



Report

National Points of Contact on Hate Crimes Annual Meeting

**20 – 21 November 2014
Hofburg Conference Centre, Vienna**

Table of Contents

Background	3
Day one, 20 November 2014	4
Optional Briefing: Key findings from ODIHR’s 2013 hate crime reporting and a discussion and consultation on the role of the NPC	4
Opening Session.....	5
Panel discussion: The role of intergovernmental organizations in supporting effective responses to hate crime.	5
Day two, 21 November	6
Session one: Updates and challenges across the OSCE region	6
Session two: Sharing current practices in hate crime recording	8
Session three: Mapping models of hate crime recording.....	8
Final session: feedback and evaluation.....	9
Feedback to ODIHR	9
Annex A: Agenda	10
Annex B: List of Participants.....	13
Annex C: Final NPC role description	15

Background

OSCE participating States first noted the importance of appointing a National Point of Contact on Hate Crimes (NPCs) in 2003.¹ Ministerial Council Decision 9/09 committed States to “nominate, if they have not yet done so, a national point of contact on hate crimes to periodically report to the ODIHR reliable information and statistics on hate crimes”. As of November 2014, 55 out of 57 participating States have appointed a NPC.

The main role of the NPC is to report official data and statistics on hate crime to OSCE/ODIHR, which is used as the basis for OSCE/ODIHR annual hate crime reports. Specifically, NPCs are asked to provide information about: official government statistics on hate crimes within their jurisdiction; existing or updated legislation pertaining to hate crimes; and initiatives aimed at improving understanding of and responses to hate crimes. In practice several NPCs play a much wider role, leading developments in responses to hate crime in their own countries, contributing to the development of ODIHR publications, trainings and events, and serving as a general expert resource at the national and international levels.

As part of ongoing efforts to support NPCs in their role, ODIHR arranged its annual meeting in Vienna on 20-21 November 2014 ([see annex A](#) for the agenda and [annex B for list of participants](#)). Thirty-three NPCs attended from 30 countries. In addition, representatives from the delegations of about ten countries attended specific sessions and sought out their respective NPCs to make active connections.

The overall aims of the meeting were:

- To exchange information, challenges and good practice initiatives among NPCs and with ODIHR.
- To discuss the role of intergovernmental organizations including the EU Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA), ODIHR, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the European Commission on Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) in supporting effective responses to hate crime
- To map and share key approaches to hate crime recording in the OSCE region and identify their strengths and challenges

Disclaimer

This report provides a summary of discussions and outcomes of the NPC meeting. This report should neither be interpreted as official OSCE recommendations based on a consensus decision, nor as an opinion of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights or of any particular OSCE participating State. The content of this report reflects opinions expressed by participants at the National Points of Contact on Hate Crime held in Vienna on 20-21 November, and no additional information has been included since then. The reader should therefore refer to other sources for updates on this topic.

¹ See Ministerial Council Decisions No. 4/03 and 10/05 on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination

Day one, 20 November 2014

Optional Briefing: Key findings from ODIHR's 2013 hate crime reporting and a discussion and consultation on the role of the NPC

Mr. Aleš Hanek (AH) and Ms. Joanna Perry (JP), Hate Crime Officers, provided a briefing on the key findings of OSCE/ODIHR's 2013 hate crime report and the role of the NPCs. JP provided an overview of the main sections and functions of www.hatecrime.osce.org, which was launched in July 2014, replacing ODIHR's paper based report. She showed participants how they can access ODIHR resources and information on how ODIHR gathers and analyses information on hate crime in order to meet its mandate. AH then took participants through a country page, explaining each section and how information submitted by NPCs is displayed. JP then presented ODIHR's new Key Observations, which explain where there is a gap between an OSCE commitment and the information that is provided to ODIHR. She highlighted that the most common observation was that data on hate crime, hate speech and/or discrimination wasn't submitted separately. The second most common was that a state had not submitted data for more than two years and the third most common was that information on prosecution and/or sentencing was not submitted.

AH then presented a draft role description for NPCs (see [annex C](#) for final role description). He explained that OSCE participating States have committed themselves (MC Decision 9/09) to nominate *a national point of contact on hate crimes to periodically report to the ODIHR reliable information and statistics on hate crimes*, and that other OSCE commitments construe the NPC's role more broadly: as a contact point for ODIHR when carrying out all aspects of its taskings related to hate crimes; and facilitating coordination with the relevant authorities in the participating State concerned. As result, ODIHR has revised the NPC role description to include a number of other potential activities and tasks including working with ODIHR on capacity-building activities such as police and prosecutor training and/or using ODIHR's tools to implement improvements on hate crime data collection and other areas at the national level. The following points were raised in discussion:

- The phrase 'change makers' isn't clear. It would be more accurate to say that NPCs can raise awareness with other departments about the importance of collating hate crime data and improving general responses to hate crime.
- Many NPCs are not in the position to 'formulate' hate crime policy. It would be better to say that they can 'contribute to' the formulation of hate crime policy.
- The revised role description should be posted on the NPC corner of hatecrime.osce.org.
- The NPC role description will be a helpful support to NPCs seeking to positively influence efforts to address hate crime at the national level.
- In order to deliver on the wider potential brief of the NPC role, it may be necessary to appoint more than one NPC.
- Commitment from the political level is needed to effectively support NPCs in their role.

- Overall, the revised role description was well received by participants and ODIHR committed to [circulating it with the final NPC report](#) and posting it on hatecrime.osce.org following final approval.
- The website is a great addition to ODIHR's reporting function, however it will need regular data updates. ODIHR confirmed that it will be able to post updates to NPC information outside the set annual reporting date of 15 November.
- ODIHR representatives confirmed that ODIHR is not in a position to verify NGO hate incident reports.

Opening Session

Ms. Cristina Finch, Head of Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department welcomed NPCs and delegations to the meeting. She emphasized the importance of ODIHR's relationship with NPCs, and gave an overview of the agenda. She welcomed the chair of the panel discussion, Ms. Robin Sclafani, Director of the NGO *CEJI, a Jewish Contribution to an Inclusive Europe* (CEJI).

Panel discussion: The role of intergovernmental organizations in supporting effective responses to hate crime.

Ms. Aydan Iyigüngör from the FRA, Mr. Michele Simone from the UNHCR, Ms. Joanna Perry from ODIHR and Mr. Stephanos Stavros from ECRI, discussed how their organizations support governments to develop effective responses to hate crime, how they coordinate their activities, and shared related challenges with NPCs.

Ms. Sclafani introduced the panelists and gave an overview of CEJI and its activities, and its guidelines for NGOs on monitoring hate crime.² Mr. Stavros then outlined ECRI's work on hate crime, particularly highlighting their cycle of country visits, which focus on national responses to hate crime, and draw on data published in ODIHR's hate crime reports. He explained that ECRI works with specific states to identify three priority areas for improvement, and identified a national trend of appointing specialized institutions that deal with hate crime. Ms. Iyigüngör described the FRA's range of surveys on hate crime and other forms of discrimination and highlighted the FRA's recently established Hate Crime Working Party, which works on hate crime recording and reporting, training, and multi-agency working, and involves several NPCs from the EU. She also highlighted the fact that ODIHR chairs the working party's subgroup on hate crime recording. Mr. Simone informed the meeting that monitoring and responding to hate crime has become a priority for the UNHCR, explained that UNHCR field mission staff attend annual hate crime trainings at ODIHR, and welcomed the fact that ODIHR and UNHCR are in the final stages of revising their joint Memorandum of Understanding. Ms. Perry outlined the work of ODIHR and highlighted its key aim to support participating States to meet their ministerial commitments on hate crime. She explained that ODIHR's regular NPC

² See <http://www.ceji.org/media/Guidelines-for-monitoring-of-hate-crimes-and-hate-motivated-incidents-PROTECTED.pdf>

meetings, and its coordination work with other key IGOs on the panel with the needs of key stakeholders such as NPCs in mind are both part of this work, and that this panel is in response to NPCs' request at the 2013 meeting.

Ms. Sclafani then opened up the discussion and asked panel members about how people could be better supported to navigate the complex activities, standards and commitments on hate crime at the international level. Mr. Stavros explained that one driver for improved clarity would be if the governments themselves requested it directly. Ms. Perry pointed out that, in addition to this, IGOs could better coordinate their activities and guidance in this regard. Ms. Sclafani pointed out that IGOs could also play a role in raising awareness about existing grants and funds that could be accessed by national authorities and NGOs. She then opened the floor for contributions.

The NPC for Slovakia explained that wearing the 'several hats' of being the national point of contact for ODIHR as well as the point of contact for the FRA was beneficial and helped achieve an overview of current activities and international priorities on hate crime. The NPC for the United Kingdom observed the benefit of moving all national agencies into one hate crime programme. In this role, he has directly experienced the many types of guidance, advice, requests and information that are issued by IGOs and therefore appreciates these positive steps towards increased coordination.

The NPC for Bulgaria and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia explained that sometimes IGOs should take a more coordinated approach when working with several national agencies within the same country to ensure strong and effective communication.

Finally, Ms. Sclafani asked the panel whether there was an overlap among the activities of international organizations. The panel responded that this was a risk and that there is an overarching need to co-ordinate activities and guidance, but that at the same time, each organization has its own mandate.

Day two, 21 November

Session one: Updates and challenges across the OSCE region

Participants worked in small groups to update each other on their work in 2014, challenges they encounter in their role and identify how ODIHR can assist. Key issues were shared in the plenary and fell into 6 main categories:

International challenges

- Different definitions across IGOs in their requests for information were mentioned as a cause for significant concern. Participants stressed the importance of a shared international definition of hate crime. And their willingness to request action on this from IGOs.

Introducing monitoring definition of hate crime at the national level

- The strengths and weaknesses of legal versus broader monitoring definitions of hate crimes were discussed and shared.
- Data protection issues: challenge of ensuring compliance with data protection laws when registering hate crimes against victims when their national identity is the basis for the offence.
- The observation was made that victim perception based recording of hate crime, or introducing a potential hate crime category might be more easily implemented in common law systems – which allow broader discretion to police officers.
- Several countries do not define hate crime in law and struggle to monitor the application of sentencing enhancement provisions. Interest in ODIHR’s hate crime monitoring guide was expressed by a number of participants.
- Deciding which bias motivations should be included in joint definitions can be a challenge. For example, what religions should be captured under the ‘religion’ flag? How should hate crime against Roma people be defined, ‘anti-Roma’ or ‘anti-Gypsyism’?
- “Good practice” in hate crime recording: implement a second level check of data to ensure quality and consistency.

Cooperating with other organizations

- In several countries, there is an increased awareness of the need to work with NGOs to improve responses to hate crime.
- Data can be shared with academics for further analysis and insight.
- Civil society groups and police use different definitions of hate crime.
- Hate crime victimization and underreporting can be measured in a number of ways, through existing general household surveys, crime surveys, and working with NGOs.
- There is a serious lack of victim services.

Capturing data across the criminal justice system

- Challenges with capturing prosecution data, and ensuring it is comparable with police data. This requires technological development to allow for the electronic recording of cases across the criminal justice system and policy development to agree shared monitoring definitions and practices between police and prosecution. There can be challenges in getting police and prosecution to agree on a single hate crime definition.
- Challenges in working in federal systems to ensure a full national picture of hate crime data and responses.
- Several countries have National Action Plans on hate crime, and national coordination structures, which allow for a strategic and more coordinated approach.

Participating State developments

- Several countries experienced a significant rise in recorded hate crime due to a focus on police training and/or the introduction of new hate crime laws. For

- example, Spain trained 20,000 police officers and experienced a four-fold increase in recorded hate crimes.
- Ireland will adopt a hate crime law in 2015.
 - Croatia has developed its system to allow for the recording of administrative offences with a bias element.
 - The US has introduced seven new religion and anti-Arab bias categories, which reflect current trends, but present implementation challenges.
 - The Holy See collects data on anti-Christian hate crime, and the quality varies greatly. It is important to improve data quality and to gather incidents against Christians where they are a minority community.

Other issues

- There is a need for police training in many countries.
- Reduced resources in some countries mean reduced capacity to record and analyse hate crimes.
- Hate crime, including murders, can often be classified as hooliganism, and therefore remain unrecorded in official figures.

Session two: Sharing current practices in hate crime recording

Ms. Karine Gilberg, NPC for France and Mr. Nikolaus Müllershausen, NPC for Germany presented their countries' approach to hate crime recording.

Ms. Gilberg outlined the following developments in France. The Ministry of Justice is currently implementing its National Action Plan against Racism and anti-Semitism, which includes the following: reforming the statistical system to enable a better understanding of racist and anti-Semitic hate crimes; better alignment of hate crime statistics across the Ministries of Justice and the Interior. In addition, the Department of Justice and Freedoms co-operated with the Ministry of the Interior to harmonize their analysis of and information about hate crime, and to make it accessible to the public. An inter-ministerial circular was signed which encourages co-ordination among investigation agencies.

Mr. Müllershausen explained Germany's approach to hate crime: hate crimes are recorded by the police and reviewed by specialist teams. While there is no specific hate crime law, an amendment is currently progressing through the legislature and there is established case law on the general sentencing clause, and a guideline on prosecuting hate crime. Work is being undertaken to encourage the judiciary to report on sentencing to the data collection authority, which scans judgments for specific information on bias motivations considered by the court.

Ms. Gilberg and Mr. Müllershausen took part in a question and answer sessions during which participants discussed specific aspects of France and Germany's recording systems.

Session three: Mapping models of hate crime recording

Participants were given the opportunity to complete their 'homework' assignment on mapping their country's approach to hate crime data collection using ODIHR's *Ten*

Practical Steps to establishing a hate crime data collection and monitoring system. Main challenges and country specific action points were then presented in plenary. Following the meeting, ODIHR analysed completed charts and summarized the key issues and shared this with NPCs.

Twenty six countries submitted their charts to ODIHR. The most commonly completed step was police training on identifying and responding to hate crime. The second most commonly completed step was hate crime legislation, with nine states reporting that they have some form of legislation or policy requiring the recording of hate crime. The most common gap was action on gender and the second most common was the lack of cross government coordination structures to improve hate crime recording. The most common areas for action were: to set up coordination structures, develop hate crime laws, conduct police training on hate crime and to carry out victimization surveys to better understand the prevalence and impact of unreported hate crimes.

ODIHR will follow up individually with NPCs to offer assistance in carrying out specific actions that have been identified. NPCs are encouraged to contact ODIHR should they want assistance in implementing identified actions for improvement.

Final session: feedback and evaluation

Ms. Finch thanked participants and closed the meeting. Participants completed evaluation forms.

Feedback to ODIHR

Throughout the meeting, participants shared suggestions, which ODIHR will carefully consider:

- Introducing a hate crime bulletin – to give legal and policy updates.
- Work with other IGOs to prepare and circulate a table summarizing approaches and terminology of different inter-governmental organizations on definition of hate crime and hate speech. Several NPCs were interested in specifically follow up with IGOs on this task.
- More space on [hatecrime.osce](https://hatecrime.osce.org/) country page for participating States to include more information about their recording practices.
- Opportunity for NPCs to share guidelines and other national hate crime resources.
- ODIHR should stress that participating States have committed to report statistics to ODIHR. This might help facilitate the work of the NPC.
- ODIHR could do more to ‘make the case for data’ and why it is important to collect it.

Annex A: Agenda

Overall aims of the meeting:

- To exchange information, challenges and good practice initiatives among NPCs and ODIHR.
- To discuss the role of intergovernmental organizations including the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA), ODIHR, UNHCR and ECRI in supporting effective responses to hate crime
- To map and share key approaches to hate crime recording in the OSCE region and identify their strengths and challenges

ANNEX:

DAY 1

15.30 – 17.00 **NPCs - Roles and Responsibilities and briefing on key findings of the OSCE/ODIHR 2013 Annual Hate Crime Report**

Mr. Aleš Hanek and Ms. Joanna Perry, Hate Crime Officers

TND Hate Crime Officers provide an interactive briefing on the key findings of the 2013 hate crime report and the role of the NPCs. NPCs are consulted on a revised role description.

17.30 – 18.30 **OPENING**

Welcome

Ms. Cristina Finch, Head of Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department

Interactive panel discussion: The role of intergovernmental organizations in supporting effective responses to hate crime.

Representatives from the FRA, UNHCR, ODIHR and ECRI discuss how their organizations support governments to develop effective responses to hate crime and share related challenges with NPCs. CEJI will also join the panel to share the NGO perspective on how intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) support responses to hate crime.

18.30 **RECEPTION**

DAY 2

9.00 – 9.15

Introduction to day two

Mr. Aleš Hanek and Ms. Joanna Perry, Hate Crime Officers

The aims and activities of the day are described to participants.

9.15 - 10.30

Session one: Updates and challenges across the OSCE Region

Moderated by Ms. Joanna Perry, Hate Crime Officer

Participants work in small groups to update each other on their work in 2014, challenges they encounter in their role and identify how ODIHR can assist. Key issues are shared in plenary.

10.30 – 11.00

COFFEE BREAK

11.00 – 12.30

Session two: Sharing current practices in hate crime recording

Moderated by Mr. Aleš Hanek, Hate Crime Officer

Mr. Daniel Milo, National Point of Contact for Slovakia presents Slovakia's approach to recording hate crime within policy frameworks that focus on extremism. Ms. Karine Gilberg, National Point of Contact for France describes France's approach to hate crime recording, with a particular emphasis on ensuring compliance with data protection legislation. Ms. Joanna Perry presents 'ten practical steps to hate crime data collection' contained in ODIHR's recent publication *Hate Crime Monitoring and Recording: a practical guide* to provide a context to the issues. Presentations are followed by a question and answer session.

12.30 – 13.30

LUNCH

13.30 – 14.30

Session three: Mapping models of hate crime recording, part two

Moderated by Ms. Joanna Perry, Hate Crime Officer

Participants work in small groups to share their approaches to hate crime data collection, current gaps in their systems and key actions that need to be taken for improvement, based on ODIHR's 'ten practical steps'.

14.30-15.00

Coffee break

15.00-16.00

Session four: ODIHR updates

Moderated by Mr. Aleš Hanek, Hate Crime Officer

Rapporteurs of the small groups present the main findings. ODIHR shares recent publications and other developments in 2014 with participants. NPCs share feedback on 2013 questionnaire and website.

16.00 – 16.30

CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION

Annex B: List of Participants

Akin	Mehtap	NPC (Ministry of Justice)	Turkey
Berdychenko	Iryna	Ministry of Internal Affairs, Main Investigation Department	Ukraine
Biber	Aleš	NPC (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)	Slovenia
Blum	David	NPC (Federal Ministry of the Interior)	Austria
Bolognesi	Marco	Ministry of Interior	Italy
Borisova	Maryana	Commission for Protection against Discrimination	Bulgaria
Coventry- Howlett	Darren	Garda Racial, Intercultural and Diversity Office	Ireland
Djärv	Carina	NPC (National Council for Crime Prevention)	Sweden
García Gómez	Antonio	Observatory for Racism and Xenophobia in Spain	Spain
Gevorgyan	Vaheh	NPC (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)	Armenia
Giannasi	Paul	NPC (Ministry of Justice)	United Kingdom
Gilberg	Karine	NPC (Ministry of Justice)	France
Holm	Pia	NPC (Ministry of Interior)	Finland
Ilieva	Evgenija	NPC (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Jamborová	Kateřina	NPC (Ministry of Interior)	Czech Republic
Kalmet	Tanel	NPC (Ministry of Justice)	Estonia
Kerluku	Elton	NPC (State Police of Albania)	Albania
Kong	Rebecca	NPC (Statistics Canada, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics)	Canada
Marrecas Ferreira	Paulo	Documentation and Comparative Law Office	Portugal
Mereuță	Mihaela Raluca	NPC (Ministry of Justice)	Romania
Milo	Daniel	NPC (Ministry of Interior)	Slovakia
Müllershausen	Nikolaus	NPC (Federal Ministry of Interior)	Germany

Palóczy	Péter (Dr.)	Ministry of Justice	Hungary
Remery	Michel	Holy See	Switzerland/Holy See
Rusu	Eugene	NPC (General Prosecutor's Department of the Republic of Moldova)	Moldova
Schöfer	Eva	NPC (Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs)	Austria
Šoć	Vladimir	NPC (Ministry for Human and Minority Rights)	Serbia
Stevens	Karen L.	NPC (U.S. Department of Justice)	United States
Theologitou	Kalliopi	NPC (Ministry of Justice)	Greece
Virgl	Christoph	Federal Ministry of the Interior	Austria
Vlašić	Tanja	Office for Human Rights and Rights of National Minorities	Croatia
Wiecken	Alma	Federal Commission against Racism	Switzerland
Zaķe-Zaikovska	Vita	Ministry of the Interior	Latvia

Annex C: Final NPC role description

Role description for National Points of Contact on hate crimes

OSCE participating States have committed themselves³ to nominate “a national point of contact on hate crimes to periodically report to the ODIHR reliable information and statistics on hate crimes”. The relevant Ministerial Council Decision emphasizes the role of the National Point of Contact (NPC) in collecting and reporting information on hate crimes. Other OSCE commitments construe the NPC’s role more broadly: as a contact point for ODIHR when carrying out all aspects of its taskings related to hate crimes, and to co-ordinate with the relevant authorities in the participating State concerned.

This document reflects these two approaches and outlines practical tasks and areas for involvement of the NPC. It is, however, important to note that the NPCs are also primary channels of any hate crime-related communication from participating States to ODIHR. Over recent years, ODIHR’s co-operation with NPCs has led to the creation of an informal NPC network, enabling direct exchange of information among the NPCs themselves.

It is the responsibility of participating States to decide which institution is best placed to fulfil the NPC role, and nominate individual NPCs. Ideally, an NPC would be an authority positioned within the criminal justice system or other government agency responsible for or with direct access to hate crime statistics and information. In cases where more than one individual is nominated as the NPC, these should co-ordinate their communication with ODIHR. Changes in NPCs need to be communicated to ODIHR.

The Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department, and more specifically its Hate Crime Officers, are ODIHR’s main contacts for communication with NPCs. The e-mail tdinfo@odhr.pl can be used to contact these Officers.

Primary tasks: Collecting and reporting official hate crime information

The primary responsibility of the NPC is to serve as a direct point of contact between ODIHR and the OSCE participating State. ODIHR gathers official information submitted by participating States and publishes it on its hate crime reporting website <http://hatecrime.osce.org/>. Information received can also be included in ODIHR reports and publications, or be disseminated through the Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Information System ([TANDIS](#)).

The NPC should:

1. provide *official* information on hate crimes to ODIHR; the following information can be submitted (and complemented or corrected) through an online questionnaire:
 - a. **statistics:** official government statistics on hate crimes, collected by police, prosecution services and the judiciary, and including available breakdowns by bias motivation and crime type;
 - b. **legislation:** information on laws, their specific provisions pertaining to hate crimes and relevant amendments;
 - c. **national initiatives:** initiatives taken at the national level to strengthen the response to hate crimes. Local or national initiatives may be relevant to data collection, training for law enforcement or judicial officials, raising awareness

³ Most recently in Ministerial Council Decision 9/09, adopted in Athens in 2009; available [here](#).

about and preventing hate crime, co-operation with civil society, the establishment of specialized working bodies designed to address hate crimes and the promotion of mutual respect and understanding; and

- d. **reports:** relevant thematic reports that have been compiled at the national level on hate crime issues.
2. if necessary, channel information requests to the institution/person best placed nationally to deal with ODIHR enquiries and to clarify or complement any information that is unclear or incomplete;
3. review the relevant national country page and other relevant information posted at <http://hatecrime.osce.org/> and inform ODIHR of any issues identified as part of the consultative process; and
4. inform and update ODIHR on any other relevant national hate crime-related developments.

Further NPC co-operation with ODIHR: Providing expert input for ODIHR's capacity-building programmes and initiatives

ODIHR supports national efforts through a wide range of programmes and initiatives. To assist ODIHR in fulfilling its mandate, NPCs can, for example:

1. disseminate information about ODIHR's training programmes for law enforcement (**TAHCLE**), prosecutors (**PAHCT**) and capacity-building activities for improving hate crime data collection, and facilitate contact between interested national structures and ODIHR in the lead up to requests for implementation of these programmes;
2. participate in the planning and implementation of TAHCLE, PAHCT and/or data-collection activities – for example, as members of national implementation working groups;
3. become involved in ODIHR training efforts as trainers;
4. identify individuals, institutions, and/or civil society organizations to participate in or speak at ODIHR seminars, conferences or expert consultation events;
5. facilitate exchange between the authorities and ODIHR when reviewing a hate crime or related law, and/or in the lead up to a request for such a review;
6. disseminate ODIHR's publications, training and education materials; and
7. help prepare and co-ordinate country visits by ODIHR or OSCE officials, when these are linked to hate crimes issues.

Areas for potential further involvement by NPCs: Using ODIHR's tools to improve national responses

Involvement with ODIHR, exposure to good practices from other jurisdictions through the NPC network, and access to information on hate crime, give NPCs the tools needed to lead and advance efforts to strengthen national responses to hate crimes.

Many ODIHR NPCs have actively engaged their domestic partners and become drivers of positive change on a national level, helping, for example, to:

1. contribute to the formulation of national strategies or action plans in response to hate crimes;
2. pass laws specifically addressing hate crimes;
3. develop or strengthen national mechanisms co-ordinating the response to hate crimes;

4. implement national police and prosecutor training programmes (TAHCLE and PAHCT);
5. strengthen or initiate cross-agency co-operation, sharing of approaches and definitions;
6. introduce intra-agency policies, guidance or instructions on hate crimes;
7. engage with victim groups and civil society organizations; and
8. improve the disaggregation of recorded data by bias motivation.