the IGF. The IGF has transformed the way I view the internet and has developed my level of awareness to problems on the online world and the internet itself. I feel as though I am now a digital citizen and I am spreading the knowledge I have gained from the experience through my peers.

My greatest hope for the future is that the YIGF project can attend the 2013 IGF. If that transpires, I dearly hope I am invited back and that I can further express my views at the IGF and make the Childnet team proud to have me as their representative. I think this year at the IGF has shown just how much potential the Youth have. I hope that in the future the youth can chair more workshops, panel in main sessions, increase its number of participants and be responsible for positive internet policy changes.”

**Recommendations for partners considering similar projects:**

It is very important to think about the practical challenges of running a project such as the Youth IGF Project:

- We have been very aware that although the young people who have taken part in the project are particularly eloquent and have expressed themselves particularly well on the topic of Internet Governance, the language of the debates is not part of their everyday conversation. Although they use the technologies and services being discussed on a daily basis, it can be daunting and confusing for them to take part in debates that are in essence the continuation of conversations and debates that exist across on many platforms and that ‘surface’ at the IGF.

- In terms of perception at the IGF, it is important to recognise that in running a youth project, the young people who form the Youth IGF Project Team are all in full time education. Therefore, although it is incredibly rewarding for them to take part in a project like the Youth IGF Project, it does require sacrifices on their behalf such as missed lessons, and in most instances they have to catch up on this school work afterwards. It can also be challenging to give the young people extra ‘homework’. Although designed to support and equip them, we found that there were young people who did not respond to emails, and chose to ignore work that was set to help them. Not only did this disadvantage them compared to their peers who had completed the work, but it also impacted on central planning.

- There are a number of practical considerations for convening a young camp and for travelling oversees with children and young people that have to be factored into planning. This includes ensuring the right ration of male to female adults/staff in the party, the need for comprehensive risk assessments, particularly if travelling to a location like Nairobi, the logistical arrangements needed to transport a large party, whether 4 young people, or a larger team of 17 (as in Nairobi) overseas, the need for thorough preparation, and the likely eventuality that even with risk assessments and plans arrangements will inevitably change on the go and there is a need to be flexible. We decided that in order to make such a trip possible 4 chaperones was the minimum number necessary. This was ‘tested’ in Baku - one youth participant was unwell and the group needed to divide. This was only possible due to the fact that we had 4 chaperones, and there were two to take care of the larger group, and two needed to attend to the other young person. These numbers would have enabled us if necessary to chaperone the remaining young people back to the UK and for a young person and necessary chaperones to remain in Baku if
needed. This turned out not to be needed, but it is important that situations like this are accounted and provided for should the need arise.

• Finally, a residential project with young people always has a ‘pastoral’ side. Working with younger teens, particularly the 15 year olds, it is important to acknowledge and to recognise that it is a phenomenal achievement to speak at an international conference at the UN to a collective audience of over 3000. This is daunting for many adults, let alone teens who are often new to the subject matter, and who are very much out of their normal zone of activity. It is also important to factor in jet-lag, tiredness due to travel and potential home-sickness. The pastoral side of such a project and the importance of spending quality time with the young people, and investing time in them understanding who they are, their interests (outside of IG) and any worries that they may have is particularly important. In travelling to Nairobi with the increased risk of tiredness due to the distance travelled, the culture shock and the different food – it was particularly important to make sure this was accounted for. The inclusion of chaperones in the project was particularly important to this end and it also ensured that while the Childnet project team were able to look after the young people during the IGF hours, the chaperones were also able to offer support in the evenings and during the night as needed.