**Working Group on Communication Strategies and Practices**

**21 November 2016, Bratislava, Slovakia**

**Welcome**

We were given a warm welcome by the Director of the Slovak National Centre for Human Rights (SNSLP), **Marián Mesároš**. He highlighted the importance of these working group meetings as a great way of exchanging good practices, and even sharing practices that didn’t work so well, and identifying together why that was. Considering the complicated times we live in, the importance of combatting hate speech was underlined as vital in our work. While extremists use very powerful terms like ‘we’ and ‘they’, equality bodies aim to personify stories, identifying he and she and showing the dignity of each individual person. It is the equality bodies’ task to speak the truth, and check their facts and numbers for all communication. Even though the numbers aren’t always pleasant, we still need to use the facts in our work. Social media has helped extremists to get into parliament, therefore we must use it cleverly to combat them, whilst allowing people to keep their freedom of speech.

**Katrine G. Pettersen** (Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud, Norway),Working Group moderator, reminded us of the recent results of the US elections. How could Trump, a man who spoke badly of women, minorities, the disabled etc, make it into the White House? In Norway, the Minister of Immigration and Integration, is also a master of ‘us and them’. We must remember that it is not just in America, but across Europe far right parties are getting closer to power and walls/barriers are being built to keep out the ‘other’.

**Using Communication to Change Legislation**

**Ann Kathrin Sost**(Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency (FADA), Germany) presented FADA’s recent work. For some background information: From 1949 to 1969, under a law inherited from the Nazi regime, about 50,000 men in West Germany were convicted of homosexuality. Many served time in prison. Some of those who survived concentration camps were jailed again as they still had time to pay. Although the law — known as Paragraph 175 for the section it was part of in the country’s Criminal Code — was eased in 1969, it stayed on the books. As a result, another 3,500 men were convicted before the law was finally rescinded in 1994, four years after the reunification of Germany. Those convicted during the Nazi period were no longer considered criminals, but those after 1945 were not rehabilitated straight away and the convictions stayed on their criminal records.

Why was this not changed? Although there were previously some attempts to change this, in general, people were afraid to change court judgements under democratic parties, and felt that it was not necessary as other EU countries hadn’t done anything either (UK, Ireland). There was even a decision by the Bundesrat to say that we needed rehabilitation for gay men, but nothing ever came out of that.

This was unacceptable for FADA, who decided to tackle this through legal arguments, a political strategy, and on the emotional level. Their main communication channels for this were a very big  
engagement with the media (especially through a successful press conference), a social media campaign and NGO and partner strategies.

Legal arguments: Professor Dr. Martin Burgi, a conservative lawyer was asked to write research on this for FADA (NB that he was conservative as then his ideas would be taken seriously). His main findings: the state cannot only find ways to take action on this issue, but it is obliged to take action! Read the English summary of the findings [here](http://www.antidiskriminierungsstelle.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/publikationen/Factsheets/factsheet_engl_Rehabilitierung_der_nach_175StGB_verurteilten_homosex_Maenner.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=3).

Political strategy: Head of FADA Christine Lueders appealed to the government to take action. FADA discussed the expert report with LGBT activists in advance of its publication to get their feedback. One week before the press conference, they sent out copies of the report to some well-chosen people with main messages.

Emotional level: Hard to find people willing to testify in public, but through connection with NGO, they met with Heinz Schmitz (who had been imprisoned for the first time for being gay at the age of 17). Mr. Schmitz (false name) originally hesitated as he had already lost contact with his family for an article in a regional paper. However he saw the need to speak out. They created a [video](https://vimeo.com/165929549) telling his story, which was shared massively on social media, also by a lot of young people. At the press conference, they showed the video, Mr. Schmitz was there and cried and it really got the message out!

Communication: Shortly before the press conference a renowned law expert at Süddeutsche Zeitung wrote about the report. Many people attended the press conference and were talking about it in the media in general. The extent of the interest garnered was such that in the middle of the press conference, the Ministry of Justice, announced that they would get rid of the law.

They also organized a Social media campaign entitled #NichtSchuldig, which was a photo campaign explaining why it was important that this was overturned with different people explaining their stories (It was launched on IDAHOT which is 17 May, the same numbers as Paragraph 175). One of the men had originally been imprisoned for being in the Swing Jugend, then for being gay!

So what’s next? Currently draft legislation in discussion, 30 million euros set aside, particularly for collective compensation (education, money into old folks homes etc). This is very important as FADA doesn’t think there’ll be many individual compensation requests. It’s not about money, but about justice. FADA also participates in a working group led by elderly gay activists, including staff from the Ministry. They have invited Heinz Schmitz to go to FADA and to hear the discussion about the new legislation in the parliament.

Success was due in part large part to good communication! (See presentation [here](http://www.equineteurope.org/IMG/pptx/fada_presentation_-_paragraph_175.pptx)).

**DISCUSSION**

* No possibility for gay people to give blood in Germany, but they are not working on this now.
* In Greece, being gay was considered a psychiatric issue, so some people were locked up! However nothing has really been done to apologise for that.
* What parts of government received information about the report in advance? FADA is affiliated to the Ministry for Family Affairs (although it’s independent) so the Minister there received it, but they sent this info to the Ministry of Justice too to get their attention. Also sent it to main heads of political parties so they know what it is about. However they didn’t want to discuss it with them before, just inform them (so they couldn’t try to change their work!)
* The whole discussion on this issue started in 1995, a year after the law was abolished. Therefore the discussion on annulling convictions had been around a long time, sometimes led by lobby groups, other times by political parties. But nothing ever happened before.
* In Serbia, politicians make very unfair statements (hate speech) about LGBTI and nothing can be done. Parliamentarians have immunity, but this could be raised by parliamentarians. In Greece, the Golden Dawn party doesn’t have immunity but the far left party does, so it’s a political issue. In order to overcome these kind of blockages, lobbying could be answer. Work with NGOs to get them to talk to their local politicians and request changes. The Church may be able to play a positive role but this is not always the case.
* Now in Malta, a law was just passed to say that it’s illegal to make LGBTI a ‘sickness’ and to try to treat it as such.
* In Cyprus, a well-known archbishop wanted to make a special school to treat LGBTI, but it was condemned by everyone.
* [In UK, they have very recently announced a law to pardon homosexuals](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/minister-unveils-plans-to-pardon-thousands-under-turings-law) (seems to make it still a bad thing!)
* In Greece, many of the refugees coming are LGBTI – would be imprisoned or worse at home. Question is how to interview these people – currently, they are trying to find out if they go to certain bars etc. But those from a village don’t know them so considered to be pretending. Many are deported back to Turkey saying they are not facing a threat there. However, there are many extremists in Turkey which could cause life threatening situations for gay people.

**TO DO**

In 2017, the policy formation working group will be looking at the European Commission’s [List of Action to Advance LGBTI equality](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/lgbti_actionlist_en.pdf). This list includes mention of a communication campaign to improve the social acceptance of LGBTI people. The result was the [#ShareyourDream campaign](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/orientation/awareness-raising/index_en.htm). Please have a look at the campaign (available in all EU languages) and consider using it in your promotional work. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please let Sarah know.

**Combatting Hate Speech and promoting our values online**

**Italian equality body UNAR – Background information**

**Marco Buemi**, currently attending the WG as an Italian expert, gave some background information on the Italian member UNAR. UNAR was set up in 2005, following the Directive in 2003. At that time, Marco was working for Swedish Ombudsman as their communication expert, then UNAR met with him and suggested he go work for them for a year – got renewed every year for 10 years, through 5 governments. All experts were working mainly on content and officers were the technical part of things. Marco worked on communication for both UNAR and the Department of Equal Opportunities. UNAR has never been independent, but never had obstacles to work until 2015. In 2015, a member of a political party (far right) posted hate speech on FB against Muslims, (this wasn’t the first time). End of July, UNAR sent a letter complaining about this (as they have a mandate to do). After holidays, early September, the politician started highlighting blocking freedom of speech. Made as much noise as possible sending letters to all (in advance of Rome elections). In all newspapers, there were pro/contra campaigns towards UNAR. NGOs in Italy wrote a couple of letters to try and give support, Equinet and EC helped too. But in the end, Director was kicked out, as were all the experts working there. Marco and team tried to create articles to raise awareness, also outside Italy, but these weren’t very successfully taken up. One year earlier, UNAR had been attacked by church on LGBTI work, so their name was already a ‘hot’ one. Office is currently seriously understaffed (as experts are gone), and any officers still there are trying to leave due to climate. They are hoping that with ESF next year there might be some people reinstated against.

**PRISM – PREVENTING, REDRESSING AND INHIBITING HATE SPEECH IN NEW MEDIA**

[PRISM](http://www.prismproject.eu/) – financed by EC - worked also with UNICRI to work with all 28 countries. Wanted to look at what are the legal aspects of 28 MS on hate speech. UK, Italy, Spain, France, Romania had research done with school kids in those countries. Also worked with media (journalists) - Marco met with Director of EL Pais in Spain, partnership with La Republica in Italy and main newspaper in Romania too.

Awareness raising was most important part of project as it’s a new issue and they really wanted to disseminate a lot. With awareness comes reporting, and trying to deal with that correctly. There was a big increase in Italy in reports from social media and media on hate speech.  
List of specific objectives on slides. Includes training with lawyers, law enforcement agency – they are usually aware about hate speech, so they deal with complaints, and exchanged on what tools they use to fight this. Marco met with FB Europe and Twitter Europe, as well as regional offices. Policies are quite light on these sites but it’s still business so they need a really good reason to shut down sites! They tested how effective they were if reports were done. Send FB 100 complaints about Charta Rome (on hate speech), only 9 were removed! Therefore less than 10 per cent of complaints are removed!

Challenges – how to include target groups in activities : lawyers, police force, schools, media – aimed to involve them all. Organised 3 seminars in each country, inviting media too, to see how they deal with comments on websites. Some just let people write whatever they want, with no moderation! They realized that in schools, they don’t know what hate speech is. Can they understand it? So started with what is hate speech. Then, I’m not racist but…

Council of Europe No Hate Speech campaign no longer has funding so have quietened down a lot.

“Words are weapons! A network without hate is in your hands.”

Aimed to make a good [video](https://youtu.be/S1aApGgIstY) to make it viral! Reasons it went well – had a deal with FB and Twitter (part of campaign from beginning), they got 5000 euros from FB and the same from Twitter – bought space to publish video on both, then we, together with them chose who our target groups, which areas etc. Worked with a creative company to get them to put together video, keeping in mind perspective on hate speech. Concentrate on haters contaminating the city (what goes around, comes around). Love against hate. Only can save yourself if you take the love!

Shared 1,680,531 times on social media – only done in 5 countries. Viewers: 184,909 on Facebook, 1,002,6000 on Twitter

[Radio campaign](http://www.prismproject.eu/english-spot-radio/) – make a lot of noise/bad statements, you would rather here nice music on the radio than this, so when you put bad statements online, this is the noise you are creating. Make music instead. 30 seconds, 7 different versions in national and local languages.

* Italy Virgin Radio / Radio Italy – spots between 21-23 h for 7 days, totally 30 spots, listeners 1800000.
* France – one month, 5000 listeners
* UK – 10 days, sent 78 times, 1.2 listeners every week (2,5 million)
* Spain – Catalan Radio Rac 105 – sent 7 times at 8-9 in morning. Mobile version downloaded 80000 times
* Romanian, Radio Kiss 11\_29 years, over 2 million

Altogether over 6 million listeners.

See presentation [here](http://www.equineteurope.org/IMG/ppt/prism.ppt).

**DISCUSSION**

* Any evaluation of how these were received? Would be good to check discussion on FB. -> On their website, they included hate and love sections to make people aware of what was out there. But there wasn’t one page used for the video – video was virally spread by FB and others, so hard to follow.
* Dimitris – hard to identify **who** is doing the hate speech. Alt Right (US) had all twitter accounts cancelled – Milo is greek/jewish, officially British and gay – he is self-victimised through this, same as Italian MP in UNAR case. Renzo/Prodi tackled Berlusconi on policies rather than personality. We need to learn about victimization from these experiences and see how we can improve this in future.
* Need to evaluate the impact on people. In Portugal, in health care many years ago, condoms were given out. But this doesn’t mean that these were used! We really should consider how to evaluate these (although in short space of a campaign, maybe social attitudes won’t change). At least we could measure discussion online (positive/negative).
* Via social media, at least you can see which people like it most, but comments will also give you an idea if it was well understood or not. Consider Paivi’s Berlin presentation on ‘[Evaluating Public Profiles and Strategies: How to monitor your public profile?](http://www.equineteurope.org/IMG/pdf/wg_communication_2nov_summary.pdf)’ *(need to be logged in to internal website to open link)*
* Unia in Belgium – need to say what freedom of speech is in order to be able to say what hate speech is. (Consider seeing [EHCR freedom of expression publication](https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-work/news/commission-publishes-freedom-expression-guidance)).
* Love / Hate space on PRISM website – why give hate the space? -> They clearly outline what is considered hate speech or love speech – just an exposition, rather than comments. Might have been a problem in Finland to highlight the hate on another platform! Note that there is an [educational toolkit](http://www.prismproject.eu/educational-toolkit/) which can be used by all.
* Should tell people what they have to change in their behavior, and then maybe you can measure those changes.

**Equality bodies’ role on social media: Where do we fit in? What’s our position? Value based counter speech and combating symbols in the media society**

**Paivi Ojanperä** (Ombudsman for Equality, Finland):We all lack resources, but what should we be doing on hate? In Belgium there seems to be a clear strategy on fighting hate speech, but we all have to fight this and clearly aren’t always doing it well. Nowadays, people don’t seem to know much about human rights. They seem to be opinions or matters of different values. People also think there’ll be no consequences – this is a free country! In Finland at the moment, no one in the government is sympathetic to the work of the equality body.

Eg. In Finland, sexual harassment experienced by young people on social media meets crime criteria in several cases. There have also been a lot of examples of Nazi groups using violence against refugees. The good news is that it seems that police will found a unit to follow online hate speech and hate crimes.

* Liquid modernity (Bauman 2002) – position of institutions and legitimacy have been questioned.
* Andrew Keen (2007) – amateur cult – has raised amateur statements to compete as equally valid presentations and statements with the real experts.
* Counter-experts – competing in public sphere with the experts. Individuals no longer know who to follow, believe, listen to.

Even in past 2 years, things have changed hugely with fake media competition, they find each other and all share the same propaganda. **We should learn from them to promote our message! (eg. influencers in social media)**

Finland has always been a global crisis mediator, helping people across the globe with their issues. Now they are sending people back to their countries to end up dead etc and that’s a political decision!

Active communication about correct concepts, terms and facts – see slides for reasons.

We exist for this, so need to make time to create counter speech in society (spread attitudes and values), we need to increase the correct knowledge and decrease prejudice, maintain our own position as key players and opinion leaders.

Essential channels – media and social media, training, cooperation with authorities/NGOs, cooperation with FB/Twitter, fact checking, avoid wrong balance (media hearing and giving equal space and importance to real and fake experts). For example, in Finland, Lithuania, there are televised debates with people and haters but there is no positive messages given out at the end, so seems more of a platform for the haters.

Researchers still think that FB is best media for changing attitudes, although Twitter is easier to use due to people who are included (journalists, experts etc). Instagram becoming more important as they can visually spread emotion.

Fake media in Finland – what the fuck page? There are 2 types – one is satire, while the other is used to promote hate. In Finland this page is promoting fake news – use real events that are twisted.

FB now has page to stop fake news [Eg. from Italy](https://www.facebook.com/notes/checkblacklist/contro-le-bufale-elenco-dei-falsi-messaggi/294034937041/)

Crisis communication and theme management in digital sphere -> # management and how to deal with and comment positively on hashtags. Most NB conversations will be linked to NB hashtags and we can inform each other about those things. Judging something creates activity – condemn, flames, media fuss, image crisis – only takes about 20 mins. We need to strengthen the good and positive and need to engage with these counter groups.

FB are working a huge amount on counter speech – PRISM part 2 would focus on counter speech.  
We need to do something clever together and use that to counter speech across our countries. Fact checking NB – who tries to combat original idea with something more appealing that combats that?

Finland: Ombudsman created a strategy on equality in comprehensive schools – got into the media, created a big hype about boys no longer being boys etc. Paivi one day later managed to take the air out of the discussion by explaining what was actually in the strategy. She paid to market that boring comment and it was shared much more broadly. This was also discussed in Estonia in main stream media and they shared the Finnish response from Paivi.

Our role is to give correct information based on agreements in law/society. However the rational/analytical way of speaking is not reaching out to people enough. How do we get into the emotional discussion?

Elisabeth Neumann (1974) “The spiral of silence. A theory of Public Opinion”, when people see they are in a minority, they don’t say anything, so the majority seems bigger than it is. Very small parties/right wing are very loud! It’s NB to put our opinion to give the voice to the silent people who agree with you. Our message does get out there!

* UK – stop funding hate, communicate politely, asking companies to stop advertising in hater newspapers <https://twitter.com/StopFundingHate>
* Malta – recently a decline in the quality of the experts. May backfire. Best thing then is to present counter arguments. We may need to learn to be populist ourselves, include passion in the arguments! Its’s hard for us as we’re used to presenting facts. Need to be careful – hate speech as a term – what is that? Need to tackle tangible arguments. Until what point should you engage? That’s the main problem. We don’t want to normalize their arguments, but need to engage!

Journalists (many of them are targets of hate themselves) – get them to engage and share your info – try to develop relationships with them through engagement on Twitter. Do this by presenting convincing counter arguments. Give space to normal persons who on an everyday basis who are saying something against hate speech.

Could we as equality bodies endorse communities/amplify their voice? Would it be effective for us to endorse them? Better to have people doing things from grassroots, without official body validating what they do.

See presentation [here](http://www.equineteurope.org/IMG/pptx/equality_bodies_role_paivi.pptx).

**Social Media with an equality body perspective**

We went through the proposed Training manual for social media with an equality body perspective. These are the sections that need to be worked on and who needs to take a look at them.

**Importance of social media:** Could be used by org to help convince bosses why we need social media. Paivi and Katrine can give examples of how important it is. Move FB paragraphs to FB section later

**Social Media Strategy:** Minta and Katrine – 10 points on how to create a social media strategy

**How to set up processes** – Elke will think about this from a ‘beginners’ point of view. Ann Katrine and Paivi not so happy with idea of private profiles being used, so reword this, but give examples of how in Estonia it works (it’s a ‘work’ account’). CZ example will be developed by Monika. In Greece they have manuals for all positions, so will be checked by Dimitris to see if we can use any of that.

**How to set the right metrics and analyze the current situation** – UK and France

**Finding your audience and reaching it** – example from CZ about promoted campaign & lady from Norway

**How to create engaging content on FB** – change title for Social Media, and look at ideas for all social media channels.

Croatia – did a Twitter poll about homeless people – how many years do you think an average homeless person has been working before they were homeless

Germany – 12 things you didn’t know about gender discrimination – can include that

**Right here, right now** – replace with sth more relevant.

Norway – women and their shoes!

Anyone with examples of quick and reactive posts on social media? Portugal – taxi drivers ‘laws are like women and should be raped’, government took steps to change that. – Carla will add sth.  
**Be a part of something bigger** – easily shared, happy ‘gay’ news ) Norway example.  
Germany and refugee/gender issue?

**Influencers** – Get rid of or change wording in Justin Bieber examples. Ask EHRC to give info on Power to the Bump & video bloggers. Paivi – journalists usually not touching on certain issues – will contact them. CZ – big group of NGOs – informal way asked for support. Wrote letters to key politicians etc

Is **FB Pixel** legal/ethical? Seems in NO it would be ok, but in Finland they took away all 3rd party providers as they carry cookies too. Now no such things on their site. Paivi will write up short section on Facebook Pixel, including issue of TRUST.

**New social media** – Twitter campaign from Belgium, as explained in social media training

**Crisis communication** - what people can say and not from Slovakia. Sarah to have a look at Crisis Communication section. Elke will give a suggestion for a new title as doesn’t like ‘crisis’ communication. Meme on special olmpics to be gotten rid of. Belgium and French examples.

Best practices vs fail stories – get examples from everyone. Ask Nadine about why not to campaign on racist stories

**CLOSE**

Sarah thanked Thekla for her participation in the Working Group, especially during her time as a moderator. She will be concentrating on other tasks within the Ombudsman from now on and will be replaced by her colleague Doros.

A big thank you also went out to Natalia and Eduard for their help and support in organizing the event and to the Slovak National Centre for Human Rights for kindly hosting us.

**AGENDA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Venue:** | **Useful contacts on the day:** |
| Slovak National Centre for Human Rights  Laurinská 18  811 01 Bratislava | **Natália Juráková:** +421 902 646 665  **Sarah Cooke O’Dowd**: +32 484 771053  **Katrine Pettersen:** +47 94018856 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sunday, 20 November 2016 – Social Event** | |
|  | **19:00** - Meet in front of Art Hotel William for a short city tour  **20:00** – Dinner at [Flagship Restaurant](http://www.bratislavskarestauracia.sk/en/) (Bratislavská reštaurácia), [Námestie SNP 8](http://share.here.com/r/mylocation/e-eyJuYW1lIjoiQnJhdGlzbGF2YSBGbGFnIFNoaXAgUmVzdGF1cmFudCIsImFkZHJlc3MiOiJOXHUwMGUxbWVzdGllIFNOUCA4LCBCcmF0aXNsYXZhLCBTbG92YWtpYSIsImxhdGl0dWRlIjo0OC4xNDYyNCwibG9uZ2l0dWRlIjoxNy4xMTAwNCwicHJvdmlkZXJOYW1lIjoiZmFjZWJvb2siLCJwcm92aWRlcklkIjozNDg1NjQ2MTAxOTl9?link=addresses&fb_locale=en_GB&ref=facebook) (for those on the tour, we will go straight to the restaurant) |
| **Monday, 21 November 2016: Working Group Meeting** | |
| 8:45 | Meet at reception of Art Hotel William and walk to Slovak National Centre for Human Rights together |
| 9:00 – 9:30 | **Welcome**   * *Marián Mesároš, Slovak National Centre for Human Rights* * *Katrine Gaustad Pettersen, Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud, Norway* |
| 09:30 – 10:30 | **Using Communication to Change Legislation**   * *Ann Kathrin Sost, Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency (FADA), Germany*   From 1949 to 1969, under a law inherited from the Nazi regime, about 50,000 men in West Germany were convicted of homosexuality. Many served time in prison. Although the law — known as Paragraph 175 for the section it was part of in the country’s Criminal Code — was eased in 1969, it stayed on the books. As a result, another 3,500 men were convicted before the law was finally rescinded in 1994, four years after the reunification of Germany. Even then, the convictions stayed on the men’s criminal records.  On the basis of research carried out and communicated by FADA, this law will now be changed. Ann Kathrin will outline what communication work they did on this work in order to make these changes come about. |
| 10:30 -11:00 | **Coffee break** |
| 11:00-13:00 | **Combatting Hate Speech and promoting our values online**   * *Marco Buemi, Coordinator of the project ‘PRISM. Preventing, Redressing and Inhibiting Hate Speech in New Media’* * *Päivi* *Ojanperä, Ombudsman for Equality, Finland*   Marco will present some of the outcomes of the PRISM project linked to three pillar activities - analysis of the phenomenon of online hate speech and of EU legal redressing mechanisms, training, educational and awareness raising activities – and delineation of a possible response strategy reflecting the position of equality bodies based on these results.  Päivi will discuss value oriented theme management and opinion leadership online in order to for us to develop some specific tactics to participate in and manage online discussions, using values based messages.  *Followed by group discussions* |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | **Lunch break** |
| 14:00 – 15:15 | **Social Media with an equality body perspective**  Follow up from the Social Media training in order to put the final touches to the manual, including good practices from our members. |
| 15:15 – 15:30 | Summary of meeting and close |

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Surname** | **First Name** | **Organisation** | **Country** |
| Bernardo | Carla | CIG | Portugal |
| Bernát | György | Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights | Hungary |
| Buemi | Marco | Expert | Italy |
| Callus | Andre | NCPE | Malta |
| Cooke O'Dowd | Sarah | Equinet | Belgium |
| Csudai | Eduard | Slovak National Centre for Human Rights | Slovakia |
| Demetriadou | Thekla | Office of the Commissioner for Administration (Ombudsman) | Cyprus |
| Francois | Michaël | Unia | Belgium |
| Hanych | Monika | Public Defender of Rights | Czech Republic |
| HORMOVITIS | DIMITRIS | GREEK OMBUDSMAN | GREECE |
| Juráková | Natália | Slovak National Centre for Human Rights | Slovakia |
| Jurkute | Mintaute | Office of the Equal Opoortunities Ombudsperson | Lithuania |
| Kabashi | Irida | Commissioner for Protection from Discrimination | Albania |
| Kahar | Kaidor | Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner's office | Estonia |
| Lujansky -Lammer | Elke | Ombud for Equal Treatment | Austria |
| Ojanperä | Päivi | Ombudsman for Equality | Finland |
| Pettersen | Katrine G | The Equality and anti-discrimination Ombud, | Norway |
| Sost | Ann Kathrin | FADA | Germany |
| Tretinjak | Ana | Office of the Ombudswoman | Croatia |
| Vlaskalin | Tamara | Commissioner for the Protection of Equality | Serbia |