



Inter-Parliamentary Union
For democracy. For everyone.

Protecting children's rights in the age of AI: A parliamentary action guide



Parliaments have a critical role in ensuring that children's rights and well-being are fully taken into account in AI. © iStock

Executive summary

From recommender systems in social media to the growing use of artificial intelligence (AI) in education, AI is increasingly affecting children's lives.¹ Yet, these technologies are generally not designed with children's best interests in mind. Parliaments therefore have a critical role in ensuring that children's rights and well-being are fully taken into account as AI is developed, deployed and regulated.

This issue brief examines two areas of particular concern: the impact of AI on children's mental health and on education.

¹ In this issue brief, the terms "child" and "children" refer to all individuals under 18 years of age. See: [United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child](#), Art. 1.

Drawing on child rights frameworks and the experience of parliaments worldwide, it identifies three key action points for parliaments:

1. **Build the evidence base and hear directly from children.** Gather evidence through hearings and inquiries, including with industry and experts, and through direct engagement with children, parents, educators and other affected groups to understand how AI is affecting children in practice.
 2. **Oversee whether protections for children work in practice.** Scrutinize the implementation and enforcement of existing laws and policies, including whether regulators and other public institutions have the powers, expertise and resources they need.
 3. **Update legislation, where needed, to address changes brought about by AI.** Review existing laws for gaps and introduce or strengthen safeguards where needed, including protections against harmful AI practices such as AI-generated child sexual abuse material, surveillance, behavioural manipulation and the commercial profiling of children.
- AI systems with children as the primary intended user group: Educational tools, games and AI companions are among the AI-enabled technologies specifically designed to target children as end users. Such systems can support children's learning and access to information but also raise questions relating to their agency and autonomy in interactions with AI.³
 - Harvesting of children's data: AI systems rely on data for training purposes. Children's data is often collected without meaningful informed consent.⁴ Related concerns extend to practices such as "sharenting", which refers to parents sharing photos, videos and personal information on online platforms.⁵
 - Intentional misuse of AI: In line with misuse of AI more generally, children can be harmed by deepfakes, hate speech inciting violence, trafficking and recruitment related to criminal activity or terrorism, or the use of AI-powered weapons in armed conflict.⁶ Specifically, the creation and dissemination of AI-generated child sexual abuse material (CSAM) is an emerging harm.
 - Children's rights and the global AI supply chain: AI can amplify existing forms of exploitation at different stages of its life cycle.^{7,8} Particularly concerning are reports on child labour in global AI supply chains, including in the extraction of materials such as cobalt, copper or lithium needed for AI hardware infrastructure.^{9,10}

How does artificial intelligence impact children's rights?

As artificial intelligence (AI) becomes increasingly embedded in children's lives, there is growing recognition that its development, deployment and governance must be aligned with children's rights.

The ways in which AI can affect children are varied, and the risks can arise at different points in the AI life cycle. Understanding these different forms of impact is important for identifying where parliamentary action may be needed:

- Children's use of general-purpose AI systems: Children increasingly use AI systems designed for adults. Engagement with "social robots", voice recognition tools or chatbots can pose significant risks to children's rights, including their physical safety and health.²

Interviews conducted for this brief show growing parliamentary concern about the effects of AI on children, but also different national contexts and priorities, and the importance of a gender perspective on the different impacts on girls and boys.

A common message is that parliaments need to understand how specific AI systems affect children, test whether existing protections work in practice and act where gaps remain.

The examples that follow show different approaches parliamentarians have taken or proposed.

2 5Rights Foundation, *Children & AI design code: A protocol for the development and use of AI systems that impact children* (2025).
 3 United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), "How to design AI for children: From principles to practice: Insights from UNICEF's 'AI for Children' piloting initiative" (2021).
 4 Badawy, W., "The ethical implications of using children's photographs in artificial intelligence: Challenges and recommendations", *AI and Ethics*, 5/3 (2025), 3281–3292.
 5 Tosuntaş, Ş. B. and Griffiths, M. D., "Sharenting: A systematic review of the empirical literature", *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 16/3 (2024), 525–562.
 6 van Coller, A., "Artificial intelligence, targeted communication, and the recruitment of children in armed conflict", *South African Yearbook of International Law*, 50/1 (2025), 1–47.
 7 Rowe, N., "Underage workers are training AI", *WIRED* (2023).
 8 International Telecommunication Union and others, *Joint Statement on Artificial Intelligence and the Rights of the Child* (2026), 5.
 9 UNICEF, *Guidance on AI and children: Version 3.0. Recommendations for AI policies and systems that uphold child rights* (2025).
 10 Government of Canada, *Risk assessment of forced labour in procurement* (2025).

Growing parliamentary concern about digital harms affecting children

Parliamentarians interviewed for this brief, and others speaking publicly, point to growing concern about the effects of AI and the wider digital environment on children:

"Given children's age, evolving capacities and particular vulnerability, parliaments must ensure that technological progress never comes at the expense of children's rights."

(Ms. Sophie Kiladze, Chair of the United Nations (UN) Committee on the Rights of the Child, former Member of the Parliament of Georgia)

"Children are early adopters of technology. The canaries in the coalmine – as we have seen with social media, gaming and other carelessly developed and poorly regulated digital environments."¹¹ (Ms. Beeban Kidron, Member of the House of Lords of the United Kingdom)

"Children cannot remain a footnote in the age of AI." (Ms. Neema Lugangira, former Member of the National Assembly of Tanzania)

"Only few understand the massive shifts going along with AI. Children are among the most vulnerable groups affected." (Mr. Michael Hose, Member of the German Bundestag)

"When we travelled across constituencies and interacted with people, one thing became very clear – uncontrolled digital exposure is becoming dangerous, especially for children and teenagers." (Mr. Nishikant Dubey, Chairperson of the ICT Committee, Lok Sabha, India).¹²

on the Rights of the Child confirms that these rights apply in the digital environment. The *Joint Statement on Artificial Intelligence and the Rights of the Child* develops this further for AI and explicitly recognizes the role of parliaments.¹⁵ For parliamentarians, a child rights lens therefore means asking not only whether a technology is "safe", but whether its design and use serve children's best interests and support their development and autonomy, while avoiding discrimination, protecting their privacy and enabling them to participate in decisions that affect them.

A rights-based approach also recognizes that measures intended to protect children, including age restrictions or age-assurance systems, can themselves affect privacy, freedom of expression, participation and access to information.

Together, these frameworks converge on the following actions:

- Prohibit harmful AI practices, including CSAM, manipulative designs targeting children and targeted advertising exploiting children's vulnerabilities.¹⁶
- Mandate child rights impact assessments for AI in educational settings.¹⁷
- Adopt age-appropriate design standards alongside protections for privacy, safety, transparency and well-being in AI systems affecting children.¹⁸
- Invest in research on the effects of AI on children's cognitive, emotional, social and developmental well-being.¹⁹
- Ensure the meaningful participation of children in the legislative process, for instance through public hearings and targeted outreach to stakeholders.²⁰

The child rights framework does not prescribe a single regulatory model. Effective protection requires a combination of measures, including age-appropriate design requirements, prohibitions on certain AI uses, clear responsibilities across the AI life cycle and access to effective remedies.²¹ Despite growing attention to the topic, translating children's rights into the governance of rapidly evolving AI remains a challenge in many countries, including their incorporation into national AI strategies and regulatory frameworks.²²

"Parliaments must ensure that national AI strategies, digital policies and legislation are reviewed through a cross-sectoral children's rights lens, with clear standalone provisions that protect children's rights, online as well as offline, with particular attention to the distinct risks and inequalities faced by girls and other vulnerable children." Ms. Neema Lugangira, former Member of the National Assembly of Tanzania

Child rights frameworks provide the basis for parliamentary engagement

AI changes the environments in which existing rights must be protected and realized. The Convention on the Rights of the Child applies to everyone under 18 years of age and is built around four general principles: non-discrimination; the best interests of the child; the right to life, survival and development; and the right of the child to be heard and have their views given due weight. It also protects rights that may be directly impacted by AI, including privacy, education, access to information, play, and protection from violence, abuse and exploitation.^{13,14}

General comment No. 25 (2021) on children's rights in relation to the digital environment of the Committee

11 5Rights Foundation, "Baroness Kidron on putting children at the start of the AI debate", Queen Mary University of London, 2 November 2023.

12 *The Times of India*, "Social media is giving children the same kind of addictive kicks as drugs: Nishikant Dubey" (24 May 2026).

13 United Nations, Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989).

14 United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), General comment No. 25 (2021) on children's rights in relation to the digital environment (2021).

15 International Telecommunication Union and others, *Joint Statement on Artificial Intelligence and the Rights of the Child* (2026).

16 *Joint Statement*, Recommendations 4(a)–(f) and 5; UNICEF, *Guidance* (2025), Requirements 2–4.

17 CRC, General comment No. 25, paras. 23 and 38; *Joint Statement*, Recommendations 1(e) and 3(e); UNICEF, *Guidance* (2025), Requirement 2.

18 CRC, General comment No. 25, paras. 19–20; *Joint Statement*, Recommendations 1, 4 and 6; UNICEF, *Guidance* (2025), Requirement 7.

19 CRC, General comment No. 25, para. 30; UNICEF, *Guidance* (2025), Requirement 10; *Joint Statement*, Recommendation 11.

20 CRC, General comment No. 25, paras. 16–18; *Joint Statement*, Recommendation 8; UNICEF, *Guidance* (2025), Requirement 8.

21 *Joint Statement*, Recommendations 3(a) and (d).

22 UNICEF, *National AI Strategies and Children* (2021).

Using a child rights lens to guide parliamentary action

Ms. Sophie Kiladze, Chair of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child and former Member of the Parliament of Georgia, stressed that inclusion and multistakeholder coordination should underpin parliamentary responses to AI and children's rights.

Because AI can affect “virtually every right protected under the Convention on the Rights of the Child”, parliaments should not treat it as a narrow technology issue.

Children, parents, educators, civil society, technical experts, government and the judiciary all need to be brought into the conversation.

“Parliamentarians have a particularly important responsibility because they translate societal concerns into legislation, oversight and public policy.”

The *Joint Statement on Artificial Intelligence and the Rights of the Child*, co-led by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, International Telecommunication Union and UNICEF, is particularly relevant for parliamentarians because it explicitly recognizes the role of parliaments in protecting children's rights as AI develops.

What parliaments can consider

- **Treat AI and children's rights as a cross-cutting parliamentary issue.**

AI can affect children across education, health, privacy, safety, justice and other areas, so scrutiny of the impact of AI on child rights may need to draw on several committees and areas of expertise.

- **Coordinate internationally.**

Use inter-parliamentary exchange to learn from other jurisdictions, identify effective legislative approaches and promote common standards for risks to children from AI that cannot be addressed by one country alone.

Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) interview with Ms. Sophie Kiladze, 24 August 2026.

The impact of AI on children's mental health

AI is increasingly shaping the digital environments, content and interactions that children encounter, from recommender systems on social media to chatbots, AI companions, online games and social robots.²³

AI can deepen existing vulnerabilities affecting children

Mr. Ernest Yaw Anim, Chairperson of the Human Rights Committee in Ghana's Parliament, highlighted how AI-related harms can interact with existing patterns of vulnerability. In Ghana, he pointed to social media and algorithmic systems as channels through which children may be exposed to cybercrime, sexual exploitation and recruitment for work abroad, particularly where vulnerable children are targeted across borders.

The challenge is not only the technology. Rapidly expanding mobile access is occurring in a context where law enforcement training, digital forensics and victim support capacity may be more limited. This makes it especially important for parliamentary scrutiny to start from the harms children are actually experiencing in the national context.

“The perpetrator may be outside Ghana, while the victim is a Ghanaian child. This makes it more difficult to protect victims and bring perpetrators to justice.”

What parliaments can consider

- **Look for how AI affects existing harms.**

Review whether cybercrime, child protection and exploitation frameworks cover the ways algorithmic systems and AI can facilitate targeting and grooming of children, or distribution of harmful content.

- **Test national institutional capacity to respond.**

Scrutinize whether law enforcement, forensic services and victim support institutions have the resources and expertise needed to implement existing protections.

- **Cross-border cooperation is essential for child protection.** Where the victim, perpetrator and platform may be in different jurisdictions, domestic protections must correspond and feed into international agreements and cooperation.

Source: IPU interview with Ernest Yaw Anim MP, 11 June 2026.

Some of the harms discussed in this section predate generative AI. Excessive engagement, harmful content and online profiling are established features of digital platforms. AI can nevertheless change their scale and character: recommender systems personalize and rank content, generative systems can create new material at scale, and conversational AI can interact directly with children in increasingly personalized and anthropomorphic ways. Parliamentary scrutiny should therefore focus on how

23 European Commission, *Child safety online: Protecting and empowering minors in a digital world: Report by the co-chairs of the Special Panel on Child Safety Online* (2026).

specific systems are designed and deployed, rather than treating AI itself as a single source of harm.

Since the early 2010s, research has examined the impact of AI in social media environments on children's mental health.²⁴ One study estimated that the introduction of Facebook alone might have caused more than 300,000 additional cases of depression among college students in the United States of America.²⁵

Existing data also documents the growing impact of AI on children across the world:

- According to UNICEF, children are over three times more likely to be users of AI systems than their parents.²⁶
- UNICEF research shows that generative AI use among children ranges from 18 per cent to 50 per cent across Europe, Asia and the Americas,²⁷ while figures in the United Kingdom indicate that 67 per cent of teenagers between the ages of 13 and 18 use generative AI.²⁸
- Studies reveal that children under the age of two already spend an average of 49 minutes per day using screens; by the age of eight, this figure has more than tripled to approximately three hours per day.²⁹
- 37 per cent of children between the ages of 9 and 11 in Argentina turn to ChatGPT for information.³⁰
- 40 per cent of children between the ages of 8 and 12 in the United States of America are active on social media,³¹ while 9 per cent of children in the United States have used AI companions such as character.ai.³²

Features such as infinite scrolling, push notifications and engagement-driven recommender systems can hinder children from disengaging, while raising concerns about excessive screen time, sleep disruption, exposure to harmful content, negative effects on self-esteem and body image, cyberbullying and other harmful online interactions.³³ According to MP Michael Hose, these effects are not gender-neutral: while boys are more likely to be exposed to violent content, social media disproportionately affects girls' perceptions of their bodies.

Parliamentarians argue that stricter rules for social media came too late. Such delays are particularly concerning as generative and other conversational AI, which have emerged at scale since the release of ChatGPT in 2022, enable more direct, adaptive and human-like interactions than conventional recommender systems.³⁴

While conversational AI can offer accessible and responsive interactions, particularly anthropomorphic patterns of communication, it can encourage emotional reliance and reduce children's opportunities to develop independence and navigate the complexity, disagreement, and reciprocity of human relationships. Algorithmic failures can also expose children to illegal or otherwise harmful content.³⁵ Particularly concerning are cases in which chatbots reinforce eating disorders, suicidal ideation or other forms of self-harm.³⁶ While further research is needed to understand how conversational AI affects children, parliamentarians can help to bring these issues to the centre of public debate and prevent a delayed political response to an escalating type of harm.

Against this background, parliaments have an important role to play in ensuring that AI develops and is used in ways that protect children's mental health and well-being. Parliaments may consider:

- **Strengthening engagement with stakeholders and experts.** Parliaments should maintain regular dialogue with companies across the AI life cycle, as well as relevant government departments, regulators, civil society, researchers, educators, parents and children, to identify emerging harms.
- **Considering a digital duty of care for platforms and providers.** Platforms and AI providers should be legally responsible for identifying and mitigating foreseeable harms arising from AI, rather than placing responsibility primarily on children and parents.
- **Investing in research.** The mental health effects of AI remain an active area of research, particularly over the longer term. Funding is essential to strengthen the evidence base and support more targeted policy responses, including restrictions on particularly harmful AI designs.
- **Evaluating regulation continuously.** Governments should require transparent and independent evaluation of whether restrictions are reducing harm without creating significant unintended consequences.

24 Hale, L. and Guan, S., "Screen time and sleep among school-aged children and adolescents: A systematic literature review", *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, 21 (2015), 50–58.

25 Braghieri, L., Levy, R., and Makarin, A., "Social media and mental health", *American Economic Review*, 112/11 (2022), 3660–3693.

26 UNICEF, *Snapshot of AI usage and concerns among children and parents: Insights from 10 countries* (2026). The countries surveyed are Armenia, Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Jordan, Mexico, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Pakistan and Serbia.

27 UNICEF (2026).

28 National Literacy Trust, "Young people and teachers' use of generative AI to support literacy in 2025" (2025).

29 Common Sense Media, *The Common Sense Census: Media use by kids age zero to eight* (2020).

30 UNICEF, *Niñas, niños y adolescentes conectados: Kids Online Argentina. Informe de resultados* (2025).

31 American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, *Policy statement on the impact of social media on youth mental health* (2023).

32 Pew Research Center, *Teens, social media and AI chatbots* (2025).

33 5Rights Foundation, *Pathways: How digital design puts children at risk* (2021).

34 European Commission (2026).

35 Beullens, K. and others, *Minors' health and social media: An interdisciplinary scientific perspective*, edited by Manolios, S. and others (Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2025).

36 European Commission (2026).

Parliamentary responses: From access restrictions to platform responsibility

Growing concern about the impact of AI on children's mental health has prompted legislative action and parliamentary debate worldwide, particularly considering the use of predatory recommender systems. Australia provides the most significant example of measures to protect children on social media. Its under-16 social media restrictions emerged from a community-led campaign responding to children's experiences of cyberbullying and online harms. Following implementation, more than 4.7 million under-16 accounts were reportedly deactivated, removed or restricted.³⁷ A further tranche of reforms is intended to increase penalties, strengthen powers to compel information from companies and tighten compliance requirements.

Such measures may reduce children's exposure to harm, but they can also affect rights to information, expression and participation, and they do not address how digital services operate once children gain access. In August 2026, the French Constitutional Council blocked proposed restrictions on the grounds that they disproportionately interfered with children's freedom of expression. Parliamentarians interviewed for this brief therefore highlighted complementary approaches. Ms. Elisa Vigil of Spain proposed time-based restrictions rather than blanket bans, while Michael Hose MP of the German Bundestag advocated a risk-based approach that distinguishes between platforms according to their design, functionality and potential harms, including the impact of recommender systems in social media.

This places greater responsibility on the systems and providers shaping children's online experience. For parliaments, this may mean ensuring that regulators, oversight bodies and relevant committees have access to the technical expertise and information needed to assess how algorithmic recommender systems, engagement incentives and other design features affect children, and to determine where stronger safeguards or duties on providers may be required.

Parliamentarians are increasingly concerned about the risks posed by AI chatbots to children. In April 2026, a bipartisan group of United States senators proposed stronger safeguards for minors, including parental controls, as well as measures addressing harmful or addictive design features and advertising targeted at children.³⁸ According to United States Senator Ted Cruz, "the rapid development of sophisticated chatbots has left many parents in the dark as powerful AI systems enter children's lives."³⁹

In the United Kingdom, Ms. Beeban Kidron has advocated conditional access rather than blanket bans, arguing that technology companies should be required to meet appropriate safety standards before children can access their services. As she put it: "Rather than banning children, we're actually saying to tech companies: you're banned unless you behave well."⁴⁰

Combining youth participation and scientific evidence in parliamentary scrutiny

The Children's Commission of the German Bundestag has examined social media, AI and child-protection issues including "sharenting", namely, the sharing of information about or images of children online. Michael Hose MP, who chaired the Commission in 2025, described its role as bringing young people's perspectives into parliamentary work while combining them with evidence from educators, digital safety advocates and specialists in fields such as psychology, developmental neuroscience and data science.

He also stressed the importance of digital resilience: helping children and young people understand, evaluate critically and respond to AI and algorithmic systems. In the Commission's work, this includes media literacy, critical thinking about algorithmic recommendations and peer support networks in schools, alongside regulation and stronger responsibility for platforms.

"Ensuring meaningful and representative youth participation is challenging ... The Commission brings together scientific expertise, the voices of young people and policy experience to better understand these challenges and develop appropriate responses."

What parliaments can consider

- **Make youth participation genuinely representative.** Seek input from children and young people of different ages, genders, social backgrounds and levels of digital engagement, so that parliamentary evidence reflects a wider range of experiences. The Commission holds hearings involving young people alongside educators and digital safety advocates.
- **Combine lived experience with specialist evidence.** Youth testimony is considered together with scientific and technical expertise when developing the Commission's work.
- **Look beyond protection to digital resilience.** Parliamentary responses can examine not only how children are protected from harmful systems, but whether schools, families and platforms are helping them to understand and critically engage with AI. The Commission also considers how media literacy, critical thinking and peer support can help children to navigate AI and algorithmic systems.

Source: IPU interview with Michael Hose MP, 21 August 2026.

37 eSafety Commissioner, "Platforms restrict access to 4.7 million under-16 accounts across Australia" (2026).

38 Ibid.

39 United States Senate, *Children's Health, Advancement, Trust, Boundaries, and Oversight in Technology Act (CHATBOT Act)*, 119th Congress (2026).

40 McKay, L. B., "'No reasonable person can say it's OK': The baroness protecting children from chatbots", *The Bureau of Investigative Journalism* (17 March 2026).

The use of AI in education

AI is becoming increasingly embedded in education, both through tools used by schools and teachers, and through applications used directly by children.⁴¹ AI can be used to assess students, personalize learning or influence educational pathways. At the same time, children are increasingly using AI by themselves: in the United Kingdom, 40.7 per cent of children between the ages of 8 and 13 reported using generative AI for homework, compared with 59.1 per cent of those between the ages of 13 and 18.⁴²

Properly designed AI tutoring could extend learning beyond the classroom by allowing children to ask questions, receive explanations suited to their level of understanding and work through difficulties interactively. AI can provide personalized learning experiences and adapt to individual learning styles, a significant benefit for children facing barriers to conventional formats of education or requiring additional support.⁴³

Many parliamentarians interviewed for this study stressed the importance of AI for children's meaningful participation in a digital society. Education about and with AI is therefore becoming an important part of helping children understand, use and engage critically with these technologies.⁴⁴

While AI can support learning, excessive reliance may reduce opportunities to develop critical skills such as

reasoning, writing and problem-solving, particularly where it limits meaningful teacher-child interaction, replaces personal relationships in educational settings, or leads to cognitive offloading.⁴⁵ AI systems may also raise further concerns about accessibility, bias and reliability, particularly when models are trained on data from children in the Global North.⁴⁶ Research therefore highlights the importance of pedagogically sound, age-appropriate and human-centred design, alongside measures to prevent algorithmic bias and protect children's privacy.⁴⁷

National AI strategies are increasingly emphasizing digital literacy, inclusion and preparing children for an AI-enabled future.⁴⁸ How these priorities translate into practice, however, depends heavily on national circumstances, including education systems, levels of digital access and existing regulatory capacity.

MP Dina Al-Bashir of the National Assembly of Jordan stressed the need for education systems to equip students with the skills required for the future. The Parliamentary Committee on Digital Economy and Entrepreneurship has focused particularly on digital literacy and children's understanding of AI. Ms. Al-Bashir also highlighted the role of parliaments in bringing together policymakers, educators, parents and the private sector to understand AI's impact on education and to inform the public about the changes brought about by AI.



AI is becoming increasingly embedded in education, both through tools used by schools, teachers and students. © iStock

- 41 Ayeni, O. O. and others, "AI in education: A review of personalized learning and educational technology", *GSC Advanced Research and Reviews*, 18/2 (2024), 261–271.
- 42 National Literacy Trust, *Children and young people's use of generative AI to support literacy in 2024* (2024).
- 43 Zdravkova, K., Krasniqi, V., Dalipi, F. and Ferati, M., "Cutting-edge communication and learning assistive technologies for disabled children: An artificial intelligence perspective", *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 5 (2022), 970430.
- 44 UNICEF, *Guidance* (2025).
- 45 Atabey, A., Sylwander, K. R., and Livingstone, S., *A child rights audit of GenAI in EdTech: Learning from five UK case studies*, Digital Futures for Children centre, London School of Economics and Political Science (2025). Gerlich, M., "AI tools in society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking", *Societies*, 15/1 (2025), Article 6.
- 46 Nyaaba, M., Wright, A., and Choi, G. L., "Generative AI and power imbalances in global education: Frameworks for bias mitigation", arXiv.org (2024).
- 47 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Results from TALIS 2024: The state of teaching* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2025). Kestin, G., Miller, K., Kiales, A., Milbourne, T., and Ponti, G., "AI tutoring outperforms in-class active learning: An RCT introducing a novel research-based design in an authentic educational setting", *Scientific Reports*, 15 (2025), 17458.
- 48 UNICEF, *National AI strategies and children* (2021).

Understanding AI's broader effects on learning

Jerome Laxale MP, Chair of the Australian Parliament's Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters, identified four areas that parliamentarians need to consider when examining the impact of AI on children:

"I see four key themes of harm that are part of the ongoing discussion. The first is algorithmic safety and exposure to harmful content, particularly when it comes to generative AI. The second is students' privacy, particularly in relation to the use of AI in education. The third is the impact of AI on education itself. This raises questions around digital equity and accessibility, as well as plagiarism and the broader impact on learning. A major issue is also the potential erosion of critical thinking, as a result of increased reliance on generative AI tools.

For education in particular, he stressed that parliamentary scrutiny should extend beyond whether children are using AI to cheat. It should also examine what data educational technologies collect, whether access is equitable, and how AI affects the development of independent learning and critical thinking skills. He pointed to changes in New South Wales around take-home examinations as one example of education systems beginning to respond to generative AI in particular.

What parliaments can consider

- **Scrutinize how student data is used.** Examine what data AI tools collect from students, how it is used and whether existing safeguards are adequate.
- **Assess equity and accessibility.** Consider whether access to AI-enabled education is equitable and whether particular groups of students risk being disadvantaged.
- **Review the impact on learning and assessment.** Through education committees, parliamentary hearings and inquiries, examine how AI is affecting critical thinking, independent learning and the development of core academic skills.

Source: IPU interview with Jerome Laxale MP, 2 September 2026.

"Digital literacy is fundamental. It is important for children, young people and adults to understand how to use AI safely and effectively." Dina Al-Bashir MP, National Assembly of Jordan

Ms. Hawa Mchafu of the Parliament of Tanzania highlighted AI's potential to make education more inclusive, particularly for children with disabilities and underserved communities, while reducing teachers' workloads and extending their reach. At the same time, she warned against the "careless introduction of AI" in education, citing risks including bias, lack of transparency, privacy concerns and children's over-reliance on AI. Tanzania's *Guidelines on AI in Education* address these risks through principles of fairness, privacy and equitable access, alongside data protection, informed consent and requirements to audit educational AI tools for bias.

Taken together, these examples show that parliamentary engagement with AI in education involves examining whether education systems are building the skills, safeguards and institutional capacity needed for AI to support children's learning and rights. Parliamentary oversight, particularly by education committees, is important in ensuring that AI in education advances rather than undermines children's rights. Parliaments may consider:

- **Making AI literacy a core part of education.** Children and teachers should develop the skills to understand, critically assess and use AI responsibly, including knowing when to use AI and when to develop skills independently.
- **Ensuring AI in education aligns with children's best interests.** Education systems should establish standards for the deployment of AI tools for education, covering privacy, bias, transparency, accessibility and effectiveness. Such standards should consider factors such as age, developmental stage and type of task.
- **Promoting pedagogically designed AI and preserving human interaction.** Education systems should distinguish purpose-built learning tools from unrestricted general-purpose AI, ensuring that AI augments rather than replaces teachers, learning relationships and social experiences.
- **Embedding children's rights in national AI and digital literacy strategies.** National authorities concerned with the implementation of AI strategies should ensure that children's rights are explicitly reflected in the development, regulation and implementation of AI and digital literacy strategies, while adapting approaches to national circumstances, including differences in infrastructure, access, resources and educational needs.

Moving from standards to enforceable safeguards in education

In the United Kingdom, Ms. Beeban Kidron has focused on strengthening safeguards for technology used by children. Parliament has acted by pushing for enforceable standards for educational technology, with Ms. Kidron introducing amendments calling for a certification scheme for EdTech.

Mr. Simeon Goldstraw, her Senior Parliamentary Assistant, highlighted concerns around AI tutoring systems, the privacy of children's educational data and the strength of the evidence being used to justify AI in schools. He noted that children are increasingly contributing to the training of AI models, whether through data harvested from EdTech platforms and homework assignments, iterative interactions with AI tools, or public social media uploads.

While government material has pointed to benefits from AI, the clearest evidence so far relates to administrative and planning tasks rather than improvements in the direct teacher–student learning experience. Ms. Kidron has therefore pursued parliamentary amendments calling for a certification scheme for educational technology.

Mr. Goldstraw also stressed that standards need to work in practice. He pointed to the United Kingdom's Age Appropriate Design Code as a strong framework whose impact, in his view, has been limited by insufficient enforcement. He also distinguished between a narrow child-safety approach and a broader children's rights approach, which asks whether technology supports children's best interests and wider development.

What parliaments can consider

- **Question the evidence behind AI in education.** Parliamentary scrutiny can examine the evidence for whether a particular piece of technology improves the educational experience. Scrutiny should consider not only whether technology avoids harm, but whether it serves children's best interests and supports their wider development.
- **Test whether safeguards work in practice.** Where standards or codes already exist, parliaments can examine whether they are being implemented and enforced effectively.

Source: IPU interview with Mr. Simeon Goldstraw, 24 August 2026.

Three actions parliamentarians can take now

Parliamentary experience across different regions shows that protecting children's rights in the age of AI requires action across all core functions. Three key priorities are building the evidence base; sustained oversight as AI is deployed in areas that affect children; and strengthening legislation where protections are inadequate.

These actions reinforce each other. Evidence helps to identify emerging harms and understand how children experience AI in practice; oversight tests whether existing protections, policies and institutions are working; and legislation can close gaps where current frameworks are insufficient.

Action 1: Build the evidence base and hear directly from children

The impact of AI on children varies across countries, communities and deployment contexts. Effective parliamentary action therefore depends on a strong evidence base, drawing from published academic research, perspectives from industry and civil society and the actual experiences of children, parents, educators and other affected groups. This is particularly important given the speed at which AI systems are being developed and deployed.

Parliaments can provide a space for children, parents, experts and the wider public to contribute to discussion on AI and children's rights, helping to ensure that parliamentarians speak with children about issues concerning them, rather than only on their behalf. Trinidad and Tobago's Parliament has held a debate with young people on the implications of AI, including its use in education, enabling them to articulate their own experiences and concerns regarding AI systems.⁴⁹ The Joint Committee on Artificial Intelligence in the Irish Oireachtas has held discussions with survivors of AI-related harm and specialized civil society organizations on the impact of AI on children and young people.⁵⁰ The Children's Assembly in the Republic of Korea has also provided a forum for children to discuss digital harms and propose measures relating to online gaming.⁵¹

Parliamentarians can:

- Engage directly with children and other constituents. Hear from children, parents, caregivers, educators, psychologists and other professionals to understand emerging AI-related impacts on children.
- Make participation genuinely representative. Seek input from children and young people of different ages, genders, socio-economic backgrounds, levels of digital access and engagement, and including children with disabilities and other marginalized groups.
- Bring together different sources of expertise. Engage subject-matter experts and professional organizations in child development, psychology, behavioural research, education and technology, alongside industry representatives, certification bodies and government agencies involved in the governance and implementation of AI.

⁴⁹ United Nations in Trinidad and Tobago, "Youth Parliamentarians Tackle Debate on AI in the Classroom" (2 December 2024).

⁵⁰ Oireachtas, "Joint Committee on Artificial Intelligence to discuss the impact of AI on children and young people" (22 September 2025).

⁵¹ IPU, "The Children's Assembly in the Republic of Korea" (July 2023).

- Commission parliamentary research. Use parliamentary research services to identify gaps in national AI strategies, legislation and available evidence, including where emerging harms affecting children have not yet received sufficient attention.
- Use hearings, debates and outreach to surface new risks early. Parliamentary committees and constituency engagement can help to identify developments that may not yet be visible in formal datasets or government reporting.

Action 2: Oversee whether protections for children work in practice

Parliamentarians can use their oversight powers to assess how AI affects children's rights and to monitor the implementation and enforcement of existing legislation and policies. Parliamentary action includes public hearings, committee reports, the creation of specialized parliamentary bodies and budget scrutiny.

The European Parliament's Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection convened a hearing on "Protection of minors online in the Single Market", including representatives of companies and civil society organizations.⁵² Children's rights were also addressed in its report on the protection of minors online, which examines risks including targeted advertising, influencer marketing, addictive design, loot boxes and dark patterns, calling for stronger integration of child protection in the enforcement of the Digital Services Act.⁵³

Both chambers of India's Parliament have examined different impacts of AI on children. The ICT Committee of India's Lok Sabha has raised concerns about children's digital safety, including digital addiction, AI risks, gaming and potential mental health harms.⁵⁴ In August 2026, the committee convened a hearing involving representatives of the technology industry to discuss the privacy of vulnerable groups including children on social media.⁵⁵ Similarly, the Standing Committee on Education, Women, Children, Youth and Sports of the Rajya Sabha has examined the implications of AI in education and its impact on children.⁵⁶

In the United States of America, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology, and the Law has convened public hearings to scrutinize the impact of digital technologies and AI on children, including social media and teenage mental health, deepfakes and online exploitation; in January 2024, for example, the Subcommittee questioned the CEOs of major technology companies on child safety and children's mental health.⁵⁷ In Switzerland, a 2026 motion introduced by MP Andrea Gmür-Schönenberger proposed legal restrictions on personalized advertising to minors, profiling-based recommendation systems that maximize engagement, and insufficiently regulated generative AI applications.⁵⁸

As noted by Mr. Simeon Goldstraw, legislation does not guarantee effective enforcement. Major challenges remain in translating legal requirements into government action. Post-legislative scrutiny is important after legislation is

passed to assess whether further action is needed, and to ensure that emerging AI-related harms are accounted for in law.

Parliaments can:

- Examine how AI and children's rights intersect with existing committee remits. AI-related impacts on children extend beyond family affairs or education and may also fall within the work of committees dealing with health, justice, human rights, technology, consumer protection and public administration. Joint hearings or inquiries can bring together expertise from different committees.
- Scrutinize government implementation. Examine how national AI strategies, child protection laws and digital policies are being implemented, including the division of responsibilities across ministries and the extent of coordination between them.
- Scrutinize private sector compliance. Examine what companies are doing to prevent and address adverse impacts on children, including the use of child rights impact assessments, age-appropriate design and measures to prevent harmful or manipulative uses of AI.
- Examine enforcement. Request information on complaints, investigations, sanctions and fines, and assess whether regulators have sufficient powers, technical expertise and access to information to hold companies accountable where harms fall on children.
- Use budget scrutiny. Assess whether sufficient resources are being provided for regulators, law enforcement, the judiciary, education authorities and mental health or other support services for affected children.

Action 3: Update legislation, where needed, to address changes brought about by AI

Parliamentarians around the world are already introducing or strengthening legislation in response to emerging AI-related harms affecting children. Building on evidence, parliamentary inquiries and international standards, parliaments can review whether existing frameworks remain fit for purpose and introduce new protections where gaps are identified.

Parliamentarians have addressed children's rights through comprehensive AI regulation, targeted social media legislation and data protection frameworks. Relevant protections may sit across child protection law, data protection, education law, consumer law, criminal law, online safety frameworks and sector-specific regulation.

In March 2026, two bills were introduced in Argentina to strengthen children's digital rights. Bill No. 0809 mandates measures such as age verification and restrictions on psychological manipulation,⁵⁹ while Bill No. 0579 proposes structural safeguards against the collection and processing of children's personal data, behavioural manipulation, psychological profiling and addiction-driven optimization through AI.⁶⁰

52 European Parliament, IMCO Hearing on [Protection of minors online in the Single Market](#) (24 June 2026).

53 European Parliamentary Research Service, "[Online protection of minors](#)" (2025).

54 *The Times of India*, "[Social media is giving children the same kind of addictive kicks as drugs: Nishikant Dubey](#)" (24 May 2026).

55 *The Hindu*, "[Parliamentary panel to question digital platforms on privacy and public order](#)" (19 August 2025).

56 Parliament of India, "[Artificial intelligence in education: Opportunities, challenges and the way forward](#)" (12 March 2026).

57 United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary, "[Social media and the teen mental health crisis](#)" (7 November 2023).

58 Swiss Parliament, Motion 26.3242: [Kinder- und Jugendschutz auf digitalen Plattformen](#) (2026).

59 Honorable Cámara de Diputados de la Nación Argentina, [Proyecto de ley 0809-D-2026](#) (2026).

60 Honorable Senado de la Nación Argentina, [Proyecto de ley S-0579/2026](#) (2026).

Australia’s Online Safety Amendment Act 2024 requires social media platforms to take reasonable steps to prevent age-restricted users from having accounts on their platforms,⁶¹ and many legislatures are considering related approaches, including France,⁶² Spain,⁶³ Türkiye⁶⁴ and the United Kingdom.⁶⁵ The proposed Bill on Children and Data in Brazil addresses the collection and use of children’s personal data, recognizing that children require heightened protection under data protection law.⁶⁶

The European Union (EU) has established one of the most comprehensive legal frameworks explicitly addressing AI and children. The EU Digital Services Act imposes stronger obligations on platforms to assess and mitigate systemic risks, with enhanced protections for minors, while the EU AI Act establishes protections relevant to age-related vulnerabilities and high-risk uses in education.⁶⁷ Comparable efforts to establish safeguards for children’s rights in comprehensive AI regulation have been adopted in Peru⁶⁸ and Viet Nam⁶⁹ and are currently under discussion in Brazil⁷⁰ and Kenya.⁷¹

The United Kingdom has adopted several measures to strengthen child protection online through the Data Protection Act 2018⁷² and the Online Safety Act.⁷³ In the United States of America, the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act established early protections for data of children under 13 years of age,⁷⁴ while more recent bipartisan efforts, including the Kids Off Social Media Act and CHATBOT Act, address AI-related harms to children, including social media and chatbots.⁷⁵

Parliaments can:

- **Review existing legislation for gaps.** Examine whether advances in AI have created loopholes in laws protecting children’s privacy, safety, equality, development and access to remedy. Children’s experiences and views can help identify unintended consequences and ensure that legal protections work in practice.

- **Draw on international child rights standards.** General comment No. 25 and the *Joint Statement on Artificial Intelligence and the Rights of the Child* can help to identify areas in which domestic legislation may need strengthening.
- **Require child rights impact assessments.** Consider requiring assessments before AI systems likely to affect children are deployed, particularly in sensitive settings such as education.
- **Mandate age-appropriate design and stronger safeguards.** Legal frameworks can require systems likely to be used by children to reflect their age, developmental stage and particular vulnerabilities.
- **Regulate against harms** including AI-generated CSAM, systems that intentionally exploit children’s psychological vulnerabilities, manipulative or addictive design, intrusive surveillance, harmful profiling and other uses inconsistent with children’s rights.
- **Ensure effective remedies.** Children and parents should have access to clear, child-friendly complaint mechanisms, content removal where appropriate, support services and effective redress.
- **Ensure restrictions on children are rights-compatible.** Measures such as age verification or restrictions on access should be lawful, necessary and proportionate, and should take account of children’s rights to privacy, information, expression and participation.
- **Consider a digital duty of care.** Assess whether and how platforms and AI providers should be legally responsible for identifying and mitigating foreseeable harms arising from AI.

61 Australian Government, [Online Safety Amendment Act](#) (2024).

62 Assemblée nationale, [Proposition de loi visant à protéger les mineurs des risques auxquels les expose l’utilisation des réseaux sociaux](#) (n° 2107) (2025).

63 Congreso de los Diputados, [Proyecto de Ley Orgánica para la protección de las personas menores de edad en los entornos digitales](#) (2025).

64 Kaya, M. B., [The Turkish Internet Law—Full translation](#) (5 January 2021).

65 United Kingdom Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, [“Fact sheet: New rules to protect children online”](#) (2026).

66 Câmara dos Deputados, [Projeto de Lei nº 2.807](#) (2024).

67 Future of Life Institute, [EU AI Act: Recital 28](#).

68 Congreso de la República, [Ley N.º 31814](#) (2023).

69 National Assembly of Viet Nam, [Law on Artificial Intelligence](#) (2025).

70 Câmara dos Deputados, [Projeto de Lei nº 2.338](#) (2023).

71 Parliament of Kenya, [Bill digest: The Artificial Intelligence Bill](#) (2026).

72 United Kingdom Parliament, [Data Protection Act](#) (2018).

73 United Kingdom Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, [Online Safety Act](#) (2023).

74 United States Congress, [Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act](#) (1998).

75 United States Congress, [Kids Off Social Media Act](#) (2025). United States Congress, [Children’s Health, Advancement, Trust, Boundaries, and Oversight in Technology Act \(CHATBOT Act\)](#) (2026).

Conclusion

As AI systems continue to evolve and become more embedded in children's lives, new implications for children's rights and new forms of harm will continue to emerge. Parliaments therefore need to move beyond responding to individual harms as they arise and ensure that children's rights are considered systematically in AI policy, oversight and legislation.

Drawing on parliamentary experience from Australia, Germany, Ghana, Jordan, Spain, the United Kingdom and Tanzania, this issue brief examines how parliaments can respond. Effective action requires a comprehensive and coordinated approach: engaging children and other stakeholders, strengthening parliamentary oversight, fostering collaboration across committees and, where necessary, developing legislation that safeguards children's rights throughout the AI life cycle.

Questions for parliamentarians to ask on AI and child rights

Understanding the impact of AI and hearing from children

- What evidence does the government have on how different AI systems affect children's rights, well-being and development?
- What child rights risk assessments are required before AI systems likely to affect children are deployed?
- Are AI-related harms to children being systematically recorded, reported and analysed?
- Which groups of children may be affected differently, including by age, gender, disability, socio-economic background or access to technology?
- How are children's views being heard and reflected in policy and regulatory decisions?

Accountability and implementation

- Which public authorities are responsible for protecting children from AI-related harms, and are their responsibilities clear?

- Do regulators have the powers, expertise and access to information needed to oversee AI systems affecting children?
- How are companies required to identify, report and address harms involving children?
- What happens when existing safeguards fail, and who is accountable?
- Are existing laws keeping pace with changes in how AI systems are designed and used?

Mental health and online risks

- What evidence exists on the effects of recommender systems, conversational AI and AI companions on children's mental health?
- What design features may encourage harmful, addictive or manipulative patterns of use?
- How are serious incidents involving children identified, investigated and reported?
- What safeguards are in place to protect children when they use conversational AI, AI companions or other systems that may pose particular mental health risks?
- What mechanisms allow children and parents to report harms and obtain support or remedy?

AI in education

- Which AI systems are being used in schools and other educational settings, and for what purposes?
- What evidence supports their educational use?
- How are these systems assessed for privacy, bias, accessibility and effectiveness?
- What data do educational AI systems collect from students, and how is the data used?
- How is AI affecting critical thinking, independent learning and other core skills?

Does your parliament need support to act on AI and child rights? Or do you have a good practice to showcase?

The IPU offers tailored support to help parliaments respond to issues relating to AI and child rights, including comparative legislative analysis and peer learning between parliaments. The IPU also provides a platform for sharing successful parliamentary action with a global audience.

Contact the IPU at ai-research@ipu.org for more information or to request a briefing for your parliament.

ANNEX

A. International and regional legal instruments

International instruments

- [Convention on the Rights of the Child](#) (1989).
- [Global Digital Compact](#) (2024).

Optional protocols

- [Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography](#) (2002).

Regional instruments

African Union

- [African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child](#) (1990).

Council of Europe

- Council of Europe, [Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law](#) (2024).

B. Recommendations, resolutions and reports of international organizations

UN committees and special rapporteurs

- United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, [General comment No. 25](#) (2021).
- United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, [Draft general comment No. 27](#) (2024).

UN agencies and bodies

UNICEF

- UNICEF, [“How to design AI for children. From principles to practice: Insights from UNICEF’s ‘AI for children’ piloting initiative”](#) (2021).
- UNICEF, [National AI strategies and children](#) (2021).
- UNICEF, [“Beyond algorithms: Three signals of changing AI-child interaction”](#) (2025).
- UNICEF, [Artificial intelligence governance in motion: A rapid global review of AI regulation and its implications for children’s rights](#) (2025).
- UNICEF, [Children’s best interests in digital policy and practice: From the voices of children, youth and experts around the world](#) (2026).

UNESCO

- UNESCO, [Guidance for generative AI in education and research](#) (2023).

- UNESCO, [Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence](#) (2021).

Independent Scientific Panel on AI

- United Nations, [Preliminary report of the Independent International Scientific Panel on AI: Evidence-based assessment of opportunities, risks and impacts of artificial intelligence](#) (1 July 2026).

International Telecommunication Union

- International Telecommunication Union and others, [Joint Statement on Artificial Intelligence and the Rights of the Child](#) (2026).⁷⁶

Inter-Parliamentary Union

- Inter-Parliamentary Union, [Handbook on child participation in parliament](#) (2011).
- Inter-Parliamentary Union, [Combating non-consensual intimate imagery: A parliamentary action guide](#) (2026).

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, [Getting children’s safety online right](#) (2026).

Regional bodies

African Union

- African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, [Draft study on human and peoples’ rights and artificial intelligence, robotics, and other new and emerging technologies in Africa](#) (2025).

Council of Europe

- Council of Europe, [Feasibility, timeliness and pertinence of elaborating a child rights impact assessment tool on artificial intelligence](#) (2024).
- Council of Europe, [Insights into artificial intelligence and its impact on the youth sector](#) (2024).

C. Legislation around the world

Argentina

- [Proyecto de Ley n° 0809-D-2026: Derechos digitales de niñas, niños y adolescentes.](#)
- [Proyecto de Ley S-0579/2026: Protección de Datos Personales de Niñas, Niños y Adolescentes en Entornos Digitales.](#)

Australia

- [Online Safety Amendment \(Social Media Minimum Age\) Act 2024.](#)

Brazil

- [Projeto de Lei n° 2.807, de 2024: Dispõe sobre a proteção da imagem de crianças, proibindo a utilização de suas fotos para alimentar ferramentas de inteligência artificial sem o consentimento expresso de seus pais ou representantes legais.](#)

⁷⁶ The Joint Statement was co-signed by several international organizations including the IPU.

- *Projeto de Lei nº 2.338, de 2023: Dispõe sobre o desenvolvimento, o fomento e o uso ético e responsável da inteligência artificial com base na centralidade da pessoa humana.*

Ecuador

- *Proyecto de Ley Reformatoria al Código de la Niñez y Adolescencia para reforzar el derecho a la dignidad, reputación, honor e imagen de niños, niñas y adolescentes.*

European Union

- Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data.
 - See: Art. 8: “Conditions applicable to child’s consent in relation to information society services”
 - See: Art. 12: “Transparent information, communication and modalities for the exercise of the rights of the data subject”
- Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on a Single Market For Digital Services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC.
 - See: Art. 18: “Notification of suspicions of criminal offences”
 - See: Art. 20: “Internal complaint-handling system”
 - See: Art. 23: “Measures and protection against misuse”
- Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act).
 - See: definition of prohibited practices in the EU AI Act
 - See: Annex III on high-risk AI
- European Commission, *Guidelines on measures to ensure a high level of privacy, safety and security for minors online, pursuant to Article 28(4) of Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 (C/2025/5519)* (2025).

Kenya

- *The Artificial Intelligence Bill* (Senate Bills No. 4) (2026).

Peru

- *Ley N.º 31814, Ley que promueve el uso de la inteligencia artificial en favor del desarrollo económico y social del país.*

Spain

- Congreso de los Diputados, *Proyecto de Ley Orgánica para la protección de las personas menores de edad en los entornos digitales (121/000052).*

Tanzania (United Republic of)

- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, *National Guidelines for Artificial Intelligence in Education* (2025).
- Electronic and Postal Communications (Online Content) Regulations (2020).
 - Children protection, Art. 18

United Arab Emirates

- Federal Decree by Law No. (26) of 2025 Regarding Child Digital Safety.

United Kingdom

- Parliament of the United Kingdom, *Data Protection Act* (c. 12) (2018).
- Parliament of the United Kingdom, *Online Safety Act* (c. 50) (2023).

United States of America

- United States Congress, *Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998*, §§ 6501–6506 (1998).
- United States Congress, *Kids Online Safety Act* (2023).
- United States Congress, *Kids Off Social Media Act* (2025).
- United States Congress, *Children’s Health, Advancement, Trust, Boundaries, and Oversight in Technology Act (CHATBOT Act)* (2026). United States Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
- California State Senate, Companion Chatbots: Children’s Safety Bill (2026). <https://legiscan.com/CA/text/SB1119/2025>

Viet Nam

- National Assembly of Viet Nam, *Law on Artificial Intelligence (Law No. 134/2025/QH15)* (2025).
 - See: Application of AI in sectors and industries (Art. 6(b))
 - See: Prohibited acts (Art. 7(2)(c))

D. Reports, hearings and speeches

Reports and guidelines

- Deutscher Bundestag, Wissenschaftliche Dienste, *Zugangsbeschränkungen für junge Menschen zu social media* (Access restrictions for young people to social media) (WD 8 - 3000 - 054/25) (2025).
- European Commission, *Child safety online: Protecting and empowering minors in a digital world* (2026).
- European Parliament, *Protection of minors online (P10_TA(2025)0299; 2025/2060(INI))* (2025).
- Government of Canada, *Risk assessment of forced labour in procurement: Information and communications technology* (2025).
- Information Commissioner’s Office, *Age appropriate design: A code of practice for online services* (2020).

Parliamentary debates, inquiries, hearings and motions

- Parliament of Australia, [Online Safety Amendment \(Social Media Minimum Age\) Bill 2024: Second reading](#) [Parliamentary debate] (28 November 2024).
- United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary, ["Protecting children online"](#) (2024).
- Houses of the Oireachtas, ["Joint Committee on Artificial Intelligence to discuss the impact of AI on children and young people"](#) (22 September 2025).
- United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Counterterrorism, ["Examining the harm of AI chatbots"](#) (16 September 2025).
- Swiss Parliament, [Motion 26.3242. Kinder- und Jugendschutz auf digitalen Plattformen](#) (Protecting children and youth on digital platforms) (2026).
- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, [Policy statement on the impact of social media on youth mental health](#) (2023).
- Children's Parliament, Scottish AI Alliance and the Alan Turing Institute, [Exploring children's rights and AI – Final report](#) (2026).
- Digital Futures for Children centre and 5Rights Foundation, [Rights.AI: Children's experiences of generative artificial intelligence in India](#) (2025).
- The US Surgeon General Advisory, [Social media and youth mental health](#) (2023).

E. Court rulings

- New Mexico Department of Justice, ["Court orders Meta to pay \\$942 million and overhaul protections for children on Facebook and Instagram in landmark New Mexico ruling"](#) (26 August 2026).
- Conseil constitutionnel, [Décision n° 2026-911 DC du 14 août 2026](#) (14 August 2026).
- Federal Trade Commission, [ByteDance, LTD., US v.](#) (2 August 2024).

F. Studies and publications by civil society, professional associations and academia

- 5Rights Foundation, [Children's Right to Privacy in the Digital World](#) (2025).
- 5Rights Foundation, [Pathways: How digital design puts children at risk](#) (2021).

This study was made possible thanks to the parliamentarians who volunteered their time to speak about this important issue in AI governance.

The IPU would like to express its sincere appreciation to Ms. Sophie Kiladze, Ms. Elisa Vigil, Ms. Dina Al-Bashir, Mr. Ernest Anim, Ms. Hawa Mchafu, Ms. Neema Lugangira, Mr. Jerome Laxale, Mr. Simeon Goldstraw, Mr. Michael Hose and their teams for providing us with valuable insights into the impact of AI on children's rights. This issue brief was developed by Alexander Kriebitz, with significant contributions from the AI Policy Team, including Alex Read and Youngjoon Yoon, under the leadership of Andy Richardson. The authors are particularly grateful to Akiyo Afouda and Rogier Huizenga for their feedback, substantive contributions and continued engagement.

This issue brief has been produced with the financial assistance of the Parliamentary Group of the Kingdom of Bahrain. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the Parliamentary Group of the Kingdom of Bahrain, nor does the use of the donor's name imply an endorsement by the IPU of any specific political or legislative agenda.