



Report of the OSCE-ODIHR Expert Meeting

Incitement to Hatred vs. Freedom of Expression: Challenges of combating hate crimes motivated by hate on the Internet

Warsaw, 22 March 2010

Introduction

Since 2003, the OSCE has acknowledged that hate crimes can be fuelled by racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic and other hateful content on the Internet.¹ In order to explore this issue further and to identify effective responses to the phenomenon of on-line hate, in June 2004 the OSCE convened in Paris a *Meeting on the Relationship Between Racist, Xenophobic and Anti-Semitic Propaganda on the Internet and Hate Crimes*. It was the first meeting organized by the OSCE dealing with the issue of cyber hate and its relationship to hate crimes.²

As a result of that meeting, OSCE participating States committed themselves to a number of practical measures aimed at addressing “cyber hate”, recognising that manifestations of hate on the Internet have the potential to incite violence and hate crimes. Despite these political commitments, however, addressing hate crimes and hate on the Internet effectively continue to be challenges for participating States. The importance of the Internet as a tool for communication, networking and social interaction has dramatically increased in recent years. At the same time the Internet has become a platform for organised hate groups to recruit, control their members, organize attacks, and intimidate and harass their enemies.

In response to these developments, OSCE Ministerial Council Decision 9/09, adopted in Athens on 2 December 2009, tasked the ODIHR “to explore, in consultations with the participating States and in co-operation with relevant international organizations and civil society partners, the potential link between the use of the Internet and bias-motivated violence and the harm it causes as well as eventual practical steps to be taken”³. In order to implement this tasking, the ODIHR decided to convene an expert meeting on 22 March 2010 on *Incitement to Hatred vs. Freedom of Expression: Challenges of combating hate crimes motivated by hate on the Internet*, with the aim of exploring

¹ Maastricht Ministerial Council Decision 4/03 of 2 December 2003 on Tolerance and Non-discrimination, paragraph 8, http://www.osce.org/documents/mcs/2006/06/19330_en.pdf.

² Consolidated summary of the meeting is available at: <http://www.osce.org/item/3833.html>.

³ Athens Ministerial Council Decision 9/09 of 2 December 2009 on Combating Hate Crimes, paragraph 12, http://www.osce.org/documents/cio/2009/12/41853_en.pdf.

the inherent challenges in investigating and prosecuting hate crimes motivated by hate on the Internet.

This meeting, the first OSCE meeting on this topic since 2004, generated a considerable interest among various stakeholder groups and resulted in a high number of participants from 31 participating States and one OSCE Partner for Co-operation. Participants included representatives of governments, international organizations, law enforcement, prosecution, civil society organizations and minority groups.⁴

This report presents a summary of the main topics discussed in the three plenary sessions of the meeting, as well as recommendations for consideration by OSCE participating States, ODIHR, civil society and the Internet industry. Views and positions presented in this report do not necessarily represent the policy or position of the OSCE or ODIHR.

To the extent possible and appropriate within its mandate, recommendations presented at the expert meeting will be followed up by ODIHR.

Unique character of the Internet

A number of participants pointed out that the specific character of the Internet poses serious challenges to any attempts to regulate content, particularly while respecting freedom of expression. Unlike traditional media, it is often very difficult to establish the identity of authors of the content available online. Material which originates in one country is copied, edited, and shared across national borders, and can be hosted in different countries, subject to different legislation. Most participants agreed that especially since the advent of Web 2.0, with its user created content and social networking, it is impossible to apply the same tools and methods used to regulate traditional media. Some participants supported the view that the ability to freely express, share and exchange ideas on the Internet has been of great benefit to society and that the negative effects of limitations to freedom of expression on the Internet would outweigh any potential benefits.

⁴ A full list of participants can be found at the end of this report.

Hit lists

The issue of “hit lists” – lists of individuals with their personal details accompanied by open or disguised calls for violence against them – was cited as a great concern by many participants. Several examples of such “hit lists” being used to carry out physical attacks against opponents of organized hate groups or visible minorities were highlighted.⁵ Some speakers noted that “hit lists” have a huge impact on the potential victims, even in the absence of physical violence. Their purpose is often to intimidate and create fear and pressure to change attitudes or stop certain social or political activities. Some participants pointed out that States have a legal or at a least moral duty to protect their citizens from crime. Bearing this in mind, some speakers suggested that States should balance the protection of individuals from violence and criminal intimidation against the principle of freedom of expression. These speakers contended that the protection of freedom of expression must be equal to, but not greater than, protection of individuals from harm. It was suggested that the link between the “hit lists” and real crimes must be investigated very seriously.

Legal aspects of “hit lists” were also discussed, in particular the challenges of prosecuting such cases, due to the high threshold for prosecution existing in some countries. Different approaches to this issue within the OSCE were illustrated with cases from Canada, The Czech Republic, Poland and USA.

Link between hate material and hate crimes

A related issue highlighted by many participants was the connection between manifestations of hate on the Internet and hate crimes in the real world. Although it is often difficult to prove such connections in criminal proceedings, several presenters illustrated this link through examples from a number of participating States. It was noted that the psychological influence of material on the Internet on youth was quite high. Videos depicting violent hate crimes often include a commentary that induces certain behaviour. Since the primary target of such videos is the young audience, the

⁵ Examples include “Redwatch” websites in the Czech Republic, Poland, Russia, and UK, and anti-abortion “hit lists” of abortion clinic doctors in a number of countries.

overall impact is potentially very serious. In the opinion of some participants, simply placing such material on the Internet constitutes an incitement to hate crimes.

A similar problem of growing concern is “cyber bullying”. This phenomenon, which targets primarily youth, is closely related to hate on the Internet and often originates in racial, ethnic, or religious bias. Some civil society representatives presented tools and methods they developed to address this issue alongside other manifestations of hate on the Internet.

Role of legislation

The role of legislation in combating hate on the Internet was a theme addressed in several speeches and presentations. It was acknowledged that legislation should be followed and enforced. Some speakers stressed the need for more precise legal definitions and the need to monitor implementation of legislation.

Other participants pointed out that due to differing approaches to hate-inciting content on the Internet and diverse criteria among the OSCE participating States for defining the threshold between freedom of expression and criminal behaviour, the impact of criminal legislation is limited and legislation alone can not adequately tackle the issue of hate on the Internet. This is illustrated by the fact that in many instances legislation has had to be creatively applied in order to penalise or sanction various expressions of hate on the Internet or in the public domain.

On the other hand, speakers presented several examples of successful prosecution of hate-inciting Internet content hosted in third countries.⁶ Participants also discussed the problem of implementation of legislation. In this regard, the need for specialised training for law enforcement officials and prosecutors on Internet-related hate crime cases was mentioned.

Despite differences in national legislation, all OSCE participating States prohibit incitement to violence. Therefore, this principle could be used as a common ground in any future harmonisation

⁶ For example, the Shepherd and Whittle case in the UK or the case of an Australian Holocaust denier arrested in Germany.

efforts. Some participants raised the question of definition of certain concepts related to hate-inciting Internet content such as “extremism” and expressed concerns regarding the criteria applied to categorise online material as extremist, since this might lead to suppression of legitimate – even if at times distasteful – discourse.

Other participants pointed out that only an independent judiciary can define what is “extremist” and ensure that the use of this term is clear and transparent.

Role of law enforcement and prosecutors

Another problem mentioned in the discussion was the lack of capacity and expertise in criminal justice systems to analyse and interpret Internet content. In order to address this problem, specialisation of law enforcement and prosecutors is needed. Some participants described the structure of specialised units dealing with hate crimes and cyber crimes in their countries and suggested that these could be used as models in other countries. At the same time, it was noted that specialisation can be very difficult in some countries, since it requires a large number of cases of the same type to justify the additional costs and structural changes involved.

Examples illustrating both difficulties in assessing the meaning and impact of texts as well as good practices were given. One suggestion was to establish official centres tasked with providing expert opinions on the nature of various texts on the Internet and an interpretation of their meaning.

Since the Internet is a global network and application of national legislation often requires international co-operation, participants highlighted the need for transnational co-operation among law enforcement and prosecutors as a pressing issue. In this regard, the Global Prosecutors’ E-Crime Network (GPEN) was mentioned as a practical example of transnational co-operation of prosecutors on cyber crimes. GPEN is network of specialist e-crime prosecutors, nominated by the International Association of Prosecutors, which provides its users with web-based access to a library of materials, as well as tools, a collection of good practices, a discussion forum and on-line training.

Strategies and solutions

Two presentations of the meeting focussed on various non-legislative methods for addressing and combating hate on the Internet. One presenter described activities of an international network of NGOs combating hate on the Internet by various means: education, negotiations with Internet Service Providers (ISPs), and creating monitoring and reporting mechanisms for hate-inciting content. Several speakers mentioned that ISPs and Internet companies are indispensable in this regard and recommended that ISPs and Internet companies should be involved in any future discussions on this topic.

The practical difficulties of removing hate-inciting material from the Internet were also highlighted in the discussion. Besides the challenges posed by jurisdiction and legislation, there are also practical challenges involved. For instance, once any material is posted on the Internet, it is usually shared on several servers or online repositories, which makes it difficult if not impossible to remove all copies completely.

Attempts to address this issue by setting up lists of keywords, filters or “blacklists” on a national level were discussed as well. Such filtering systems are in place in several European countries (Germany, UK and others). However, there are doubts regarding their effectiveness, as well as concerns about the threat that undue limitations could pose to freedom of expression. A presentation by one participating State focused on this approach, including the use of self-regulatory mechanisms by major ISPs, accompanied by a “blacklist” of Internet sites.

Some participants questioned the value of attempting to suppress hate speech on the Internet and stressed that it would not solve the problem of Internet-motivated hate crimes. Even if such hate speech were universally criminalised, the discussions would just move underground, using more obscure and therefore secure ways of communication, making it more difficult for law enforcement agencies to track and monitor such content.

Education and media literacy

Several speakers expressed the view that the long term solution to hate-inciting content on the Internet should be based primarily on education and media literacy. These speakers argued that it is neither technically possible nor desirable to control what kind of content is accessed online by various groups of people. Therefore, they suggested that the best solution would be to equip Internet users – especially young users – with the skills needed to enable them to critically assess, analyse and process online information. The Media Awareness Network in Canada was mentioned as a practical example of such an approach. Other participants stressed the need to respond to hate speech with counterarguments and to create an environment where civil discourse conquers hate.

Empowering users

Some participants suggested creating and enhancing mechanisms to flag inappropriate content. Many sites already allow users to flag offensive content for review. Such mechanisms are based on the Terms of Service, which define what type of content is considered as inappropriate by the owner of a particular website or ISP. Outreach to Internet companies and ISPs running major websites was suggested as a possible solution. Some speakers noted that it is equally important to reinforce positive anti-hate content by posting positive messages.

Recommendations:

The following provides a summary of recommendations that were put forward by participants in the expert meeting. These recommendations were not adopted by the participants and they do not necessarily reflect the consensus of the meeting participants. They are directed to participating States, OSCE institutions, civil society and the Internet industry.

Recommendations to governments and international organizations

- Investigate the link between the existence of “hit lists” on the Internet and the commission of hate crimes using such “hit lists”;
- Train law enforcement agents and prosecutors on how to address crimes motivated by racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic or other related bias on the Internet and share information on successful training programmes as part of an exchange of best practices;
- Support specialisation of law enforcement officers and prosecutors dealing with cyber crime and hate crimes;
- Identify a single point of contact in law enforcement agencies to serve as the recipient for complaints about material which increases the risk of hate-fueled violence;
- Involve ISPs and Internet companies in any future discussions on the topic of hate on the Internet and encourage their participation in any future meetings;
- Promote and support media literacy programmes as a part of a general curriculum in order to equip young people with the skills needed to enable them to critically assess, analyse and process online information;
- Develop, test and analyse educational concepts against online hate speech and implement such concepts broadly on an international level;
- Support measures and programmes to stimulate an environment where civil discourse conquers hate;
- Provide support for networks that combat cyber-hate with a multidimensional approach consisting of educational work and effective counter measures;
- Develop cross-border exchanges of information and best practices of different countries and organizations;
- Condemn bigotry and violence motivated by bias whenever and wherever it arises.

Recommendations to OSCE institutions

- Collate and evaluate existing empirical research, to identify and quantify the extent of illegal hate material on the Internet and the impact of exposure to such hate material, particularly on young people;
- Seek and facilitate agreements among participating States on universally acceptable responses to reduce the harm caused by illegal hate material through:
 - i. The identification and dissemination of voluntary agreements between Internet providers and users that balance freedom of expression against the need to reduce harm;
 - ii. Working with civil society to counter the negative narrative contained in inciteful hate material;
 - iii. The establishment of a network of “Single Points of Contact” to share information among States;
- Closely cooperate with other Intergovernmental organizations, in particular with the United Nations and the Council of Europe in efforts to effectively tackle hate on the Internet.

Recommendations to NGOs

- Actively challenge hate material on the Internet;
- Lobby Internet Service Providers to implement voluntary agreements with their customers to limit hate content.

Recommendations to Internet companies and Internet Service Providers

- Develop a systematic and effective approach in order for anyone to be able to notify them easily of any online hate-inciting material and to request that such material be removed or blocked;
- Work with States and civil society to understand the harm caused by targeted hate material and the business imperative on making the Internet a safe environment that allows all users to enjoy its benefits free from exposure to harmful hate material;
- Create and enhance mechanisms available to users of Internet sites to flag inappropriate content.

Agenda

10:00-10:15	Welcome and Opening Remarks Amb. Janez Lenarčič , Director of the ODIHR
10:15 - 12:30	Session 1: Legal framework and practical challenges in investigating and prosecuting Internet inspired hate crimes Speakers: Nasrin Khan , Expert on hate crime legislation, EUPOL COPPS Danuta Glowacka-Mazur , National Point of Contact on hate crimes, Polish Ministry of Interior and Administration Barbara Bosserman , Expert on federal hate crime law, Civil Rights Division at the U.S. Department of Justice Moderator: Nils Muiznieks , Chair, ECRI
12:30 - 13:30	Buffet lunch
13:30 - 15:00	Session 2: Successful examples of investigating and prosecuting hate crime cases related to hate on the Internet Speakers: Wim Stienen , Prosecutor, The Netherlands Lukáš Vilim , Police expert, Presidium of Police Force, Organized Crime and Extremism Department, Czech Republic Alexey Zhafyarov , General Prosecutor`s Office, Russian Federation Moderator: Floriane Hohenberg , Head of Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department
15:00-15:30	Coffee break
15:30 - 17:00	Session 3: Sharing of best practices, approaches and methods in addressing the phenomenon of hate on the Internet Speakers: Ronald Eissens , Director, Magenta Foundation, the Netherlands Martin Derchsler , Freiwillige Selbstkontrolle Multimedia-Diensteanbieter, Germany Moderator: Ženet Mujić , Senior Adviser, Office of the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media
17:00 - 17:30	Closing Session: Recommendations and conclusions

List of Participants

Speakers/Moderators:

1. Ms. Barbara BOSSERMAN, Advisor, Civil Rights Division at the U.S. Department of Justice, USA
2. Mr. Martin DRECHSLER, Member, FSM, Germany
3. Mr. Ronald EISSENS, Director, Magenta Foundation, Netherlands
4. Ms. Danuta GŁOWACKA-MAZUR, Director of the Department of Control, Complaints and Petitions, Ministry of Interior and Administration, Poland
5. Ms. Floriane HOHENBERG, Head, Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department, ODIHR
6. Ms. Nasrin KHAN, Legal Expert, EUPOL COPPS, United Kingdom
7. Ambassador Janez LENARČIČ, Ambassador, Director of ODIHR
8. Mr. Nils MUIZNIEKS, Chair, European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), Council of Europe
9. Ms. Ženet MUJIĆ, Senior Adviser, Office of the Representative of the Freedom of the Media, OSCE
10. Mr. Wim STIENEN, Public Prosecutor, Public Prosecutor's Office, Netherlands
11. Mr. Lukáš VILÍM, Police Officer, Police of the Czech Republic, Terrorism and Extremism Division, Czech Republic
12. Mr. Alexey ZHAFYAROV, Head of the Division of Supervision on Execution of Interethnic Affairs Legislation, General Prosecutor's Office of the Russian Federation

Participants:

13. Ms. Liane ADLER, Human Rights Adviser, ODIHR
14. Mr. Sayed ALY, Counter-Terrorism Officer, Action against Terrorism Unit, OSCE
15. Mr. Elmar AULER, Detective Chief Inspector, Federal Criminal Police Office (BKA), Germany
16. Mr. Osman BAJRAM, Volunteer, Association of Citizens Sumnal, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
17. Mr. Andrew BAKER, Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on Combating anti-Semitism, USA
18. Mr. Boudris BELAID, Member, OMDH Moroccan Organization for Human Rights, Morocco
19. Ms. Debbie BENSINGER, Assistant Director of Legal Affairs, Anti-Defamation League, USA
20. Ms. Sonja BÖHME, Senior Programme Manager, Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and Future", Germany
21. Ms. Ilze BRANDS KEHRIS, Director, Latvian Centre for Human Rights, Latvia
22. Ms. Suzette BRONKHORST, Director, International Network Against Cyber Hate (INACH), Netherlands
23. Ms. Shenaz BUNGLAWALA, Vice Chair, Europe and International Affairs committee, Muslim Council of Britain, United Kingdom
24. Ms. Sarah BURTON, Lawyer, Secretariat of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), Council of Europe
25. Mr. Maksym BUTKEVYCH, Project co-ordinator, Social Action Centre, Ukraine

26. Mr. Tuncay CAKMAK, Vice President, COJEP International, France
27. Ms. Aneta CEGLIŃSKA, Police Officer, National Police Headquarters, Poland
28. Ms. Pervin CHAIROULA, Member, Western Thrace Minority University Graduates Association, Greece
29. Mr. Patrick CONNELL, Political Officer, United States Mission to the OSCE, USA
30. Ms. Anita DANKA, Officer on Roma and Sinti Issues, ODIHR
31. Ambassador Douglas DAVIDSON, Ambassador, United States Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, USA
32. Ms. Monique DE GROOT, First Secretary, Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the OSCE, Netherlands
33. Mr. Pavol DRAXLER, CEO, DESECON, Slovakia
34. Ms. Halima EMBAREK WARZAZI, Member, Advisory Council on Human Rights (CCDH), Morocco
35. Mr. Mustafaoglu ERCUMENT, Member, Western Thrace Minority University Graduates Association, Greece
36. Mr. Veysel FILIZ, Vice President, INGO Conference of the Council of Europe, France
37. Ms. Silvia FROATS, Professional Associate, United States Mission to the OSCE, USA
38. Msgr. Anthony R. FRONTIERO, Official of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, Permanent Mission of Holy See to the OSCE, Holy See
39. Ms. Matilde FRUNCILLO, Adviser on Civil Society Relations, ODIHR
40. Mr. Arsen GABRIELIAN, National Security Officer, National Security Service, Armenia
41. Ms. Zhivka GEORGIEVA, Senior Legal Advisor, Commission for Protection against Discrimination, Bulgaria
42. Mr. Paul GIANNASI, Police Superintendent, Ministry of Justice, United Kingdom
43. Ms. Aleksandra GLISZCZYŃSKA – GRABIAS, Researcher, Poznan Human Rights Centre, Institute of Legal Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland
44. Ms. Marzena GORZYŃSKA, Expert, Ministry of Justice, Poland
45. Mr. Innokenty GREKOV, Program Associate, Human Rights First, USA
46. Mr. Nathan HALL, Criminologist, Portsmouth University / UK Government Race for Justice Programme, United Kingdom
47. Mr. Niels-Erik HANSEN, Director, Documentation and Advisory Centre on Racial Discrimination (DACoRD), Denmark
48. Mr. Norbert HINTERLEITNER, Adviser on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, ODIHR
49. Mr. Tufan HÖBEK, Legal Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Turkey to the OSCE, Turkey
50. Ms. Pia HOLM, Chief Superintendent (National Point of Contact), Police of Finland, National Police Board, Crime Combating Unit, Finland
51. Mr. Svetoslav ILIEV, Senior Legal Advisor, Commission for Protection against Discrimination, Bulgaria
52. Mr. Mika ILLMAN, State Prosecutor, The Office of the Prosecutor General, Finland
53. Mr. Krzysztof JARYMOWICZ, Director, Foundation for Freedom, Poland
54. Mr. Krzysztof JAWORSKI, Police Officer, National Police Headquarters, Poland
55. Mr. Mikko JORONEN, Advisor - Ethnic Equality, Finnish League for Human Rights, Finland
56. Ms. Klara KALIBOVA, Director, In IUSTITIA, Czech Republic
57. Mr. Nadir KAMALADDINOV, Director International Caucasus Foundation on Minority Issues (ICFMI), Azerbaijan

58. Mr. David KAMPFHENKEL, Detective Inspector, Federal Criminal Police Office (BKA), Germany
59. Ms. Celina KIN, Policy Officer, European Network Against Racism, Belgium
60. Mr. Witold KLAUS Assistant Professor Institute of Legal Study, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland
61. Ms. Wiesława KOSTRZEWA-ZORBAS, Chief expert, Office of the Government Plenipotentiary for Equal Treatment, Chancellery of the Prime Minister, Poland
62. Mr. Marcin KOZŁOWSKI, Police Expert, National Police Headquarters, Poland
63. Mr. Mehmet Yılmaz KÜÇÜK, Human Rights President, Human Rights Presidency, Prime Ministry of the Republic of Turkey
64. Ms. Malgorzata KUCZYNSKA, Political Officer, Embassy of Canada in Poland
65. Mr. Warren KUNCE, Moderator of Online Organization, YouTube Transgender Blogging Community, Sweden
66. Ms. Katarzyna ŁAKOMIEC, Lawyer, Human Rights Defender's Office, Poland
67. Ms. Kelly LOW, Adviser on Anti-Terrorism Issues, ODIHR
68. Ms. Anna MALMON, Co-ordinator of the Monitoring Team on Racism and Xenophobia, Ministry of Interior and Administration, Department of Control, Complaints and Petitions, Poland
69. Mr. Rafał MASZKOWSKI, Member, Never Again Association, Poland
70. Mr. Chris MBURU, Acting Chief, Anti-Discrimination Section, United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Geneva
71. Ms. Ewa MELLER, Lawyer, Campaign against Homophobia, Poland
72. Ms. Agnieszka MIKULSKA, Project Manager, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Poland
73. Mr. Daniel MIŁO, Adviser on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, ODIHR
74. Mr. Andrzej MIRGA, Senior Adviser on Roma and Sinti Issues, ODIHR
75. Ms. Antoine MISONNE, First Secretary, Embassy of Belgium in Poland, Belgium
76. Mr. Bensadik MOHAMED, Counsellor to the Minister, Ministry of Communication, Morocco
77. Mr. Tiberius Ilie MOLDOVAN, Chief Prosecutor of Service for International Cooperation, Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice, Romania
78. Mr. Andrzej MONDRY, Police Officer, National Police Headquarters, Poland
79. Mr. Yekmalyan MUSHEGH, Human Dimension Meetings Officer, ODIHR
80. Ms. Alexandra NAZAROVA, Program Coordinator, Youth Human Rights Movement, Russian Federation
81. Ms. Stefańska OLGA, Member Pagan Federation, Poland
82. Mr. Larry OLOMOFE, Deputy Head, Tolerance and Non-Discrimination Department, ODIHR
83. Ms. Olga OPANASENKO, Second Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Russian Federation
84. Ms. Macha PARIENTE, Head of the Legal Department, LICRA (International League against Racism and Antisemitism), France
85. Mr. Bashy QURASHY, Chair, Jewish Muslim Co-operation Platform, Denmark
86. Mr. Tomasz RADTKE, Prosecutor, Warsaw District Prosecutor's Office, Poland
87. Ms. Fatima RESIT, Western Thrace Minority University Graduates Association, Greece
88. Ms. Ellen ROGERS, Consultant, ODIHR
89. Mr. Eugen RUSU, Prosecutor, Office of Prosecutor General, Moldova

90. Mr. Evgeniy SCHEGOLIEV, Lecturer, State University, High School of Economics, Russian Federation
91. Mr. Yerlan SHAIMARDANOV, Head of Subdivision, National Security Committee, Kazakhstan
92. Mr. Vladimir ŠOĆ, Advisor, Ministry for Human and Minority Rights, Serbia
93. Mr. Tankut SOYKAN, Adviser on Combating Racism, Xenophobia and Discrimination, ODIHR
94. Ms. Kovicjka ŠPIRIĆ, Ambassador, Embassy of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Poland, Bosnia and Herzegovina
95. Mr. Alexander STEFFEK, Advisor at Complaints Bureau ZARA, Austria
96. Ms. Jeanette STOVEL, Political Counsellor, Embassy of Canada in Poland, Canada
97. Mr. Mark TOWNSEND, Detective Sergeant, National Domestic Extremism Team, United Kingdom
98. Ms. Laura TUGANBEKOVA, Prosecutor, Prosecutor General's Office, Kazakhstan
99. Mr. Rimvydas VALENTUKEVIČIUS, Chief Prosecutor, Head of the Division of Special Investigation of Prosecutor General's Office, Lithuania
100. Mr. Gidon VAN EMDEN, Deputy Director, European Policy & Jewish Affairs, CEJI – A Jewish Contribution to an Inclusive Europe, Belgium
101. Mr. Igor VEJNOVIC, Programme Assistant, Regional Centre for Minorities, Serbia
102. Mr. Alexandr VERKHOVSKY, Director, SOVA Center for Information and Analysis, Russian Federation
103. Ms. Radka VICENOVA, Project manager, People Against Racism, Slovakia
104. Mr. Georg VOULGARIS, Public Prosecutor at Athens Court of First Instance, Ministry of Justice, Greece
105. Mr. Richard WARMAN, Barrister and Solicitor, INACH, Canada
106. Mr. Michael WHINE, Member, Race for Justice Advisory Group, Office for Criminal Justice Reform, United Kingdom
107. Ms. Marijana ZUBONIA, Embassy of Bosnia & Herzegovina in Poland, Bosnia and Herzegovina