

DEVELOPING A TOOLBOX FOR COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES 14-15 December 2015

MEETING REPORT

Executive summary

Background

As the challenges facing the European Union grew in 2014-2015, there were widespread calls for increased efforts to communicate the principles of respect and non-discrimination across the EU. For example, in December 2014 the Council stated that *"the EU should consider strengthening targeted actions designed to raise awareness and promote the respect of fundamental rights and values, including assessing the need for the development of an EU communication strategy."* Following the Paris and Copenhagen attacks, the Heads of State or Government called in February 2015 for *"communication strategies to promote tolerance, non-discrimination, fundamental freedoms and solidarity throughout the EU."* This was echoed by the European Parliament's resolution of 9 July 2015.

In response, the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) and the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior (BMI) jointly convened a workshop to discuss existent practices as well as the development of new tools and approaches ("toolbox") to ensure the effective communication of the EU's core principles and values. These in turn aim to support national authorities, local authorities and service providers in promoting respect, non-discrimination, freedoms and solidarity. To ensure a wide-ranging input and to maximise a comprehensive application of the meeting's final outputs, participants were invited from the EU institutions and national and local authorities, as well as communication experts and practitioners involved in combating racism, deradicalisation, and human rights education.

Main findings and analysis

Communication should always be two-way, in a form of a dialogue

There is evidently a need to move away from one-way, top down communication towards two-way, participatory ways of communicating on the understanding that meaningful dialogue is by definition a *conversation* between two or more parties. In this regard, this expert group questioned the provision of one-way information such as *central office type* directed campaigns or the routine provision of printed information or pamphlets.

'Partners for dialogue' rather than 'target audiences'

The very notion of being a 'target' has an alienating effect, irrespective of the merits of the message, and therefore undermines the objective of honest and *authentic* dialogue. Whatever the aims of a communication strategy, a successful outcome is therefore reliant on a shared ownership of the process. This, in turn,

is best achieved if the dialogue takes place in the spirit of equality, in which the word 'partners' replaces 'targets'.

'Partners for dialogue' must be included in the design of communication strategies and measures

To achieve shared ownership of any communication process, the input of all potential partners for dialogue is imperative from the very outset. The wider engagement of other allies and message multipliers can then be developed from this common starting point, and promises to be more effective on this basis.

Respect for everyone by everyone as the core principle to be communicated

The fundamental rights and freedoms enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU form the guiding principles of the European Union, and yet they often remain inaccessible, even to educated audiences such as school teachers or members of the judiciary. The development and widespread distribution of a user-friendly and attractive toolkit about the Charter itself would be a first step to improve this situation. At the same time, ownership of these values needs to be perceived as *universal* in order to foster respect *for everyone by everyone* in accord with the values and fundamental rights enshrined in the Charter. The challenge is to make these values common to everyone living in the EU.

Different groups respond to different approaches

In the present multimedia world of communications, different groups are attracted to starkly different channels, depending on age, education, religious, ethnic, or other background. While young people are interested in politics, they tend not to read newspapers. At the same time, some elderly people cannot use the Internet. Politicians struggle to make their voices heard amongst some constituencies, while most ordinary people have little interest in reading meeting reports. A variety of communications channels are needed in response to this complex reality, such as:

- face to face dialogue;
- social media – in particular Twitter and Facebook;
- toolkits and related user-friendly publications
- train-the-trainers programmes;
- work with multipliers from within the different groups

Beyond the concept of counter-narratives

A European narrative is needed that can be broken down and tailored to different needs and requirements at local or community level. For example, the Syria Strategic Communication Advisory Team (SSCAT) recognised that counter-narratives were proving inadequate, and in response is working to develop positive narratives. One participant at the workshop said: '*real, authentic stories are key*', while another defined '*three success factors for communicating human rights: relevance, public interest, authenticity.*' The prerequisite for an effective communications toolbox is '*careful listening*' and while counter-narratives to violence and insurgency are needed, they are '*not enough*'. A more effective method is required that resonates with the young and other disaffected communities.

From reacting and preventing to shaping: creating inclusive societies in a fundamental rights framework.

In order to counter extremism, more inclusive societies are needed. The best of all possible prevention strategies would therefore be to foster the acceptance of universal/European fundamental rights. Efforts to strengthen social cohesion and the concept of living together in freedom and security with people of different cultural or religious backgrounds on the basis of fundamental rights and values were considered crucial in this regard. Thus although deradicalisation strategies are important, in order to work they need to be embedded in a culture of promoting inclusion, of communicating respect and non-discrimination to the widest possible audience.

Rights awareness must be raised

Despite work by FRA and other fundamental rights organisations and advocates, large parts of the majority population and in particular minorities remained largely unaware of their legal entitlements in democratic and free societies. A number of FRA surveys confirm that people often don't report discrimination because they are either unaware of anti-discrimination legislation or simply don't believe it will help them. A gap therefore exists between the rights afforded to citizens in the EU and their *awareness of these rights* that remains to be filled. The meeting heard of several ongoing initiatives that purported to increase awareness of citizens' rights. The European Commission presented some interesting examples: Colloquium, Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) and its new centre of excellence; the Syria Strategic Communication Advisory Team (SSCAT); the EU Internet Forum, and the Europe for Citizens Programme. ECRI (European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, Council of Europe) was also present and suggested there would be good synergies with its new action plan focusing on education, combating discrimination and support for developing effective integration policies.

The authenticity of the messenger is essential

Real testimonies have often proven to be by far the most powerful method to explain and exemplify a message and reach the widest audience. Quite simply, a true story is engaging, authentic and self-evidently not conveyed by someone advocating a preconceived agenda.

Language and terminology are crucial but their impact underestimated

It was recognised that the use of terms such as 'Islamism' or even general terms such as 'refugee', 'migrant' and 'Islam', are frequently used erroneously and in some contexts have assumed toxic connotations. Terminology therefore needs to be reclaimed and re-defined as a matter of urgency. In this regard, the development of glossaries or guidelines would be helpful, in particular for politicians, opinion-leaders and the media.

Knowledge management is key

Funding and organising the exchange of knowledge (including through physical meetings), as well as translations, are critical. At present, there is no overview available of the many good practices that already exist across the EU, and they remain for the most part unknown. There is also a lack of exchange of experiences

ANNEX: Detailed meeting results

Background

Aims

During the period 2014 – 2015, there was a widespread call for increased efforts to more effectively communicate respect and non-discrimination across the European Union. This requirement was affirmed at various Council, EP, EC meetings and Ministerial Conferences: In December 2014 the Council stated that *"the EU should consider strengthening targeted actions designed to raise awareness and promote the respect of fundamental rights and values, including assessing the need for the development of an EU communication strategy."* Following the Paris and Copenhagen attacks, the Heads of State or Government asked in February 2015 for *"communication strategies to promote tolerance, non-discrimination, fundamental freedoms and solidarity throughout the EU."* In July 2015 the European Parliament echoed this call.

In response, FRA and the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior (BMI) jointly convened a workshop to collect experiences and discuss developing communication tools and approaches that could support a communication toolbox as well as such communication strategies. The intended outcome was to support national authorities, local authorities and service providers in promoting respect, non-discrimination, freedoms and solidarity.

This meeting is consistent with FRA's 2016 Annual Work Programme in which it is committed to *'continue to raise public awareness on fundamental rights issues and disseminate information about its work, focusing particularly on communicating with its key stakeholders and partners,'* and that FRA *'develops communication products, tools and services for institutions, organisations and actors who are human rights stakeholders....'*

It was recognised that FRA's expertise and existing materials in the area of communication and awareness raising would serve as both a helpful and practical starting point. It was also agreed that an explicit output of the meeting would be to develop a 'toolbox' on how best to communicate on respect and non-discrimination.

An inclusive participation

To ensure a wide-ranging input and to maximise a comprehensive application of the meeting's eventual outputs, representatives included those from the EU institutions, national and local authorities, as well as communication experts and practitioners dealing with combating racism, deradicalisation, and human rights education. There were 44 participants, from:

- European Commission, Parliament and Council
- Ministries of Security, Interior, Integration, Social Affairs
- Local authorities
- EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator office

- Civil society communicators, from organisations working on deradicalisation, hate crime, intercultural and inter-faith dialogue and education
- Academia
- Ministry of the Interior, Austria (BM.I)
- EU Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA)

In what way?

The intention of this report is to summarise participants' suggestions, insights and expertise in order to develop a 'toolbox' that would have practical applications. This aim would necessitate, from the outset, the identification of key messages and intended audiences, i.e. '*What to communicate to whom*'.

Following this, the discussion broadened to address the challenge of ascertaining and developing:

- Approximately 13 key audiences and key messages
- Tailor-made communications tools, channels and narratives
- Clarity as to how the toolbox could be helpful, relevant and welcomed
- Next steps vis-a-vis achieving all of the above in a realistic timeframe

Analysis

It was affirmed at the outset of this meeting that democratic states need to respect and protect fundamental rights and that the first step in achieving this goal is 'clear and honest communication'. Thus, the challenge for the European Union is not to re-examine its founding human rights values but, rather, ascertain how to more effectively communicate to wider society the *presence* of these specified and affirmed principles and to explain their added value for everyone in everyday life, their importance for living together in freedom and security and why they are therefore perceived as inviolable.

The word 'narrative' prevailed throughout the meeting, as did the words 'counter-narrative', 'deradicalisation', 'urgency', 'communication strategy', 'toolbox', 'tolerance' and 'respect'. Besides it was the words, 'listening', 'authenticity' and 'inclusive' that resonated powerfully, for reasons that were clearly understood. Firstly, it was said, effective communication is, primarily, a **listening** skill. Secondly, unless we acknowledge the gaps between our espoused values and our actual practices we severely undermine the **authenticity** of our message. Finally, if we are not demonstrably socially **inclusive** we will surely fail to inspire those very communities who are vulnerable to exclusion and consequently least influenced by the Union's commitment to upholding its values.

Thus, the meeting set itself on a demanding but resolute course, recognising that it was 'positive narratives' that should be prioritised, rather than 'counter-narratives'. In this context it should be highlighted that the common framework for everyone are the fundamental rights and values of the Fundamental Rights Charter. Not only specific e.g. alienated or disadvantaged groups, but equally the 'majority population' are key audiences for communication. This also means acknowledging that 'communication strategies', or a 'toolbox', have to also resonate in a local context in order for local communities to relate to it.

Notwithstanding the abovementioned challenges, it was affirmed that for a communication 'toolbox' to be of genuine added value, the next step was to sponsor a deeper awareness of fundamental freedoms and human rights to the widest possible audience. However, this could only be achieved in a non-divisive way, avoiding engendering feelings of victimization. Therefore, the overarching aim should be 'shaping *inclusive* societies in a *fundamental rights framework*.'

This task would call for a set of communication tools that emphasises the *overall* societal value of respecting *all* human rights. Correspondingly, such strategies should thus resist being directed by a narrative demarcated by the narrow confines of day-to-day headlines; an approach that would risk being seen as a kneejerk reaction to extremism. No particular community, or minority groups, should be singled out; rather, an all-encompassing association of allies and multipliers should be envisaged as 'dialogue partners' in this endeavour; member states, law enforcement officials, teachers, faith leaders, young people, to name a few. 'There *has* to be an interconnectivity with *ordinary* people,' one participant summed up.

DETAILED MEETING REPORT

Day 1

OPENING – Wilhelm Sandrisser and Friso Roscam Abbing

In his opening speech, Wilhelm Sandrisser emphasized the following questions as the most crucial:

- What is the political mandate?
- Why do we need communication strategies?
- What kind of communication is needed?
- What can be achieved by communication?
- What "EU content" could serve for narratives?
- What could be our vision?



He explained the mandate of the Council, the European Council and other Ministerial conferences. Communication strategies are needed urgently firstly because many (young) people within the EU don't understand the added value of tolerance, non-discrimination or fundamental freedoms and more and more of

them are becoming radicalised in the one or other way and secondly because many refugees/migrants have to be familiarised with life in free and pluralistic societies. Counter narratives can help to prevent negative effects like radicalisation, whereas narratives can help to proactively strengthen social cohesion and social inclusion, can help to integrate migrants, to open up perspectives for (young) people, to strengthen the competitiveness of MS/the EU (shaping positive outcomes). We have to ask: What is already working? What is still missing? Article 2 of the EU Treaty as well as the Fundamental Rights Charter should serve as “EU content” for narratives. The vision could be “Shaping inclusive societies in a human rights framework”

Furthermore, he affirmed the principle that all *Democratic states need to respect fundamental rights, to protect fundamental rights and to promote/fulfill fundamental rights. Communication is the first step.*

<p>Relevant articles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art. 1 – human dignity • Art. 2 – the right to life • Art. 4 – prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment • Art. 6 – the right to liberty and security • Art. 7 – respect for private and family life • Art. 8 – protection of personal data • Art. 10 – freedom of thought, conscience and religion • Art. 11 – freedom of expression and information • Art. 12 – freedom of assembly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art. 14 – right to education • Art. 15 – freedom to choose an occupation and right to engage in work • Art. 18 – right to asylum • Art. 20 – equality before the law • Art. 21 – non-discrimination • Art. 22 – respect for cultural, religious and linguistic diversity • Art. 23 – equality between men and women • Art. 48 – presumption of innocence and right to defence • Art. 49 – principles of legality and proportionality of criminal offences and penalties
--	---

Friso Roscam Abbing emphasised the fact that the source of the principles to be discussed at the workshop, and to be communicated, was the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

The relevant Articles cited ranged from Art. 1 – human dignity and Art. 2 – the right to life, through Art. 10 – freedom of thought, conscience and religion, to Art. 21 – non-discrimination and Art. 23 – equality between men and women.

He went on to underline the fact that the workshop was not only about countering radicalisation, as this would be taking too narrow a view to solve the challenges the EU is currently facing. “The malaise goes further,” he said. “We are seeing intolerance, a lack of respect and discrimination in so many places around the EU perpetrated, we should remember, mainly by members of the majority and not the minority population. Targeted follow-up action after the workshop would be crucial to answer the call by EU leaders to create more tolerant societies”.

TOUR DE TABLE – main points

Participants were then invited to present themselves and their work in a tour-de-table. They were asked to contribute a few lines on how they perceive the prevailing attitudes in relation to communicating respect and non-discrimination and what their particular approach and questions were. Their views were clustered as following:

<p>Narratives and counter-narratives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop tailor made positive narratives • Countering racist narratives and incidents • Discuss positive messages and counter narratives • How to provide a counter narrative to the extreme right message • Reflect on the counter narrative and narratives • Developing counter narratives at local level • Receive positive messages to be used • Counter narratives, narratives and alternative narratives • Creating counter narratives via education • EU youth don't see our narratives anymore (ISIS already provide counter narrative) • How to develop more concrete messages against discrimination <p>EU values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU values as rules to live together • EU values: not moral debate but as enshrined in EU law • Going from "their" values to "our" values • European values - "our" values? ("wording 'our values' can lead to exclusion instead of inclusion") • How to make values catchy • How can we translate the EU values for minorities? <p>Learn and share experiences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to better communicate our work? • Hear new ideas and learn from the expertise in the room • Discuss and bring experience from toxic environment • Bring my experience • I am here to learn 	<p>To be considered in communicating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excluding risks may lead to excluding people • Security debate is motivated by fear • Bring forward the programme of the colloquium • Communicate values advocated by the EP • To what extent do we "walk the talk": ensure people who come to the EU are equally treated? • Innovative history teaching as a solution to contemporary challenges <p>Communication tools (local / EU level)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to wisely use e-opportunities for governments to respect / promote FRs? • Train and educate local governments, MGMT, civil society organisations. Which methods work / which do not? • Fundamental rights challenges in e-government, e-society • Media literacy – how to create citizens that are capable of thinking before they use social media? • Integration – rule of law and values: which channels to use (in education)? <p>Cooperation with civil society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will civil society organisations be able to use the toolbox and contribute with good practices? • Interested to hear civil society experience • How can civil society good practices enrich the discussion? • Needed: expertise from civil society organisations
--	---

- Getting inspired
- Listen convey messages and make suggestions
- Bring the EC expertise and think outside the toolbox
- Know what you are doing and share practices and common messages
- To find new strategies and discuss rights and responsibilities
- To share tools
- Contribute with best practices



PANEL DEBATE

Moussa Al-Hassan Diaw spoke about his work with (former) foreign fighters, advising on how best to approach them and what narratives to use. His organisation works mainly in prisons and schools. Schools ask their organisation to help them. They are a good place for prevention, because it brings together people that otherwise would not have met. As Muslims, their organisation is a more credible voice for young Austrian Muslims. Similarly, their work in prisons is important. "Here, they can discuss with prisoners their perspectives for the future: e.g 'what will you do when you come out of prison?'" According to him, both reaction and prevention are crucial. "It is difficult to change when the social environment for people remains the same. Thus, we need narratives that build inclusive societies, positive societal developments that imply change. We should not ask: 'where do you come from?' The question itself infers marginalisation – it makes people feel different."

Clémentine Vooren discussed integration and the 'welcoming society' in the Netherlands. She underlined that the Dutch government has made a move from *reaction* to *prevention and inclusion*. "Where there are tensions, dialogue is employed as an important instrument. Dialogue has moved from 'group-specific' to *dialogue with mixed groups*, focussed on specific issues. There is a Social stability unit which works as a small expertise unit with people constantly on the ground. This allows for quick reactions and liaison with communities following any serious incidents. The focus of work in the past was on newcomers; but although this shift was made in order to make integration a success, there remains a need to also focus on the receiving society. A new instrument has been developed via an 'Integration Act'. Whilst people are supported and welcomed they are also 'required to subscribe to Dutch values'. A pilot phase with many volunteers has just finished and was quite successful."

Asiem El Difraoui stressed the differentiation between alternative narratives, counter narratives and narratives. "Counter-narratives are not enough. Narratives have to provide stories and images of our society, aimed at underpinning EU values. Alternative narratives show concrete opportunities. Only now, under pressure following the attacks, some alternative narratives are emerging. 'There is a lot of doubling of work taking place in different countries – with no knowledge

about each other's efforts. This calls for a greater need for exchange of experiences and knowledge. Also, there is a need for translations of quality work.'

WHAT TO COMMUNICATE TO WHOM?

This session inquired *what* (messages, narratives) needs to be communicated and to *whom* (key audiences) in order to successfully communicate respect and non-discrimination.

- **Communicating respect and non-discrimination – presentations by European Commission**

Nathalie Stockwell, European Commission DG JUST, Fundamental Rights Unit, underlined the risk that in times of insecurity and fear (referring to the recent terrorist attacks and increased security in some Member States, and to the refugee crisis) unjustified generalisations, exclusions and intolerance find a fertile ground to grow. This makes it all the more important to stand strong and promote with all tools at our disposal a culture of tolerance and respect in the EU. She welcomed best practices highlighted in the panel debate and underlined initiatives taken by the Commission such as reinforced funding for training and raising awareness on fundamental rights. She also spoke about the first Annual Colloquium on Fundamental Rights in October 2015 which this year discussed "Tolerance and respect: *preventing and combating antisemitic and anti-Muslim hatred in Europe*". She stressed the importance of the colloquium as process. It creates a space where a variety of actors, including civil society and policy makers, can get together and come up with concrete and workable actions to improve the fundamental rights situation in the EU. It is also a tool, launching a dynamic of regular communication and dialogue around fundamental rights issues. Fighting hate speech by working with IT companies, civil society and the media; fostering inclusive education, media literacy and empowering actors at local level such as schools, teachers, young leaders; launching a high level group on hate crime; creating an award for journalists; funding training and awareness raising and making available a one stop shop for stakeholders to find out about these funding possibilities were among the actions proposed at the Colloquium (Colloquium conclusions at: <http://ec.europa.eu/iustice/events/colloquium-fundamental-rights>)

She concluded by underlining the importance of the local level when it comes to communicating on tolerance and non-discrimination, giving examples of best practices in the Member States. Top down communication is often not ideal in these contexts and given main target groups. Gathering best practices on communicating tolerance and non-discrimination and facilitating their dissemination should be the focus of this workshop.

Bert Van Maele, European Commission DG JUST, Communication Unit, shared some examples of how the Colloquium itself was communicated, especially that highly sensitive topics were discussed there. During the Colloquium there was not much online hate speech. There were 139 tweets and n°1 trending topic on Twitter for the 2 days of the colloquium. Three success factors for communicating

human rights were identified: Relevance, Public interest and Authenticity. A short video was shown featuring two women testimonies.

Kostas Sasmatzoglou, European Commission DG HOME, spoke about four projects that are run by DG HOME.

RAN (Radicalization Awareness Network): approximately 2,000 practitioners are involved in the RAN network. The RAN Centre of Excellence has a new working group called RAN Communications and Narratives (RAN C&N). The working group will gather insights on the content of narratives, its key audiences, the credible messengers and different ways of dissemination. It aims to establish a platform for vulnerable young people to find alternative stories, other perspectives and peers who can offer help and support in a positive way; innovative offline initiatives; campaigns built around important moments and in response to terrorist attacks; a European day for prevention of violent extremism.

SSCAT (The Syria Strategic Communications Advisory Team) aims at developing and exchanging best practices in the area of strategic communication with a view to preventing and countering terrorist crime and violent extremism with a particular focus foreign fighters. SSCAT has been operational for nearly one year.

The EU Internet Forum was launched in December 2015 in Brussels and brought together EU Interior Ministers, Internet Companies, Europol, and the EU Counter Terrorism Co-ordinator. The objectives of the Forum focus on two areas: Restricting the availability of terrorist and hate speech material online, and supporting and increasing effective counter-narratives online.

The *Europe for Citizens Programme* funds projects that aim:

- To contribute to citizens' understanding of the EU, its history and diversity;
- To foster European citizenship and to improve conditions for civic and democratic participation at EU level;
- To raise awareness of remembrance, common history and values.

- **FRA's work on respect and non-discrimination** was introduced by the Head of Equality and Citizen's Rights Department, **Ioannis Dimitrakopoulos**.

Most Member States do not collect data on ethnic discrimination or racist incidents. Those that do use different methodologies and definitions, so that the data are not comparable. FRA initiated EU wide surveys to collect comparable data on large randomly selected minority population samples (see www.fra.europa.eu/publications). FRA evidence shows that rights awareness is low among the different groups surveyed. Most people don't report discrimination as they either are not aware where to turn to, and/or didn't believe anything would be done about it. He also showed statistics on the rapidly increasing use of the internet, in particular among young people, and the increased access to the internet among households across the EU.

WORKING GROUPS: what to communicate to whom

Participants discussed in small working groups key audiences and what to communicate. The summary statements were:

What to communicate

- Factual information; communicating facts
- Fundamental rights; knowing your rights (and with this, your obligations)
- Existing support
- Inclusion; sense of belonging
- Authenticity, originality
- Critical thinking and attitude in media
- Emotion: "I feel your pain"
- Appreciation
- Respect for others, tolerance
- Communicating non-discrimination
- EU values, universal values
- Testimonies, human stories
- Identifying commonalities

To whom:

- 13 Identified key audiences
- Member States,
- International organisations
- Vulnerable, affected communities
- Law enforcement officials
- Wider public, citizens
- Media
- Local authorities
- Teachers/educators
- Civil society organisations
- Young people
- Parents
- Faith leaders
- Far right sympathizers

EVENING RECEPTION

The final part of Day One was held at the Austrian Ministry of the Interior, an evening reception hosted by the Austrian Minister of the Interior, Johanna Mikl-Leitner.





She highlighted the interest of the Ministry *"in communication strategies to promote tolerance, non-discrimination, fundamental freedoms and solidarity throughout the EU,"* as called for by the Heads of State or Government at their informal meeting in February 2015 *"If fundamental rights and freedoms are understood as common basis for living together and are mutually respected, then social cohesion and thereby also internal security are being*

strengthened", said Mikl-Leitner.

From her point of view, *"the best prevention against xenophobia, extremism, radicalisation or terrorism are inclusive societies. Three points are of utmost importance in this respect. Firstly, that everyone finds a place in the society and actively contributes to it; secondly, that diversity is perceived as added value and thirdly, that there are commonly accepted values and rules for living together. In fact, the Fundamental Rights laid down in the Charter constitute Fundamental Freedoms for all of us; and at the same time they can be understood as rules for living together in freedom and security"*, said the Minister.

Proactive communication by and among different stakeholders is more important than ever today – because of two reasons:

- Firstly, due to an increase of polarisation and extremism within our societies – and thereby the so-called "angry citizens", Anti-Semitism or Islamophobia have to be taken into consideration.
- Secondly, because in the years to come many refugees will have to be integrated and familiarised with a life in our democratic and pluralistic societies.

Therefore, not only "counter-narratives" are needed to counter extremism or radicalization, but first and foremost tailor-made "narratives" to explain the added value of living in free and open societies. The development and communication of such "European Narratives" require both a broad range of experiences and special know-how.



In his speech, incoming FRA Director Michael O'Flaherty emphasised that awareness and protection of fundamental rights is the "best form of prevention" against radicalisation and extremism.

"Everyone living in the EU needs to know what their rights are as individuals and they need to know what their obligations are towards others so that their rights, too, are respected".

The Director pointed out that rights awareness among the general public in the EU remains "worryingly low", with a recent

Eurobarometer survey showing that less than half (45%) of respondents would know their rights if they were discriminated against. "It is not sufficient for legislation to exist if people are not aware of their rights to be able to use and enforce them". He underlined that it is important to communicate the rights and values as enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Day 2

Day Two started with a recap from the previous day in a presentation by Wilhelm Sandrisser:

- He reminded that the political mandate requires "narratives" to better explain the added value of tolerance, non-discrimination and fundamental freedoms
- Do we have to prepare both narratives and counter narratives? The political mandate is to promote narratives.
- "*Dialogue groups*" would be a better description to ensure "two way communication".
- *What* should be promoted by communication? Living together in freedom and security on the basis of fundamental rights and values, as well as social inclusion and social cohesion.
- Fundamental rights offer fundamental freedoms and can be understood as "Fundamental Rules".
- The vision should be "Shaping inclusive societies in a human rights framework." People's awareness of their rights, European and universal values, the concrete meaning of fundamental rights, international human rights conventions.
- We need to learn how to *communicate efficiently via* face to face communication, social media, intra cultural and intra religious dialogue, tailor made tools, involvement of authentic voices, and strengthened political focus.
- What *existing* instruments should be used? Narratives, useful elements from counter-narratives, awareness raising material by the FRA, like police training manuals etc.
- What could be basically communicated? European values and universal values, the concrete meaning of Fundamental Rights in everyday life, focusing on those with special relevance for social inclusion and cohesion. A basic toolkit on the Fundamental Rights Charter could be helpful;
- A good starting point is to find common ground with other dialogue groups.



DEVELOPING TAILOR-MADE COMMUNICATION TOOLS, CHANNELS AND NARRATIVES FOR SPECIFIC KEY AUDIENCES

What followed were two rounds of working group discussions, focussing on the tools and channels on how to reach each of the 13 key audiences identified earlier.



1. MEMBERS STATES, INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

1.1 Which communication tools, channels and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- Credibility: not just communicating but promoting shared values, such as the rule of law;
- Exchange of best practices through dialogues and cooperation;
- Monitoring in order to react at an early stage;
- Political messages/statements should avoid stereotypes/discriminatory language;
- Rebutting to political messages that reinforce stereotype is important – do not leave them uncommented;
- Promoting role models;
- Using modern communication channels;
- Data/statistics to establish factual basis.

1.2 What has proven successful, and why?

- Role models;
- Cooperation;
- Authority of impartial entities;
- Positive narratives;
- Long-term policies.

1.3. What should be avoided?

- Public 'naming and shaming' inhibits dialogue;
- Replicating other Member States initiatives without appropriately adapting them;
- Avoid polarizing;
- Not responding to political messages that oppose the principle of shared values;
- Populist messages, short-term policies.

1.4. Possible partners / allies?

- Media;
- International organisation;
- NGOs, research institutes;
- National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs);
- Civil Society.

1.5. What else could be helpful?

- Dialogue with IT companies to involve them as important stakeholders;
- To involve private sector through public-private partnerships;
- Awareness raising at local authorities level to facilitate implementation on the ground and gather feedback;
- Code of conduct defining media's responsibility on how and what to communicate;
- Involving migrants, campaigners, civil society to enhance dialogue on a local level.

2. CIVIL SOCIETY, NGOs

2.1 Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- Identify multipliers by mapping NGOs;
- Civil society is often under/misrepresented;
- Often more efficient;
- Resilience from within CS and NGOs;
- Include credible partners to build trust;
- Fund NGO and limit competition among them.
- Respect and acknowledge NGOs for their role, and pay for their expertise;
- Dynamic culture as a factor against extremism.

2.2. What has proven successful, and why?

- Learning from successful initiatives;
- Local culture as a source of resistance;
- Co-creation between NGOs and governments;
- Real participation of Civil society organisations, not just their consultation;
- Listening;
- Keeping NGOs autonomous.

2.3. What should be avoided?

- Only focusing on counter-terrorism;
- Underestimating civil society expertise.

2.4. Possible partners / allies?

- Academia, NGOs, social professional groups;
- Encourage exchange through dialogue and facilitate networking.

2.5. What else could be helpful?

- Seed funding/crowd funding;
- Revising tax regime for NGOs;
- Impact evaluation of measures.

3. MEDIA

3.1 Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

Meta-narrative, backed with facts and policy advice, promoting social cohesion and the notion that fundamental rights belong to everybody.

3.2. What has proven successful, and why?

Public service media has to promote diversity but the promotion of fundamental rights is not a part of their mandate. Therefore, approach media with relevant facts to enhance their mandate.

3.3. What should be avoided?

- Targeting only news markets; programmes, filmmakers, etc should be also considered;
- Preaching to journalists instead of raising awareness.

3.4. Possible partners / allies?

Civil society associations in different EUMSs and operating in different languages.

3.5. What else could be helpful?

- Define who is the sender;
- Media as a multiplier;
- Reflect on how does FRA target the media;
- For FRA reach the right audience at the right time it is important to increase budget for communication and media advocacy;
- Understand the new cross-media context which enables to create a big impact with little means;
- Media monitoring mechanisms.

4. PARENTS

4.1 Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- Stock-taking of best practices at MS level;
- Schools;
- Sports club for disseminating guidelines for parents, supporting their children in sports activities;
- Support groups;
- Schools/classes mothers;
- Early access to language education has positive outcomes for children and parents, especially mothers;
- Resilience trainings;
- Translate basic rights for wider coverage, e.g., through displaying main notions, such as passenger rights, in public places;
- Guidance and control of children behaviour online.

4.2. What has proven successful, and why?

Support groups.

4.3. What should be avoided?

Top down approach; too clearly coming from the government.

4.4. Possible partners / allies?

ENOC (Children Ombudsmen); sport clubs, parents association of (ex)-Jihadists; NHRBs.

4.5. What else could be helpful?

Some guidance by governments on the kind of “parenthood” that is increasingly accepted, particularly in nowadays societies where both parents work outside home.

5. LAW ENFORCEMENT / POLICE

5.1. Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- Awareness raising;
- Appropriate training in law, human rights, JPCEDH analysis;
- Mediation;
- Coping with different cultural backgrounds;
- Language skills;
- Community policing;
- Diversity management;
- Contact with schools to build positive image;
- Detection of criminal activities;
- Publicity for the police to promote a positive image.

5.2. What has proven successful, and why?

- Contact with local communities to build trust to know what goes on in the community (identity, possible criminals, etc.);
- Focus on the rights of the police, giving them a positive note;
- Taking pride in servicing the community which is built on mutual respect.

5.3. What should be avoided?

- Violence and overreaction;
- Abuse of police powers;
- Disrespect for the community;
- Police should not be separated from the communities.

5.4. Possible partners / allies?

- Community leaders;
- Schools;
- Media;
- Social entrepreneurs;
- Politicians;
- Equality bodies.

55. What else could be helpful?

- TV;
- Training in cyber-crime, e.g. hate crime.

6. YOUNG PEOPLE

6.1 Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- Online, programmes and relevant NGOs;
- Focus on 13-30 years old as young people become radicalised in school;
- Key figures who act as role models and reach out to young people on emotional level, e.g., video programmes;
- Increase media literacy, virtual resources, publish additional materials;
- Enhance human rights knowledge through education in classroom, online, and also touching on religious issues;
- Achieve positive effect through skillful rhetoric, pride, plurality, emotion and build competence to deal with conspiracy theories and propaganda.

6.2. What has proven successful, and why?

- Counter narratives through social media and other on line actors;
- Changing identity on the internet;
- Engaging wise people who young people can trust;
- Community management and interacting with young people;
- Different resources.

6.3. What should be avoided?

Derogatory terms, ethnic differentiation.

6.4. Possible partners / allies?

Federal agencies, schools, teachers, families, NGOs.

6.5. What else could be helpful?

Countering hateful content but providing reasons for doing so.

7. FAITH LEADERS

7.1 Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- Toolkit, addressing religion and fundamental rights, should be developed in cooperation;
- A toolkit for teachers and trainings should be based on this prospective toolkit;
- Face to face communication;
- Using faith leaders as multipliers in schools;
- Using social media for joint messages;
- Implementing positive religious narratives to emphasise the benefit of living together; developing common religious narratives.

7.2. What has proven successful, and why?

- Deradicalisation, promotion of Islam together with fundamental rights;
- Involving members from different communities into each others' activities;
- Using social media for joint statements.

7.3. What should be avoided?

- Only focusing on Muslims or radicalisation;
- Just using faith leaders as "target" audiences.

7.4. Possible partners / allies?

- FRA
- Confessional civil society organisations

7.5. What else could be helpful?

- Dialogue among religions that is not limited to faith questions but also involves broader societal and fundamental rights discussions;
- Not perceiving religious groups as homogenous;
- Taking into consideration people's cultural background alongside their religious belonging.

8. LOCAL AUTHORITIES

8.1 Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- Tools to facilitate the application of human rights at the local level;
- Practical guidelines; training, raising awareness; exchange of good practices; feedback from local authorities to central authorities; cross-border cooperation and town twinning;
- Funding;
- Highlighting success stories.

8.2. What has proven successful, and why?

- Highlight success stories; exchanging good practices;
- Linking standards and daily practice.

8.3. What should be avoided?

- Imposing standards without providing practical guidelines; a top down approach;
- Lack of data.

8.4. Possible partners / allies?

Local NGOs/equality bodies; migrant associations.

8.5. What else could be helpful?

- Awareness raising among local politicians of their roles and responsibilities;
- Positive messages on advantages of integration;
- Cooperation among local authorities.

9. MAJORITY POPULATION / CITIZENS

9.1. Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- An example of successful campaigns is City of Manchester that communicated a negative message in a 'positive' way: "who's responsible for how clean is our city? You are".
- Broadcasting, diversity on entertainment TV.
- EU should be the sender of messages that come from positive and attributable to different senders, i.e., without a signature, source.

9.2. What has proven successful, and why?

- Narrow down large public into parts that live together, e.g., cities, communities.
- Although not universal, communicate messages with emotions, humour, funny examples.
- Choose good, interesting artists / designers creative people for campaigns.
- Maintain diversity within the team,

9.3. What should be avoided?

- Boring messages, stereotyping, too much top-down communication.
- Institutional campaigns.

9.4. Possible partners / allies?

- Good story-tellers.
- City councils.
- Bike rentals, for putting advertisements on bikes.
- Media: TV, videos, Netflix.
- Role models.
- Ambassadors.

9.5. What else could be helpful?

- Fundamental values.
- Sport/football teams.
- Strengthening the community.
- Individual storytelling by refugees.
- Knowing which rights you have.

10. FAR RIGHT SYMPATHIZERS

10.1 Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- Immediate reaction is vital to ensure correction or penalty.
- Face to face contact and work with groups.
- Every religion has an aspect on non-violence which should be communicated.
- 'Web-constable': police officers who working on social media to answer questions and provide counter-narratives.

10.2 What has proven successful, and why?

- Direct work with groups.
- Showing that extremism is not heroic behaviour, but sick behaviour.
- Allowing different opinion but no violence.

10.3 What should be avoided?

- Wrong naming of groups (ie, IS instead of Daesh).
- Ignoring the problem will not solve it.

10.4. Possible partners / allies?

- Teachers, social workers because a lot of people from far right are from broken families.
- Police should only interfere when all other society instruments failed.

10.5. What else could be helpful?

- Offer alternatives for people to belong and be part of something.
- Former radicals telling their stories.
- Being ready.

11. VULNERABLE TO EXCLUSION GROUPS, AFFECTED COMMUNITIES

11.1. Which communication tools, channels, and narratives are most appropriate for this particular key audience?

- Meeting between mayors and communities to find common values, room for empathy.
- Civil society focus groups.
- Interfaith dialogues.
- Trainings / participative processes.

11.2. What has proven successful, and why?

Effective engagement: integrity, transparency, factual information, two-way messages asserting basic common values, drawing the red line in terms of what is not acceptable, making room for hearing communities as well as what should be enhanced; engagement with local actors/officials, building long-term relationships, finding authentic voices, training professional groups about the values, establishing interfaith, intercultural platforms in order to bridge the gaps.

11.3. What should be avoided?

- Victimisation.
- Two-dimensional statements / 'values'. Double standards.
- Conflicting messages.

11.4. Possible partners / allies?

- Civil society groups, including ethnic and faith-based groups.
- Local authorities.

11.5. What else could be helpful?

Perception of double standards, and feeling of victimization that can be enhanced if we are not prudent in our communication, fundamental rights

as universal values can be disputed. Clash of 'values' feeding the claim of moral superiority. Being aware of negative perceptions of 'universal values'.

12. TEACHERS/EDUCATORS

Focused mostly on schools, and on finding common non-verbal strategies to develop commonalities. An emphasis to provide in-service training for teachers, especially on mediation skills. For example, a school in London has five happy religion days. Funding programmes such as Erasmus aimed at teachers. Teachers rarely have the understanding of fundamental rights, therefore, there is a need to promote it, and to discuss social issues at schools.



MISSING ELEMENTS FOR SUCCESSFUL COMMUNICATION?

What else would you find useful for your communication work?

Are there any other aspects the toolbox should include?

How can the toolbox be further developed and disseminated?

Points to be considered

- Translations.
- What do we want to achieve.
- Dissemination.
- Beware of overlaps, e.g., RAN.
- Go beyond the EU, link to Council of Europe's Action plan on inclusive societies.
- Reflect on the narratives we communicate, on how to develop a meaningful message for groups, and what is the most important message for each group.
- Put efforts in engaging "difficult" groups rather than "easy targets".
- Evaluation of initiatives.
- Get social media outlets to cooperate on dissemination.
- Industry funding.

- Compare methodologies between different countries, e.g., hate crime, etc.
- Engage students through grants, competitions, use their narratives.
- FRA material needs to be written in accessible language. Mission statement as meta narrative.
- Narrative communication team, cooperation with civil society, dialogue groups. SSCAT already working on narratives, not only counter narratives. Similarly, CoE 'no hate' campaign.
- EU narrative, messages adjusted to local context so that people can relate to them.
- engage representatives of the groups that we want to talk to.
- We need not a new toolbox but make things happen on the ground.
- FRA to provide support, identify partners. Not only developing, but also streamlining and disseminating messages.
- Bottom up approach: 20 concrete examples on the ground to be included in the toolbox as best practices.
- Process of dialogue is a long-term investment that needs to be sustained through networks in good times as well. This is more efficient than trying to write down the 'right' message
- Be aware that root causes are different for different groups.
- Inventory should have a practical approach and contextualised.
- Need to reach younger generations.
- Ask key audiences on how to communicate with them (tools and channels).
- Knowledge has to be dialogue group specific, usable, and translated, if needed. ion is key.
- Creation of a Wiki instead of a print compilation.
- Accessible interface for end user.
- Who is the keyaudience of the toolbox?
- Refer to FRA's Clarity project.
- Produce short videos explaining key messages on fundamental rights, presenting authentic personal testimonies.
- Create an interface that allows finding find different tools, to go to subthemes.
- The exercise of organising the knowledge is also creating and organising the message.
- Dissemination aimed at national, local level. Publishing is not enough, it is important to translate and disseminate useful knowledge.
- When developing the toolkit, consider train teachers, trainers.
- Use existing material to avoid duplication.

KEY CONCERNS REGARDING THE PROSPECTIVE TOOLKIT

Even though there were detailed and far-reaching suggestions, it was a clear that the toolbox should be accessible and user friendly. This would require a hands-on publication, tailored to its key audiences.

Either as an integral part to the toolkit, or supplementary to it, various communication methodologies were suggested. For example, a database, a handbook, an updatable weekly blog, an interactive interface and more inventive

use of social media outlets. The overriding concern was that the toolbox content, regardless the format, should help to engender an ongoing dialogue with its users, and not to *"disappear into the bookshelves of international organisations"*.

In view of the 2015 events, concerns were expressed about the dangers of religious extremism, but it was similarly recognised that the task at hand was to produce a toolbox that had as its focus a far wider intent. For example, to challenge the proponents of political bigotry, anti-semitism and racism, to advocate LGBT rights and to expose the distortions that are regularly employed by various media to spread Islamophobia. Therefore, a consensus emerged that **positive** narratives, as opposed to **'counter-narratives'** would prove to be the more effective tools to emphasise the importance of tolerance, non-discrimination and the appeal of fundamental freedoms in open and democratic societies.

CLOSING ROUND

In the closing round participants expressed their overall impressions and remarks.

- Follow up with a workshop on how to develop a narrative, make stories out of "rights".
- Potential to create an effective, reciprocal and dynamic tool that people can use in specific settings.
- Make the tool known.
- Always keep in mind those "out of sight" groups you want to keep a dialogue with.
- We are convinced of the need to promote fundamental rights. Media are about informing, not about implementing communications strategies.
- Social media's impact is fundamental. The core of discussions is fundamental rights and values. Communicate rights and responsibilities: "You are a citizen, and you have a part to play".
- Consider how to monitor communication, and how to measure effectiveness.
- Increase rights awareness among all, not only for minorities. Everyone is part of society and everyone has rights and duties.
- Trying to promote inclusiveness of societies is an inspiring initiative. But it is also a big challenge. How to connect local level to the European project?
- Going back to strengthen social media.
- It's time for a book 'The little European' in a language that children can understand as in the "Little Prince".
- Important to implement the suggestions shared. We need more people who already do this work, and not a high level conference.



- National and European statement on radicalisation, poverty, lack of participation are needed. These problems can be prevented.
- EU institutions need a tailor-made approach.
- Useful to have different people coming together. Good to see a lot is happening already. Toolkit focus on initiatives that really work.
- Curious as to how we can develop this together. We need something concrete which can be applied afterwards on a practical level: a narrative and guidance on how to protect, respect, and fulfil rights.
- The mode of dialogue in this room should be communicated on a larger scale. Keep the message on what are human rights for us simple.
- Use a top down design on what are human rights for the EU locally.
- Compile existing knowledge in an accessible format for everyone.
- We need to pick up the pace. We cannot continue working in a “business as usual” pace.
- Fast moving, everlasting, adaptable and updatable kit. Create a dummy of the toolkit for feedback. Include advice on how to summarise meta-narrative on a slogan etc.
- There’s a multitude of ideas, but how to encompass them all? We need a call center, not a toolkit.
- Distinguished level of confusion, which requires a structured follow up. Raise awareness among the Member States.
- Four needs: remain local, have local champions, speak to the heart and not only mind, do more together.
- More clarity about the content of the toolbox is needed. Awareness raising about inclusive speech and role of media for media representatives will start next year (2016).
- Thankfully not fixated on deradicalisation. Strong mood for output.
- Use of social media is key.
- I would like to continue defining the meta-message etc. Another workshop would be useful.
- Continuity through reporting back to FRA Management Board and providing input into the Fundamental Rights Forum.

Participants’ evaluation of the meeting shows that they found it useful and interesting, and intend to use findings directly in their own work.