The self-assessment framework

The tables below sets out the evidence that was collated to understand and describe current strengths and weaknesses across the relationships that form national hate crime recording and data collection systems. It aims to build on and complement existing approaches such as OSCE-ODIHR's Key Observations framework and its INFAHCT Programme.[312] Guidance that relates to what evidence can be captured, used and published by public authorities is contained in the International Standards section below. 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.

Table one sets out the general approach to self-assessment and the main relationships in the 'system'. Table two was used to complete 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 systems. Where possible, we aimed 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.

---

312 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

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	
The main relationships are identified across the system: Law-enforcement – prosecution; judiciary; Ministry of Interior Prosecution – Judiciary, Ministry of Justice Ministries - Ministries (e.g. MoI-MoJ, etc.) Victim - law enforcement; prosecution, ministries; CSOs General public – law enforcement; Ministry(ies), prosecution; CSOs CSOs – law enforcement; prosecution; ministries, other CSOs. IGO – ministry(ies); CSOs Further background information about existing IGO frameworks and actions is provided in the accompanying standards document. Other bodies and ministries are also relevant, including equality bodies and non-criminal justice agencies and ministries. These are included where relevant in national reports.	Technical frameworks allow for recording and data collection Policy frameworks allow information to be shared across the system. 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.	Evidence that the frameworks are used – data is recorded, shared, collected, published and information is acted upon to develop policy and improve responses. The 'frontline', whether investigators, prosecutors or CSOs are the ones that 'give life' to, or are limited by, existing policy frameworks.	Each relationship is given a score of 0-3 for: 1. 'framework' 2. 'action' An overall score of 5-6= green; 3-4 = amber; 0-2 = red. Green = Good relationship. Effective framework and action, with room for improvement. Amber = Adequate relationship. Relatively limited framework and action. Red= Poor relationship. Very limited framework and action.

Specific relationships and criteria

General analysis			
Relationship	Evidence: this column sets out the evidence that is considered when describing a relationship as 'red', 'amber' or 'green' (See table one)		**Score** Framework: Action: Total: Colour:
	Framework	Action	
Law enforcement – prosecution	Relevant norm/standard: 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) Law enforcement are able to record information about victim support and safety. (Standard 5) 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) 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)	Relevant norm/standard: Realistic data is produced by the system (very low numbers indicate an unrealistic measure of hate crime prevalence) (Standards 6 and 7). 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. Law enforcement and prosecution service meet regularly, to review progress and share information and/or take part in joint training.	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation	

	Framework	Action	
	Framework	**Action**	
Law enforcement – judiciary	**Relevant norm/standard:** **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)** **The courts have the facility to record sentencing information, including whether the hate element was considered and the outcome (Standard 7)** **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).**	**Relevant norm/standard:** **Realistic data is produced by the system (very low numbers indicate hate crime laws are not being used). (Standards 6 and 7)** **Emerging information is used – for example, meetings involving both parties discuss available data, problem-solve and identify actions.**	**Framework:** **Action:** **Colour:**
	Description of national situation:	**Description of national situation:**	
	Framework	**Action**	
Law enforcement – Ministry of Interior (MoI)	**Relevant norm/standard:** **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)** **Law enforcement are able to record information about victim support and safety (Standard 5)** **This information can shared with the MoI or relevant ministry for data collection and analysis.** **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).**	**Relevant norm/standard:** **Emerging information is used – for example, meetings involving both parties discuss available data, problem-solve and identify actions.** **Realistic data is produced by the system (very low numbers indicate hate crime laws are not being used). (Standards 6 and 7)**	**Framework:** **Action:** **Colour:**
	Description of national situation:	**Description of national situation:**	

	Framework	Action	
Prosecution-Judiciary	Relevant norm/standard: 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). There is the facility to record sentencing information, including whether the hate element was considered and the outcome (Standard 7) 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)	Relevant norm/standard: Emerging information is used – for example, meetings involving both parties discuss available data, problem-solve and identify actions. Realistic data is produced by the system (very low numbers indicate hate crime laws are not being used) (Standard 6) There is no evidence that the prosecution and judiciary regularly reflect on problems and gaps with the data and information that is captured.	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation:	
	Framework	Action	
Prosecution – MoJ	Relevant norm/standard: The prosecution service is able to record relevant information - including about evidence of bias - and to share this with the MoJ for data collection purposes (Standard 4) 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 and 9)	Relevant norm/standard: Emerging information is used – for example, meetings involving both parties discuss available data, problem-solve and identify actions.	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation:	
	Framework	Action	
MoI – MoJ (and other ministries, named at national level)	Relevant norm/standard: The two bodies receive data and information from law enforcement and the prosecution service, respectively (Standards 1,2,3,4). 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 across the criminal justice system (standards 8 and 9)	Relevant norm/standard: Emerging information is used – for example, meetings involving both parties discuss available data, problem-solve and identify actions. Realistic data is produced by the system (very low numbers indicate hate crime laws are not being used) (Standards 6 and 7)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation:	

	Framework	Action	
Victim- Law enforcement	Relevant norm/standard: 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) Law enforcement are able to record information about victim support and safety (standard 5) There is a process to keep victims informed about the progress of the investigation (Standard 10, 11, 12, 13,14) Law enforcement can accept anonymous reports of hate crime. (Standard 42).	Relevant norm/standard: The system is used to record bias motivations and crime types and to ensure specific support to victims (Standards 15 and 16) The system is used to keep victims informed about the progress of the investigation (Standard 11) Action is taken to increase reporting (Standard 17)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation:	
	Framework	Action	
Victim - Prosecution	Relevant norm/standard: There is a process to keep victims informed about the progress of the criminal justice process (Standards 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18,19).	Relevant norm/standard: The system is used to keep victims informed	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	
	Framework	Action	
Victim - MoI (or relevant ministry) -	Relevant norm/standard: 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 (Standards 20, 21, 22, 42)	Relevant norm/standard: Relevant policy commitments on improving reporting and support have been made and acted upon (Standard 17) Victimisation surveys are carried out and the results are published in an accessible format (Standard 23)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	

	Framework	Action	
	Relevant norm/standard: 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 and 42)	Relevant norm/standard: The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)	Framework: Action: Colour:
Victim - CSO monitoring Racist HC –	Description of national situation	Description of national situation court.	
	Framework	Action	
Victim-organisation monitoring disability hate crime	Relevant norm/standard: 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) (Standards 31 and 42)	Relevant norm/standard: The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation	
	Framework	Action	
Victims-organisations monitoring Anti-LGBT+ hate crime	Relevant norm/standard: 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) (Standards 31 and 42)	Relevant norm/standard: The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	
	Framework	Action	
victims -organisation monitoring Anti-Roma hate crime.	Relevant norm/standard: 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 and 42)	Relevant norm/standard: The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	

	Framework	Action	
Victim-organisation monitoring antisemitic hate crime	Relevant norm/standard: 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) (Standards 31 and 42)	Relevant norm/standard: The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	
	Framework	Action	
Victim-organisation monitoring anti-Muslim hate crime	Relevant norm/standard: 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) (Standards 31 and 42)	Relevant norm/standard: The system is used by victims. The CSO regularly provides direct support to victims or referrals to support services (Standard 29)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	
	Framework	Action	
General public- Law enforcement	Relevant norm/standard: Law enforcement are able to comprehensively record hate crimes, including bias indicators and specifically flag bias motivations and crime types (Standards 1,2,3) See law enforcement-prosecutor relationship for details on police-recorded data.	Relevant norm/standard: Hate crime data is produced, published and made accessible (Standard 6) Action is taken to increase reporting (Standard 17 and 42)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation:	
	Framework	Action	
general public - MoI	Relevant norm/standard: MoI has access to law enforcement and other official hate crime data (see relevant relationships).	Relevant norm/standard: Data and information (for example on hate crime strategy and actions plans) are produced, published and made accessible (Standard 6).	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation:	

	Framework	Action	
General public-Prosecution	Relevant norm/standard: Prosecution service records and captures data on the number and outcomes of hate crime prosecutions (Standards 4 and 7).	Relevant norm/standard: Data on prosecuting hate crime are produced, published and made accessible (Standard 6).	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation:	
	Framework	Action	
general public - Courts	Relevant norm/standard: The courts record and captures data on the number and outcomes of cases where hate crime laws were applied (Standard 4).	Relevant norm/standard: Data on hate crime sentences are produced, published and made accessible (Standards 6 and 7)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation:	
	Framework	Action	
General public - CSO	Relevant norm/standard: 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) (Standards 31 and 42)	Relevant norm/standard: 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: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	
	Framework	Action	
CSO-Law enforcement	Relevant norm/standard: The two bodies are members of an agreement to refer cases for support services (Standard 16 and 29) There is a structure for connection, that could include specialist police networks, a training agreement, information-sharing protocol, etc. (Standard 24, 25, 26, 41, 42) 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)	Relevant norm/standard: 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).	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	

	Framework	Action	
CSO-Prosecution	Relevant norm/standard: No expectation that there is an information-sharing agreement in place. 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, 9 and 41)	Relevant norm/standard: Evidence of CSO input into prosecutor training; and/or joint case reviews, and/or specialist prosecutors offices that make connections with CSOs (Standard 25)	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation:	Description of national situation:	
	Framework	Action	
CSO - Ministries	Relevant norm/standard: NB – not all ministries will have relationships with CSOs. Generally, the lead ministry on hate crime should have some link(s). Framework: CSO is a member of cross-government framework with a focus on hate crime recording and data collection (Standards 8 and 9)	Relevant norm/standard: CSOs play an active role in these frameworks, CSO data is actively considered in government policy-making. The CSO uses its data to raise awareness about the problem and to advocate for improvements (Standard 40).	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	
	Framework	Action	
Network* – LGBT+ * 'Network' means a group of CSOs that work together to record and monitor hate crime using a common methodology. This network might be a small or large number of CSOs that is coordinated by a person or one member organisation.	Relevant norm/standard: Both bodies are members of a framework that shares data and works in coalition to advocate for improvements in responses to hate crime (Standard 31)	Relevant norm/standard: The framework is used. There is evidence of coalition building and advocacy based on shared positions.	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	

	Framework	Action	
Network – anti-Roma	Relevant norm/standard: Both bodies are members of a framework that shares data and works in coalition to advocate for improvements in responses to hate crime (Standard 31)	Relevant norm/standard: The framework is used. There is evidence of coalition building and advocacy based on shared positions.	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	
	Framework	Action	
Network – racist	Relevant norm/standard: Both bodies are members of a framework that shares data and works in coalition to advocate for improvements in responses to hate crime (Standard 31)	Relevant norm/standard: The framework is used. There is evidence of coalition building and advocacy based on shared positions.	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation	Description of national situation	

	Framework	Action	
IGO – relevant government ministry/ CJ agency	**Relevant norm/standard:** 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) Parties are able to influence international norms and standards on hate crime reporting, recording and data collection and related activities and guidelines See standards document for information current platforms of exchange and cooperation.	**Relevant norm/standard:** See standards document for ongoing action by IGOs to connect with national authorities on hate crime reporting, recording and data collection National assessment will look at these factors: Data is shared with IGO in line with agreed obligations/as part of regular requests. National representatives attend IGO networking events National representatives ask for and implement capacity-building activities in the area of hate crime recording and data collection.	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation N/A – this is a set international framework.	**Description of national situation**	
	Framework	Action	
IGOs- Network	**Relevant norm/standard:** There is an agreement and framework for data and information on hate crime to be shared with an IGO and vice versa (Standard 37) Parties are able to influence international norms and standards on hate crime reporting, recording and data collection and related activities and guidelines See standards document for information current platforms of exchange and cooperation.	**Relevant norm/standard:** Data is shared between the two parties as part of regular requests. CSOs attend IGO networking events and ask for and implement capacity-building activities in the area of hate crime recording and data collection	Framework: Action: Colour:
	Description of national situation N/A – this is a set international framework.	**Description of national situation**	