

Facing all the Facts: Self-assessment grid on hate crime recording and data collection, framed by international norms and standards – England & Wales

This document sets out the evidence that can be used to understand and describe current strengths and weaknesses across the relationships that form national hate crime recording and data collection systems.¹ It aims to build on and complement existing approaches such as OSCE-ODIHR's Key Observations framework and its INFAHCT Programme.² Guidance that relates to what evidence can be captured, used and published by public authorities is based on a list of standards which is provided as a separate document. This framework seeks to support an inclusive and victim-focused assessment of the national situation, based on a concept of *relationships*. It integrates a consideration of evidence of CSO-public authority cooperation on hate crime recording and data collection as well as evidence relating to the quality of CSO efforts to directly record and monitor hate crimes against the communities they support and represent.³

Table one sets out the general approach to self-assessment and the main relationships in the 'system'. Table two provides the country-based description. It is important to note that there can be many different agencies playing some kind of role in recording and data collection within one country, especially in federalised and devolved systems. Where possible, it is important to capture this complexity. For the purposes of this project, the focus is at the national level. Where there is information about significant regional differences within a country, this is highlighted. There can also be significant variations in the legal procedure that governs how cases progress from the investigation to prosecution stages across different jurisdictions. For example, cases can be directly reported to prosecutors as opposed to law enforcement; some cases are prosecuted by law enforcement, not prosecutors. Again, this methodology aims to reflect this complexity, however it remains a 'work in progress', amendable at the national level post-publication. For a full consideration of the limitations of this framework, see the Methodology Report.

¹ See methodology report for more on the concept of 'systems'.

² ODIHR Key Observations, <http://hatecrime.osce.org/sites/default/files/documents/Website/Key%20Observations/KeyObservations-20140417.pdf>; this methodology could also be incorporated in the framework of INFAHCT self-assessment, as described on pp. 22-23 here: <https://www.osce.org/odihr/INFAHCT?download=true>

³ For a full description of the main stakeholders included in national assessments, and how the self-assessment framework relates to the 'systems map', see the Methodology Report, Part II.

Table one: Self-assessments: general approach

Relationship	Evidence used to describe relationships Two main categories of evidence are applied based on referenced international norms and standards.		Score
	Framework	Action	
<p>The main relationships are identified across the system:</p> <p>Law-enforcement – prosecution; judiciary; Ministry of Interior</p> <p>Prosecution – Judiciary, Ministry of Justice</p> <p>Ministries - Ministries (e.g. Mol-MoJ, etc.)</p> <p>Victim - law enforcement; prosecution, ministries; CSOs</p> <p>General public – law enforcement; Ministry(ies), prosecution; CSOs</p> <p>CSOs – law enforcement; prosecution; ministries, other CSOs.</p> <p>IGO – ministry(ies); CSOs</p> <p>Other bodies and ministries are also relevant, including equality bodies and non-criminal justice agencies and ministries.</p> <p>These are included where relevant in national reports.</p>	<p>Technical frameworks allow for recording and data collection</p> <p>Policy frameworks allow information to be shared across the system.</p> <p>The most active and responsible ministries produce a policy framework that gives the police and other agencies the technical capacity to identify, record and act on hate crime data. If a government ministry hasn't developed an inter-departmental framework to allow for police to record all bias motivations or led the process to develop joint guidelines on recording and data collection, the police are limited in how they can relate to victims in this area.</p>	<p>Evidence that the frameworks are used – data is recorded, shared, collected, published and information is acted upon to develop policy and improve responses.</p> <p>The 'frontline', whether investigators, prosecutors or CSOs are the ones that 'give life' to, or are limited by, existing policy frameworks.</p>	<p>Each relationship is given a score of 0-3 for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'framework' 2. 'action' <p>An overall score of 5-6= green; 3-4 = amber; 0-2 = red.</p> <p>Green = Good relationship. Strong ability (framework) and strong effort (action) to connect, always with room for improvement.</p> <p>Amber = Adequate relationship. Relatively limited ability and effort to connect.</p> <p>Red= Poor relationship. Very limited ability and low effort to connect.</p>

Specific relationships and criteria

<p>General analysis (see main report)</p> <p>Key points – specific lines between police and CSOs because there is specific data sharing.</p>			
Relationship	Evidence: this column sets out the evidence that is considered when describing a relationship as ‘red’, ‘amber’ or ‘green’ (See table one) (Refer to end note for relevant international norm/standard)		Score
	Framework	Action	
<p>Law enforcement police – prosecution CPS</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Law enforcement are able to comprehensively record hate crimes, including bias indicators and specifically flag bias motivations and crime types (Standards 1,2,3,4)</p> <p>Law enforcement are able to record information about victim support and safety. (Standard 5)</p> <p>The prosecution service is able to record information sent to them by the police about bias motivations and crime type (Standard 4) and relevant information about victim support and safety (Standard 5)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Realistic data is produced by the system (very low numbers indicate an unrealistic measure of hate crime prevalence) (Standards 6 and 7).</p> <p>Data is shared systematically between the police and prosecution service to progress individual cases, including meeting victim’s safety needs, and to review issues in performance.</p> <p>Law enforcement and prosecution service meet regularly, to review progress and share information and/or take part in joint training.</p>	<p>Framework: 3 Action: 2 Colour: green</p>

	<p>The two bodies are members of a policy and technical framework to record and share data about bias indicators, crime types and victim support/safety needs (Standard 8; Standard 9)</p>		
	<p><i>Description of national situation:</i> Police in England and Wales record hate crimes based on the following definition, "any criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by hostility or prejudice towards someone based on a personal characteristic." This definition is applied to five centrally monitored strands of hate crime: (i) race or ethnicity; (ii) religion or belief; (iii) sexual orientation; (iv) disability; and (v) transgender identity.</p> <p>When recording crimes, police are required to consider if an offence is a hate crime before they can progress to the next step of recording. If the definition applies, it can be flagged based on more than one monitored category.</p> <p>The police are required to undertake assessments of victims' needs and the risks they face (p. 68).</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> 94,098 hate crimes were recorded in 2017-2018, an increase of 17% compared to the previous year. The increase in recorded crime is to be welcomed as a sign that the gap between unreported crime, indicated by the Crime Survey for England and Wales is reducing and that police are improving their ability to recognise and record hate crimes.</p> <p>However, in 2014 the criminal justice inspectorate, HMICFRS found that overall crime was under-recorded by 19%.⁴ A 2018 inspection by the same inspectorate found that police missed the opportunity to record an incident as a hate crime in 11 out of the 40 cases they reviewed.⁵ The Inspectorate report recommends specific steps, including training for call handlers and first responders on improving the identification and recording of hate crime. The Facing all the Facts Project has developed, piloted and launched this online learning.</p>	

⁴ Her Majesty's Inspectorate for the Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Service (2014), 'Making the Victim Count', <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/publications/crime-recording-making-the-victim-count/>

⁵ HMICFRS, 'Understanding the difference' (2018), p. 51

	<p>The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and Police share the same monitoring definition of hate crime. The CPS must also (manually) apply a hate crime ‘flag’ on their recording system where a case is already flagged by the police and, published policy on making prosecution decisions and preparing cases must be followed (see victim-CPS relationship for further detail).</p> <p>Unlike police data, which must also be submitted to and reviewed by the Home Office (See police-Home Office relationship). CPS data is produced, reviewed and published internally. As such they are performance as opposed to statistical reports. This is explained in the methodology section of its annual reports. The data that forms the basis of CPS hate crime reporting is derived from the CPS’ Case Management System (CMS), CPS’ Witness Management System (WMS) and its associated Management Information System (MIS). The data are held within three separate databases within the MIS4, based on defendants, offences and victims or witnesses. Data cannot be correlated between the separate databases. This means that CPS data is entirely dependent on the correct manual application of the flag.</p> <p>Information about victim support and safety needs in the context of applying for measures to support them during the criminal justice process should</p>	<p>Overall, based on police-recorded and crime survey data, policy makers and practitioners have access to rich and realistic data about the prevalence and impact of hate crime in England and Wales and about where action is needed to improve the quality of official data and responses to victims.</p> <p>In 2017-2018 14,151 cases were prosecuted. All hate crime charge decisions must be made by the CPS as a matter of policy. This means that police must refer all hate crime cases to the CPS when they believe they have discovered evidence of a suspect’s guilt . There has been a recent decrease in the number of cases referred by the police. As stated in the CPS 2017-2018 report, ‘The most recent data (2017/18) indicates a continued fall in receipts of 4.4%. The most significant falls over 2017/18 were: Staffordshire 39.0%; North Yorkshire 34.6%; South Wales 25.8%; Derbyshire 22.5%; and West Mercia 22.5%’.</p> <p>There is evidence that the CPS and police are using these findings to take action. As stated in the CPS 2017-2018 hate crime report, ‘Following discussion with the NPCC, a police-led assessment exercise was undertaken in Q3 2017/18 across a sample of affected forces. The aim was to identify and explore disposals in cases recorded as hate crimes but not referred to the CPS for charging. Once the</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<p>also be registered and used to determine if a victim or witness needs particular support to take part in the criminal justice process, in line with specific obligations under the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime. (see victim-police and victim-CPS relationships for further information)</p> <p>Senior police and CPS representatives are members of a hate crime strategy board along with representatives from other government departments and agencies to ensure implementation of the Government's Hate Crime Action Plan, which includes obligations relating to improving hate crime reporting, recording and data collection.</p> <p>The plan is ultimately overseen by the Inter-Ministerial Group (IMG) on Safe and Integrated Communities. The IMG is co-chaired by the Home Secretary and the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government and has Ministers from key other Government Departments, including the Departments for Education, Health and Social Care, Education, Culture Media and Sport, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Ministry of Justice. Alongside this sits a Directors General chaired Board of senior officials responsible for coordinating work across seven Integration and Counter Extremism programmes to deliver the ambitions in the Government's Counter-</p>	<p>results of the assessment exercise are known, joint action will be taken to address findings.' (p. 21)</p> <p>The most recent in a series of joint inspections focused on police and CPS' handling of disability hate crime found that the police failed to communicate victims needs to the CPS in 57% of disability hate crime cases referred.</p> <p>There is no established programme of joint training involving the CPS and Police. CPS training is delivered nationally, which might increase the likelihood of consistent outcomes.</p> <p>Police training is locally implemented, which might increase the chance of inconsistent outcomes and delivery. The Facing all the Facts project developed and launched online learning aimed at all police call handlers and first responders.</p> <p>Recent research found that communication between police and CPS can be problematic, recommending that, 'the CPS provide police (and independent barristers employed for the prosecution) with a direct and open line to CPS area hate crime leads in order to ensure that credible evidence of hostility is collated early on in the investigation process.'. Hate Crime and the Legal Process: Option for Law Reform, Walters et al (2017) p. 87</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>Extremism (2015) and Integrated Communities Strategies (2018).</p> <p>An Independent Advisory Group on Hate Crime comprised of CSOs, academics and others provides critical input and challenge to the delivery of the action plan.</p> <p>Every regional hate crime leads group has police and CPS representation and are tasked with reviewing performance etc.</p> <p>The CPS also has its own Hate Crime Strategy, committing itself to, 'Improving the accuracy and completeness of relevant data'.</p> <p>The CPS and police are implementing a Hate Crime Evidence Checklist to improve the preparation of cases.</p>	<p>Senior police and CPS representatives meet quarterly within the framework of the national hate crime strategy board described above.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
Law enforcement police – courts	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>Law enforcement are able to comprehensively record hate crimes, including bias indicators and specifically flag bias motivations and crime types (Standards 1,2,3,4)</p> <p>The courts have the facility to record sentencing information, including whether the hate element was considered and the outcome (Standard 7)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>Realistic data is produced by the system (very low numbers indicate hate crime laws are not being used). (Standards 6 and 7)</p> <p>Emerging information is used – for example, meetings involving both parties discuss available data, problem-solve and identify actions.</p>	<p>Framework: 1</p> <p>Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: Amber</p>

	<p>The two bodies are members of a policy and technical framework that allows cases to be traced from investigation to sentencing stages and to record and share data about victim safety and support needs (Standards 5, 8 and 9).</p>		
	<p><i>Description of national situation:</i> See law enforcement – prosecution relationship for police recording procedure.</p> <p>The Courts system</p> <p>The police, Crown Prosecution Service and the Courts have independent IT systems. The result is that the ‘hate crime marker’ is manually transferred from one agency to the next, increasing the chance of error and omission and reducing the chance of obtaining comparable data.</p> <p>The Judiciary is independent. The courts are administered by a service within the Ministry of Justice. The Courts service in England and Wales has two different and unconnected systems for the Magistrates and Crown Courts. Both have ‘markers’ where administrators can mark that a court hearing recognized a crime as a hate crime. In practice these systems have not produced useful data as they require an administrator to proactively input the marker and many cases have</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation:</i></p> <p>A national shared platform aims to provide a consistency that will allow much more robust data of CJS interventions in hate crime cases and the current arrangements collect the most vital information because the CPS has seen the value of collecting courts data to help assess its own performance.</p> <p>CPS performance in capturing court decisions on applying hate crime sentence uplifts has significantly improved. The CPS 2017-2018 hate crime report it stated that it recorded sentence uplifts were issued in 67.1% of hate crime prosecutions which was up from 53.5% in the previous year.</p> <p>Overall, evidence suggests that challenges in IT systems outlined in the framework section above have significantly undermined the criminal justice system’s effectiveness in tracing hate crime cases across the system and recording sentencing outcomes (see also Walters et al, 2017).</p>	

	<p>been missed.</p> <p>In recognition of this shortfall in capability the Crown Prosecution Service has agreed to record Court activity and case results pending a new single IT system that is under development to join CPS, Courts and Probation Services to provide a continuous record of action. A benefit of this will be that once a case is identified as a hate crime then that marker will stay on the case throughout the CJS and will make data analysis significantly more robust.</p> <p>The Ministry of Justice is represented on the Hate Crime Strategy Board and the Independent Advisory Group has supported Judicial and Magistracy training for hate crime.</p>		
	Framework	Action	
<p>Law enforcement Police – Ministry of Interior (Home Office)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Law enforcement are able to comprehensively record hate crimes, including bias indicators, and specifically flag bias motivations and crime types (Standards 1, 2, 3, 4)</p> <p>Law enforcement are able to record information about victim support and safety (Standard 5)</p> <p>This information can shared with the Home Office or relevant ministry for data collection and analysis.</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Emerging information is used – for example, meetings involving both parties discuss available data, problem-solve and identify actions.</p> <p>Realistic data is produced by the system (very low number suggest that the system isn't being used) and there is regular publication of hate crime data in national statistics.</p>	<p>Framework:3</p> <p>Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: green</p>

	<p>The two bodies are members of a policy and technical framework to record and share data about bias indicators, crime types and victim support/safety needs (Standards 8 and 9).</p>		
	<p><i>Description of national situation:</i> Police are able to comprehensively record hate crimes and victims support and safety needs (see police-CPS relationship above).</p> <p>Hate crime data are supplied to the Home Office by the 43 territorial police forces of England and Wales, plus the British Transport Police. Forces either supply the data at least monthly via the Home Office Data Hub (HODH) or on an annual basis in a manual return. For forces with data on the Data Hub, the Home Office extracts the number of offences for each force which have been flagged by forces as having been motivated by one or more of the monitored strands. Therefore, counts of hate crime via the HODH are dependent on the flag being used for each hate crime offence. It is then possible to derive the count of offences and the monitored strands covered.</p> <p>The Home Office also leads on the production of the Crime Survey for England and Wales, which provides important context for police data (see police-CPS relationship).</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation:</i> There is regular publication of hate crime data in the National Statistics . Crime Surveys suggest that citizens exposure to hate crime is reducing over time (In England and Wales) but recorded hate crime is significantly increased. This effectively indicates that the police recorded 1 in 2 actual hate crimes in 2017/18 compared to 1 in 6 in 2009.</p> <p>The combined data provided by police-recorded data and the Crime Survey for England and Wales is described in the police-CPS relationship (See also Home Office-Victim relationship for crime survey). Overall, it provides a good basis for trouble shooting and problem solving. These data have been used to develop the Government’s Hate Crime Action Plan.</p> <p>In addition to formal data publications, hate crime data is collated nationally to inform policing decisions and to assess community tensions. The regularity of these reports is dictated by prevailing threat levels but can range from daily to quarterly.</p> <p>The increased reporting of hate crime has come at</p>	

	<p>In addition to the hate crime national statistics which are collated and published by the Home Office, the police collate and analyse hate crime data on more regular timescales. This period can range from quarterly to daily as dictated by prevailing threat assessments. These reports are not rigorous enough for publication as not enough time has passed for data validation but they are collated by the National Community Tensions Team (NCTT) and used to inform operational decisions. Redacted versions of the reports are shared with officials from relevant Ministries.</p> <p>Senior police and Home Office representatives are members of a hate crime strategy board along with representatives from other government departments and agencies to oversee implementation of the Government's Hate Crime Action Plan, which includes obligations relating to improving hate crime reporting, recording and data collection</p>	<p>a time of significantly reduced funding and police staffing levels and some stakeholders believe that this has had an impact on the service levels by those victims who have come forward. Maintaining confidence in affected communities could be challenged if these extra crimes do not receive an effective response.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
Prosecution (CPS)- Judiciary	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The prosecution service is able to record relevant information about evidence of bias and, where appropriate, systematically present this to the court (Standards 4 and 7).</p> <p>There is the facility to record sentencing</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Emerging information is used – for example, meetings involving both parties discuss available data, problem-solve and identify actions.</p> <p>Realistic data is produced by the system (very low numbers indicate hate crime laws are not being</p>	<p>Framework:2</p> <p>Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: Amber</p>

	<p>information, including whether the hate element was considered and the outcome (Standard 7)</p> <p>The two bodies are members of a policy and technical framework to record and share data about bias indicators, crime types and victim support/safety needs. (Standards 8 and 9)</p>	<p>used) (Standard 6)</p> <p>There is no evidence that the prosecution and judiciary regularly reflect on problems and gaps with the data and information that is captured.</p>	
	<p><i>Description of national situation:</i> The CPS is able to record detailed information relating to its prosecution activities on hate crime including cases referred by the police, charging decisions and victim and witness needs for support at court (see police-CPS relationship).</p> <p>CPS also records information about the court process, including whether a sentence uplift was applied.</p> <p>Data on the outcomes of specific offences of hate crime (for example, the racially and religiously aggravated offences of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1997, as amended) are more reliable than those relating to whether a sentence uplift was applied by the court. This is because the specific offences are charged and recorded fully at the earlier stages of the criminal justice process whereas the sentence enhancements are applied at the end of the process by the court. To be recorded, the judge or magistrate must state in open court that the offence has been aggravated by hostility towards disability, sexual orientation,</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation:</i> CPS performance on recording sentencing uplifts (see framework above) has greatly improved in recent years, according to its 2017-2018 Hate Crime Report</p> <p>There is no evidence that the prosecution and judiciary regularly reflect on problems and gaps with the data and information that is captured.</p>	

	transgender identify, race or religion and the outcome must be manually recorded. The CPS has committed to record sentence uplifts in its case management system and has greatly improved in this area in recent years.		
	Framework	Action	
Grey line connecting Ministry of Interior (Home Office), Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The ministries receive data and information from law enforcement and local authorities, respectively (Standards 1,2,3,4).</p> <p>The ministries are members of a policy and technical framework to record and share data about bias indicators, crime types and victim support/safety needs across the criminal justice system (standards 8 and 9)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Emerging information is used – for example, meetings involving both parties discuss available data, problem-solve and identify actions.</p> <p>Realistic data is produced by the system (very low numbers indicate hate crime laws are not being used) (Standards 6 and 7)</p>	Framework: 2 Action:3 Colour: N/A
	<p><i>National description</i> There is the facility to share the range of information gathered by the police, prosecution service and others, detailed in this map, across the relevant government ministries that are members of the Inter-Ministerial Group (IMG) on Safe and Integrated Communities (see police-Home Office relationship). The Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government partly fund the National Community Tensions Team (NCTT). See main report for further information on the Government’s strategic framework and action plan on understanding and addressing hate crime.</p>	<p><i>National description</i> Relationships across ministries are strong and allow information to be used as a basis for immediate and longer term action and to allow Ministries to inform decisions on the latest information as well as share data and information with local authorities for appropriate action. For example information is used as the basis of national action plans and immediate responses as a result in spikes in hate incidents and crimes.</p>	

	Framework	Action	
Victim- Law enforcement Police	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Law enforcement are able to comprehensively record hate crimes, including bias indicators – including victim perception - and flag bias motivations and crime types (Standards 1, 2, 3, 4)</p> <p>Law enforcement are able to record information about victim support and safety (standard 5)</p> <p>There is a process to keep victims informed about the progress of the investigation (Standard 10, 11, 12, 13,14)</p> <p>Law enforcement can accept anonymous reports of hate crime.</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The system is used to record bias motivations and crime types and to ensure specific support to victims (Standards 15 and 16)</p> <p>The system is used to keep victims informed about the progress of the investigation (Standard 11)</p> <p>Action is taken to increase reporting (Standard 17)</p>	<p>Framework: 2</p> <p>Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: Amber</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation:</i> Operational Guidance sets out recording obligations and directs police to conduct needs assessment, however a recent Inspection by HMICFRS, 'Understanding the Difference' found that the framework was insufficiently detailed, concluding that, 'The lack of national direction means that the type and level of service victims receive depend on where they live.'(p. 63). The Inspection found that 12 forces have a bespoke hate crime risk</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation:</i> The police recorded over 90,000 hate crimes in 2017-2018 (see police-CPS relationship). The increase in recorded crime indicates increased victim confidence and police ability to record. However, weaknesses in police identification and recording have been identified (See police-prosecution relationship).</p> <p>The Crime Survey for England and Wales 2017-2018 (see Home Office-victim relationship)</p>	

	<p>assessment, 18 use a generic risk assessment that applies to all victims, five use a risk assessment for hate crime which relates to anti-social behaviour and eight have no secondary risk assessment process at all. Similarly, in our case assessments, we found that only 56 out of 180 had an enhanced risk assessment completed. This is deeply unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Anonymous reports can be received through a large number of third party reporting centres, on the True Vision web portal, and from established CSOs that record and monitor hate crime (see CSO-police relationships).</p> <p>The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime imposes the obligation on police to assess victims' support needs. Victims of hate crime are entitled to an enhanced service, which includes being informed about the progress of investigations within shorter timescales, being referred to a specialist service, where available. The police are also obliged to explain and offer to help victims complete a 'victim personal statement', explaining the impact of the offence on them. The VPS is considered by the court during the sentencing stage.</p>	<p>reported that only 51 per cent of hate crime victims were very or fairly satisfied with the handling of the matter, compared to 69% of victims of CSEW crime overall. Hate crime victims were also more likely to be very dissatisfied (25%) with the police handling of the matter than overall CSEW crime (15%). The survey also found that victims of hate crime were less likely to think the police had treated them fairly or with respect (67%), compared with victims of CSEW crime overall (81%).</p> <p>Police forces are required to conduct their own 'victim satisfactions surveys', which include questions on hate crime. This information is gathered at local level and can be shared during community-engagement activities and to inspectorates. It is not collated nationally.</p> <p>A recent inspection by HMICFRS on disability hate crime found that efforts to give victims information and refer them to support services, were inconsistent, and some inadequate across the country. For example, some forces did not have accessible versions of their information leaflets for people with visual impairments and for people with learning disabilities (p. 72).</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>A series of joint inspections focused on police and CPS’ handling of disability hate crime. Issues identified in the most recent inspection included (also see CPS-victim relationship):</p> <p>The police failed to communicate victims needs to the CPS in 57% of disability hate crime cases referred.</p> <p>Appropriate arrangements to support victims to give their best evidence were made in 17 cases (32.7%), and overall, for victim care, 41 of the 90 (45.6%) cases were judged as inadequate or requiring improvement and only 49 (54.4%) as good or outstanding (this finding also applied to the police).</p> <p>In terms of increasing reporting, there are many examples of actions taken by local police to increase reporting at the local level, often as part of Hate Crime Awareness Week.</p> <p>For national efforts, see Home Office-victim relationship.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
Victim – Prosecution CPS	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>There is a process to keep victims informed about the progress of the criminal justice process (Standards 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18,19).</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The system is used to keep victims informed</p>	<p>Framework: 2</p> <p>Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: amber</p>

	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>The CPS is bound by the Code for Victims of Crime. Victims of hate crime are entitled to an enhanced service, which includes being informed about the progress of prosecutions within shorter timescales, including whether a case has been dropped. The CPS has obligations to apply for support measures at court to assist victims and witnesses to give their ‘best evidence’.</p> <p>CPS also has published its commitments to victims in a range of hate crime prosecution public statements.</p> <p>The CPS has published a specific guide to support for disabled victims and witnesses.</p> <p>The CPS has recently committed to reviewing and publicly reporting on the quality of their letters to victims.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>As reported in CPS Annual Reports, the CPS has steadily increased the percentage of successful hate crime prosecutions. In 2017-2018, there was a 84.7% conviction rate of cases flagged as hate crimes.</p> <p>There is limited information relating to the quality of CPS communication and connection with victims in general. A series of joint inspections focused on police and CPS’ handling of disability hate crime.</p> <p>Issues identified in the most recent inspection included (also see police-victim relationship):</p> <p>Appropriate arrangements to support victims to give their best evidence were made in 17 cases (32.7%); none of the victim letters that were inspected had been adjusted to accommodate the victim’s disability. Overall, for victim care, 41 of the 90 (45.6%) cases were judged as inadequate or requiring improvement and only 49 (54.4%) as good or outstanding (this finding also applied to the police).</p>	
	Framework	Action	
Victim - Judiciary	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>There is the facility to record sentencing information, including whether the hate element was considered and the outcome (Standards 6 and 7).</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The court informs the victim of the sentencing outcome and whether the hate element of the offence is reflected.</p>	<p>Framework: 2</p> <p>Action: 0</p> <p>Colour: red</p>

	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>The prosecution and courts service (see victim-prosecution relationship) are able to record the sentencing outcomes, however, sentencing remarks, which refer to whether a sentence uplift has been applied and why, are only published for cases that are regarded as being ‘in the public interest’. Most hate crime case will not qualify under this narrow test. The Lammy Review recommends that, ‘in future, all sentencing remarks should be published in both audio and written form. This would provide a clear record for victims and offenders of the rationale for sentencing decisions.’ (page, 36).</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>There is no evidence that victims are routinely informed by the court about whether and why a sentencing enhancement has been applied.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
Victim - Home Office	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>There is an established and resourced framework to gather data about unreported hate crime – for example through victimisation surveys that include questions about hate crime (standard 20, Standard 21, Standard 22)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>Relevant policy commitments on improving reporting and support have been made and acted upon (Standard 17)</p> <p>Victimisation surveys are carried out and the results are published in an accessible format (Standard 23)</p>	<p>Framework: 2</p> <p>Action:2</p> <p>Colour: amber</p>

	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>The Home Office conducts regular crime surveys that, since 2009, have included questions on hate crime. The findings are fed into its Hate Crime Action plan (see police- Home Office relationship).</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>The crime surveys give regular and comprehensive estimates of the prevalence of hate crime in England and Wales (see police-Home Office relationship).</p> <p>Policy commitments relating to improving support and reporting have been made in successive hate crime action plans, however, there is evidence that local civil society organisations with the skills to provide this support are struggling to remain open due to a lack of funding. The main report details the limitations of current hate crime reporting approaches and makes specific suggestions for improvement.</p> <p>A major awareness raising campaign on hate crime was carried out in 2018.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
Victim - CSO monitoring Racist hate crime	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)</p>	<p>Framework: 1</p> <p>Action: 1</p> <p>Colour: red</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>While there are several dedicated local and regional services for victims of racist crime that record and monitor incidents – see for example, Stop Hate UK and Stand Against Racism and Inequality (SARI) - there is no organisation with</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>Although reports of racist crime are by far the most commonly reported and recorded, there is no hate crime recording and monitoring CSO focused on racist crime that has national reach.</p> <p>There is evidence, presented in the main report</p>	

	<p>national coverage, focusing on recording and monitoring racist crime.</p> <p>Stop Hate UK provides a service in 8 London Boroughs, 12 English counties and 2 universities. Users can connect with the service through social media, whatsapp and a telephone hotline.</p>	<p>that local and regional CSOs have had to reduce or close down their activities due to a perennial lack of funding.</p> <p>Stop hate UK received 397 reports of racist incidents in 2017-2018. Stop Hate regularly refers callers to the police and support services.</p> <p>Issues relating to reporting and recording of racist crime are discussed in the main report.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
Victim(s)- CSO disability hate crime	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)</p>	<p>Framework: 1</p> <p>Action: 1</p> <p>Colour: Red</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>RADAR has produced a detailed and high quality guide to setting up third party reporting centres for disability hate crime.</p> <p>While there are several dedicated local and regional services for victims of disability hate crime that record and monitor incidents – see for example CHOICE Hackney and Stop Hate UK - there is no organisation with a national profile, focusing on recording and monitoring disability hate crime.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>As set out above there is no hate crime recording and monitoring CSO focused on disability hate crime that has national reach. There is evidence, presented in the main report that local and regional CSOs have had to reduce or close down their activities due to a perennial lack of funding.</p> <p>Stop Hate UK recorded 300 cases of disability hate crime in 2017-2018. Stop Hate UK regularly refers callers to the police and support services.</p> <p>It is unknown how many organisations are using</p>	

	<p>Stop Hate UK provides a service in 8 London Boroughs, 12 English counties and 2 universities. Users can connect with the service through social media, whatsapp and a telephone hotline. It also provides a specific learning disability hate crime service.</p>	<p>the RADAR guidance.</p> <p>Issues relating to reporting and recording racist crime are discussed in the main report.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
Victim(s)- CSO Anti-LGBT+ hate crime	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)</p>	<p>Framework: 1 Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: Amber</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>There are several local and regional services for victims of hate crime against LGBT+ people in England and Wales. Galop is the only specialist LGBT anti-violence charity in the country and runs a national recording and reporting service with telephone and online options for reporting and support. The service gives victims the option of allowing Galop to report an incident to the police on their behalf and provides a range of information about hate crime against LGBT+ people. Galop is well known in the LGBT+ community and significantly invests in raising awareness of its reporting and support services.</p> <p>Stop Hate UK provides a service in 8 London</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>Several thousand incidents are reported to Galop annually. The organisation’s London-based case work service provides in-depth support to hundreds of victims of homophobic and transphobic hate crime annually. Galop regularly refers people to relevant services, however, victims of anti-LGBT+ hate crime outside London are unlikely to receive this specialist service.</p> <p>Stop Hate UK recorded 117 homophobic incidents and 49 transphobic incidents in 2017-2018</p> <p>There are some local groups established to support victims of LGBT Hate Crime but their coverage is not universal and tends to be based in</p>	

	<p>Boroughs, 12 English counties and 2 universities. Users can connect with the service through social media, whatsapp and a telephone hotline.</p>	<p>Metropolitan areas. The reduction in funding to CSO's supporting hate crime victims has led to many areas favouring 'universal' services that support all victims of hate crime and some LGBT advocates believe that such a service is likely to less favoured by many LGBT victims.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
<p>Victim(s) -CSO Anti-GRT hate crime.</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)</p>	<p>Framework: 1 Action: 1 Colour: Red</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> The CSO Herts GATE runs the online reporting portal, Report Racism GRT, which guides users to a clear and simple form. The site also links to support services in different parts of the country and the police-run reporting site, True Vision. Herts GATE was a local service that has recently been given support to begin national coverage and as such they are still developing their reach into the wider national community.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> There is no data available on how well or often the reporting Herts GATE site is used by victims or whether victims are referred to support. The report racism site shows live data, however, it isn't clear which timescales or locations the data refers to. The police facility True Vision has a dedicated section for GTR communities and this site has been viewed 22,000 times in 2 years. Whilst not all viewers will have been GTR that figure is around 8-25% of the population estimates of the National Statistics Office.</p>	

	Framework	Action	
Victim(s) – CSO Anti-Muslim hate crime.	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)</p>	<p>Framework: 2 Action: 3</p> <p>Colour: green</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> There are many civil society organisations and groups around the country that record and monitor anti-Muslim hate crimes.</p> <p>The organisation Tell MAMA runs Measuring Anti-Muslim Attacks (MAMA), which is a secure reporting service that allows people from across the UK to report any form of Anti-Muslim abuse. Incidents can also be reported through WhatsApp, twitter, Facebook, etc. A report is followed up by a phone call to confirm details and determine if a support referral is needed.</p> <p>Tell MAMA has a national Information Sharing Agreement with the National Police Chiefs’ Council and exchanges anonymised information at local and national level.</p> <p>Importantly, Tell MAMA supports all victims of anti-Muslim hostility including sectarian attacks and those based on mistaken perception.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> Tell MAMA’s annual reports (See Tell MAMA-general public) clearly illustrate that victims and witnesses regularly report hate incidents to the organisation. It isn’t clear how many victims were referred to specialist support either delivered directly by Tell MAMA or another agency.</p> <p>Stop Hate recorded 129 ‘Faith-based’ incidents, however these are not disaggregated further (https://www.stophateuk.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Stop-Hate-UK-Stats-Report-2017-18-FINAL.pdf)</p>	

	<p>This infographic details the process they follow.</p> <p>Stop Hate UK provides a service in 8 London Boroughs, 12 English counties and 2 universities. Users can connect with the service through social media, whatsapp and a telephone hotline.</p>		
	Framework	Action	
Victim- CSO antisemitic hate crime	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)</p>	<p>Framework: 3</p> <p>Action: 3</p> <p>Colour: green</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>The Community Security Trust works across England and Wales to offer support and advice to victims of antisemitic hate crime. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal safety advice; • Online, telephone and email reporting of hate crime • Referrals to other agencies, Help in reporting to Police or 3rd party reporting on their behalf; • Guidance through the Criminal Justice System and accompanying victims to court; • Trained psychological support volunteers who are available to speak to victims; • 24/7 emergency number for ongoing hate crimes/incidents; • Online & hard copy 'Hate Crime: A guide for those affected' 	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>CST receives reports of antisemitic incidents from a range of sources, including directly from victims or members of their family; from witnesses; from CST's own national volunteer structure; from security guards at Jewish buildings; and via incident data sharing programmes with Police forces around the UK (see CST-police relationship for more information about the data sharing agreement).</p> <p>It is clear from CST's regular reporting on antisemitic incidents (see CST-general public relationship) that the organisation has a strong relationship with its communities. It isn't clear how many victims were referred to specialist support either delivered directly from CST or referred to</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publishes an annual Antisemitic Incidents Report with statistics, examples and case studies, shorter update reports every six months and one-page monthly incident bulletins are available. <p>CST has recorded antisemitic incidents in the United Kingdom since 1984</p> <p>Stop Hate UK provides a service in 8 London Boroughs, 12 English counties and 2 universities. Users can connect with the service through social media, whatsapp and a telephone hotline.</p>	<p>another agency.</p> <p>Stop Hate UK recorded 129 'Faith-based' incidents, however these are not disaggregated further (https://www.stophateuk.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Stop-Hate-UK-Stats-Report-2017-18-FINAL.pdf)</p>	
	Framework	Action	
General public-Law enforcement	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard</i></p> <p>Law enforcement are able to comprehensively record hate crimes, including bias indicators and specifically flag bias motivations and crime types (Standards 1,2,3)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>Hate crime data is produced, published and made accessible (Standard 6)</p> <p>Action is taken to increase reporting (Standard 17)</p>	<p>Framework: 3</p> <p>Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: green</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>British police have a comprehensive hate crime recording system (see law enforcement-prosecutor relationship for details).</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>Police data is collected, analysed and presented alongside crime survey figures - clearly showing trends in reporting and recording (see police-Home Office relationship).</p> <p>The police carry out regular action to increase reporting at the regional and local levels. National Hate Crime Awareness Week is a very active time</p>	

		for many police forces in this regard.	
	Framework	Action	
general public – Ministry of Interior Home Office	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The Home Office has access to law enforcement and other official hate crime data (see relevant relationships).	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Data and information (for example on hate crime strategy and actions plans) are produced, published and made accessible (Standard 6).	Framework:3 Action: 3 Colour: Green
	<i>Description of national situation</i> The Home Office collects, reviews and published police-recorded hate crime data (See police-Home Office relationship).	<i>Description of national situation</i> The Home Office regularly publishes and reviews cross-government hate crime action plans , related actions are based on evidence collected from police-recorded hate crime, Crime Survey and other figures. A major awareness raising campaign on hate crime was carried out in 2018 .	
	Framework	Action	
General public- Prosecution CPS	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Prosecution service records and captures data on the number and outcomes of hate crime prosecutions (Standards 4 and 7).	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Data on prosecuting hate crime are produced, published and made accessible (Standard 6).	Framework: 3 Action: 3 Colour: Green
	<i>Description of national situation</i> The CPS captures detailed information on hate	<i>Description of national situation</i> The CPS has a dedicated webpage on hate crime. It	

	crime through its performance management system (see police-CPS relationship).	publishes detailed annual reports and regular newsletters on its activities relating to hate crime.	
	Framework	Action	
General public - CSO antisemitism	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO regularly publishes data and information describing victims' experiences of hate crime based on their own recording systems (Standard 39). The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).	Framework: 3 Action: 3 Colour: Green
	<i>Description of national situation</i> See AS-victim relationship for details of CST's and Stop Hate UK's reporting and recording system.	<i>Description of national situation</i> The Community Security Trust regularly gathers and publishes data on the range of abuse experienced by Jewish people and communities in the form of full annual reports and summary quarterly reports, which are well publicised and high profile. The reports explain CST's recording methodology (see CST-police relationship), give case examples and clearly distinguish data on hate crimes and incidents. Stop Hate UK produces annual detailed statistical reports about how its services are being used.	
	Framework	Action	
General public - CSO LGBT+	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO regularly publishes data and information describing victims' experiences of hate crime	Framework:3 Action: 1

	<p>focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)</p>	<p>based on their own recording systems (Standard 39).</p> <p>The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).</p>	<p>Colour: Amber</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> Galop receives reports from across the country through its online reporting portal and its telephone hotline. See LGBTQ+-victim relationship for details of Galop and Stop Hate UK's reporting and recording system.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> Due to the need to prioritise its case work and direct support service, Galop is not able to regularly compile and publish reports based on its own recording activities. However, Galop has produced a number of factsheets based on its in-depth experience of direct support to victims of homophobic, bi-phobic and transphobic crime. Galop has also published a number of research reports that critically analyse available data on anti-LGBT+ hate crime together with recommendations.</p> <p>Stop Hate UK produces annual detailed statistical reports about how its services are being used.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
<p>General public - CSO anti-Muslim</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO regularly publishes data and information describing victims' experiences of hate crime based on their own recording systems (Standard 39).</p> <p>The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).</p>	<p>Framework: 2 Action: 3</p> <p>Colour: Green</p>

	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> MAMA, run by Tell MAMA is available to receive reports from across England through its online reporting portal and telephone hotline. See anti-Muslim-victim relationship for details of Tell MAMA and Stop Hate UK's reporting and recording system.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> Tell MAMA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - publishes detailed, well publicised and high profile annual reports based on data received through its reporting service - highlights notable cases, often in real time - examines themes such as gendered anti-Muslim hate incidents and lessons learned from specific and high profile incidents. <p>Stop Hate UK produces annual detailed statistical reports about how its services are being used.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
General public - CSO Gypsy, Roma and Travellers	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO is able to systematically record hate crimes and incidents using a transparent victim-focused methodology that is accessible to its target community(ies) (Standard 31)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The CSO regularly publishes data and information describing victims' experiences of hate crime based on their own recording systems (Standard 39).</p> <p>The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).</p>	Framework: 1 Action: 1 Colour: Red
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> The CSO Herts GATE runs the online reporting portal, Report Racism GRT (see GRT-victim relationship).</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> While there is 'live data' available on Report Racism GRT, the timescales are not clear and there are no available resources to produce analytical reports on anti gypsy, Roma and traveller hate crime.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
CSO antisemitism -	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The two bodies are members of an agreement to</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Structures and frameworks are used in a</p>	Framework:3 Action: 3

Law enforcement Police	<p>refer cases for support services (Standard 16 and 29)</p> <p>There is a structure for connection, that could include specialist police networks, a training agreement, information-sharing protocol, etc. (Standard 24, 25, 26)</p> <p>Both bodies are members of a cross government group that regularly considers evidence of hate crime prevalence and responses to the problem and considers actions for improvement. (Standard 8 and 9)</p>	<p>meaningful way/ the two bodies connect in meaningful ways.</p> <p>For example, The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).</p>	Colour: green
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> Under the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime, the police are under a duty to refer victims to specialist support services where ‘appropriate and available’. Specific services are not listed in the Code.</p> <p>The Community Security Trust has signed a national information-sharing agreement with the National Police Chiefs Council, that allows all police forces and the CST to share anonymised data on hate crimes and incidents with each other.</p> <p>The agreements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set out the specific information that will be shared by both parties including anonymised details of incident/s crimes targeting the specific community and, in the case of the police, 	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> On support: the police regularly refer victims to CST for support.</p> <p>On data sharing: CST and police regularly share data and information. According to CST’s 2018 report 643 of the 1,652 antisemitic incidents recorded by CST nationally in 2018 came to CST via information sharing agreements with the Police, representing 39 per cent of the incidents. Likewise police official data published by the Home Office includes incidents referred by CST.</p> <p>The data is regularly used for intelligence and prevention purposes.</p> <p>See also CSO monitoring racist crime-police relationship for Stop Hate UK action in this area.</p>	

	<p>anonymised details of arrests made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explain how they are compliant with data protection, human rights and other legislation; • specify that information will be shared every 6 months, but allow for more frequent sharing as and when agreed; • appoint a single point of contact - a named individual from both the police and the CSO is responsible for ensuring compliance with the agreement. <p>CSOs are not members of the hate crime strategy board that is responsible for the delivery of the hate crime action plan, and reports to government ministers. However, CST are represented on the national Independent Advisory Group, which provides scrutiny and challenge to the government's delivery of the National Hate Crime Action plan among other actions.</p>		
<p>CSO anti-Muslim-Law enforcement</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The two bodies are members of an agreement to refer cases for support services (Standard 16 and 29)</p> <p>There is a structure for connection, that could include specialist police networks, a training agreement, information-sharing protocol, etc. (Standard 24, 25, 26)</p> <p>Both bodies are members of a cross government</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Structures and frameworks are used in a meaningful way/ the two bodies connect in meaningful ways. For example, The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).</p>	<p>Framework: 3 Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: Green</p>

	<p>group that regularly considers evidence of hate crime prevalence and responses to the problem and considers actions for improvement. (Standard 8 and 9)</p>		
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> Under the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime, the police are under a duty to refer victims to specialist support services where ‘appropriate and available’. Specific services are not listed in the Code.</p> <p>The Tell MAMA has signed a national information-sharing agreement with the National Police Chiefs Council, that allows all police forces and the Tell MAMA to share anonymised data on hate crimes and incidents with each other</p> <p>The agreements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set out the specific information that will be shared by both parties including anonymised details of incident/s crimes targeting the specific community and, in the case of the police, anonymised details of arrests made; • explain how they are compliant with data protection, human rights and other legislation; • specify that information will be shared every 6 months, but allow for more frequent sharing as and when agreed; • appoint a single point of contact - a named 	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> On support: the police regularly refer victims to Tell MAMA for support.</p> <p>On data sharing: Tell MAMA and police regularly share data and information and include them in their respective records.</p> <p>As national partners of the police, Tell MAMA are able to contribute to ‘critical incident Gold Groups’ which coordinates the national response of police and partners.</p> <p>This relationship has proved itself invaluable in recent years and has allowed for coordination of public information programmes and joint deployments into communities suffering the effects of raised tensions.</p> <p>Data produced by the information- sharing agreements is regularly used for intelligence and prevention purposes.</p> <p>For example, In March of 2018, a series of letters were sent to high-profile Muslims and Islamic</p>	

	<p>individual from both the police and the CSO is responsible for ensuring compliance with the agreement.</p> <p>CSOs are not members of the hate crime strategy board that is responsible for the delivery of the hate crime action plan, and reports to government ministers. However, Tell MAMA are represented on the national Independent Advisory Group, which provides scrutiny and challenge to the government's delivery of the National Hate Crime Action plan among other actions.</p>	<p>institutions. The letters said that 3rd April that year had been declared as 'Punish a Muslim Day'. They set out why the author felt that Muslims should be harmed and allocated 'points' for each act of violence, trying to encourage people to attack Muslims. The letters were covered in the media before the police became aware and the caused significant levels of fear amongst Muslim communities.</p> <p>The police called together a 'Gold Group' to oversee community tensions and included partners, independent advisors, government departments and civil society, including Tell MAMA.</p> <p>The Gold Group took information, data and intelligence from all participants, based on the information-sharing agreement - and carried out regular combined threat assessments. These informed an action plan which was regularly monitored by the group. It developed an agreed communications plan designed to reassure communities without increasing the risk of perpetrators being motivated to commit violence.</p> <p>Throughout the period of increased risk all partners shared information and hate crime data on a daily basis and this allowed for the effective allocation of resources until the threat level decreased.</p>	
--	---	--	--

		See also CSO monitoring racist crime-police relationship for Stop Hate UK action in this area.	
CSO Anti LGBT+ - Law enforcement	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The two bodies are members of an agreement to refer cases for support services (Standard 16 and 29)</p> <p>There is a structure for connection, that could include specialist police networks, a training agreement, information-sharing protocol, etc. (Standard 24, 25, 26)</p> <p>Both bodies are members of a cross government group that regularly considers evidence of hate crime prevalence and responses to the problem and considers actions for improvement. (Standard 8 and 9)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Structures and frameworks are used in a meaningful way/ the two bodies connect in meaningful ways. For example, The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).</p>	<p>Framework: 2</p> <p>Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: Amber</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> Under the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime, the police are under a duty to refer victims to specialist support services where ‘appropriate and available’. Specific services are not listed in the Code.</p> <p>Galop signed a national information-sharing agreement with the National Police Chiefs Council,</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> On support: the police regularly refer victims to Galop for support.</p> <p>On data sharing: Galop and police regularly share data and information and include the information in their respective records.</p> <p>The data is regularly used for intelligence and</p>	

	<p>that allows all police forces and Galop to share anonymised data on hate crimes and incidents with each other</p> <p>The agreements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set out the specific information that will be shared by both parties including anonymised details of incident/s crimes targeting the specific community and, in the case of the police, anonymised details of arrests made; • explain how they are compliant with data protection, human rights and other legislation; • specify that information will be shared every 6 months, but allow for more frequent sharing as and when agreed; • appoint a single point of contact - a named individual from both the police and the CSO is responsible for ensuring compliance with the agreement. <p>CSOs are not members of the hate crime strategy board that is responsible for the delivery of the hate crime action plan, and reports to government ministers. However, Galop are represented on the national Independent Advisory Group, which provides scrutiny and challenge to the government’s delivery of the National Hate Crime Action plan among other actions.</p>	<p>prevention purposes.</p> <p>See also CSO monitoring racist crime-police relationship for Stop Hate UK action in this area.</p>	
CSO disability -	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i>	<i>Relevant norm/standard:</i>	Framework: 1

<p>Law enforcement</p>	<p>The two bodies are members of an agreement to refer cases for support services (Standard 16 and 29)</p> <p>There is a structure for connection, that could include specialist police networks, a training agreement, information-sharing protocol, etc. (Standard 24, 25, 26)</p> <p>Both bodies are members of a cross government group that regularly considers evidence of hate crime prevalence and responses to the problem and considers actions for improvement. (Standard 8 and 9)</p>	<p>Structures and frameworks are used in a meaningful way/ the two bodies connect in meaningful ways. For example, The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).</p>	<p>Action: 1</p> <p>Colour: Red</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>There is no CSO with a national profile focusing on recording and monitoring disability hate crime. Stop Hate UK provides a service in 8 London Boroughs, 12 English counties and 2 universities. Users can connect with the service through social media, whatsapp and a telephone hotline. Stop Hate UK and the police are signatories to an information-sharing agreement that allows all police forces and Stop Hate UK to share anonymised data on hate crimes and incidents with each other.</p> <p>The agreements:</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>See CSO monitoring racist crime-police relationship for Stop Hate UK action in this area.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set out the specific information that will be shared by both parties including anonymised details of incident/s crimes targeting the specific community and, in the case of the police, anonymised details of arrests made; • explain how they are compliant with data protection, human rights and other legislation; • specify that information will be shared every 6 months, but allow for more frequent sharing as and when agreed; • appoint a single point of contact - a named individual from both the police and the CSO is responsible for ensuring compliance with the agreement. 		
CSO racist and Law enforcement	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> The two bodies are members of an agreement to refer cases for support services (Standard 16 and 29)</p> <p>There is a structure for connection, that could include specialist police networks, a training agreement, information-sharing protocol, etc. (Standard 24, 25, 26)</p> <p>Both bodies are members of a cross government group that regularly considers evidence of hate crime prevalence and responses to the problem and considers actions for improvement. (Standard 8 and 9)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Structures and frameworks are used in a meaningful way/ the two bodies connect in meaningful ways. For example, The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).</p>	<p>Framework: 1 Action: 1 Colour: Red</p>

	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>There is no CSO with a national profile focusing on recording and monitoring racist hate crime. Stop Hate UK provides a service in 8 London Boroughs, 12 English counties and 2 universities. Users can connect with the service through social media, whatsapp and a telephone hotline. Stop Hate UK and the police are signatories to an information-sharing agreement that allows all police forces and Stop Hate UK to share anonymised data on hate crimes and incidents with each other.</p> <p>The agreements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set out the specific information that will be shared by both parties including anonymised details of incident/s crimes targeting the specific community and, in the case of the police, anonymised details of arrests made; • explain how they are compliant with data protection, human rights and other legislation; • specify that information will be shared every 6 months, but allow for more frequent sharing as and when agreed; • appoint a single point of contact - a named individual from both the police and the CSO is responsible for ensuring compliance with the agreement. 	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>Stop Hate UK regularly provides statistical and case study (anonymised) information to police forces that commission its services. Typically each area will receive a quarterly data report on contacts to the Stop Hate UK Line services and associated monitoring information - this currently equates to 22 separate reports across hate crime types each quarter. In addition, as part of the information sharing agreement, Stop Hate UK produces 3 bespoke data requests per quarter.</p> <p>The police also use the information-sharing agreement to, for example, notify Stop Hate UK of changes in levels of hate crime reporting. Stop Hate UK is only commissioned to operate in 22 out of the 61 counties in England and Wales, and less than a third of London Boroughs. This leaves other counties without a service connected to a national information-sharing agreement on racist crime with the police or with national policy structures.</p>	
--	---	---	--

	Framework	Action	
CSOs - Prosecution CPS	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> No expectation that there is an information-sharing agreement in place.</p> <p>Both bodies are members of a cross government group that regularly considers evidence of hate crime prevalence and responses to the problem and considers actions for improvement (Standards 8 and 9)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> Evidence of CSO input into prosecutor training; and/or joint case reviews, and/or specialist prosecutors' offices that make connections with CSOs (Standard 25)</p>	<p>Framework: 2 Action:3 Colour: green</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> CST, Galop, Tell MAMA and representatives from disabled people's organisations and Dimensions are members of the CPS' external advisory group on hate crime, which addresses data and other issues.</p> <p>CSOs are not members of the government's hate crime strategy group, however, CST, Galop and Tell MAMA are members of the independent advisory group that feeds into the cross government strategy group.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i> CST, Galop, Tell MAMA and representatives from disabled people's organisations and Dimensions are consulted on all aspects of CPS hate crime policy and performance through regular meetings of the external advisory group as well as providing ad-hoc input as needed.</p> <p>The CPS runs 'hate crime scrutiny panels' across the country, which involve representatives across affected communities to scrutinised unsuccessful cases and lessons learned.</p> <p>The CPS does not disaggregate its data on hate crime prosecutions of racially and religiously aggravated offences, which undermines the granularity of information relating to prosecutions on antisemitic crime, anti-Muslim hate crime and other religiously aggravated hate crime.</p>	

	Framework	Action	
CSOs Antisemitism, anti-Muslim, anti-LGBT+ to grey line – grey line government Ministries	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> NB – not all ministries will have relationships with CSOs. Generally, the lead ministry on hate crime should have some link(s).</p> <p>Framework: CSO is a member of cross-government framework with a focus on hate crime recording and data collection (Standards 8 and 9)</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> CSOs play an active role in these frameworks, CSO data is actively considered in government policy-making.</p> <p>The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).</p>	<p>Antisemitism, anti-Muslim : Framework:3 Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: green</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>The Government has a formal working relationship with the Community Security Trust, Tell MAMA, Galop and Stop Hate UK through information-sharing agreements (see police-CSO relationships). In addition, these four organisations are members of the Hate Crime Independent Advisory Group, which feeds into the Inter-Ministerial Group (IMG) on Safe and Integrated Communities (See police-prosecution relationship).</p> <p>The National Government provides some limited founding to support CSO’s where there is a specific need to develop new services to meet gaps and the targets of its Hate Crime Action Plan.</p> <p>Other funding can be provided by local authorities and Police and Crime Commissioners to meet local community needs.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>(antisemitism, anti-Muslim, anti-LGBT+) As described in the relevant CSO relationships, the situation can vary significantly across the country and is challenged by sustained austerity.</p> <p>(racist, disablist, anti-GRT) There is no organisation recording racist, disablist or anti-GRT hate crime in with national reach or with an established relationship with government ministries.</p>	<p>Anti-LGBT Framework: 2 Action: 2</p> <p>Colour: Amber ----- Racist, anti- disability, GRT: Framework: 1 Action: 1</p> <p>Colour: Red</p>

	Framework	Action	
IGO – grey line	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> There is an agreement and framework for data and information on hate crime to be shared with an IGO and vice versa. (Standards 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37)</p> <p>Parties are able to influence international norms and standards on hate crime reporting, recording and data collection and related activities and guidelines</p> <p>See standards document for information current platforms of exchange and cooperation.</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i> See standards document for ongoing action by IGOs to connect with national authorities on hate crime reporting, recording and data collection</p> <p>National assessment will look at these factors: Data is shared with IGO in line with agreed obligations/as part of regular requests.</p> <p>National representatives attend IGO networking events</p> <p>National representatives ask for and implement capacity-building activities in the area of hate crime recording and data collection.</p>	<p>Framework: 3 Action: 3 Colour: green</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>N/A – this is a set international framework.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>The UK Government appointed a ‘National Point of Contact’ (NPC) to IGO’s for hate crime who regularly attends the following meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the High Level Group on Racism and Xenophobia coordinated by the European Commission, DG-JUSTICE; - the sub-group on police recording practices hosted by the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA); - and the OSCE Office of Democratic 	

		<p>Institutions and Human Rights' regular National Points of Contact Meetings.</p> <p>The NPC regularly submits data and information about hate crime to the FRA, DG-JUSTICE and OSCE-ODIHR for publication in their reports on hate crime in line with their mandates.</p> <p>The NPC has arranged several country visits to the UK for EU and OSCE state representatives to learn about the UK approach to hate crime recording and data collection.</p>	
	Framework	Action	
IGOs- CSOs	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>There is an agreement and framework for data and information on hate crime to be shared with an IGO and vice versa (Standard 37)</p> <p>Parties are able to influence international norms and standards on hate crime reporting, recording and data collection and related activities and guidelines</p> <p>See standards document for information current platforms of exchange and cooperation.</p>	<p><i>Relevant norm/standard:</i></p> <p>Data is shared between the two parties as part of regular requests.</p> <p>CSOs attend IGO networking events and ask for and implement capacity-building activities in the area of hate crime recording and data collection</p>	<p>Framework: 2</p> <p>Action:3</p> <p>Colour: green</p>
	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>N/A – this is a set international framework.</p>	<p><i>Description of national situation</i></p> <p>CST, Galop and Tell MAMA regularly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - report data and information to 	

		<p>hatecrime.osce.org</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- attend international meetings convened by the European Commission, the FRA and the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) to share insights and good practice on hate crime in England and Wales.	
--	--	---	--