FRA EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

MONITORING AND RECORDING ANTISEMITISM IN THE EU

STATE OF PLAY AND WAYS FORWARD

REPORT



Contents

About this publication 3

Introduction 4

1. Existing commitments to record antisemitism 7

2. Recording of antisemitic incidents by national authorities 11

Recording antisemitic incidents online 15

3. Ways forward to improve the recording of antisemitic incidents 17

Setting up data collection mechanisms 17

Recognising and recording antisemitic bias motivation 18

Exchanging practices to improve recording 18

Cooperating with civil society organisations 19

Developing multistakeholder partnerships 19

Conducting surveys on the lived experience of antisemitism 20

Conclusion 21

Annex – Country overviews 22

About this publication

© European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2026

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

For any use or reproduction of photos or other material that is not under the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights copyright, permission must be sought directly from the copyright holders.

Neither the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights nor any person acting on behalf of the Agency is responsible for the use that might be made of the following information.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2026

HTML

- TK-01-25-041-EN-Q
- ISBN: 978-92-9489-700-8
- DOI: 10.2811/7193011

PDF

- TK-01-25-041-EN-N
- ISBN: 978-92-9489-721-3
- DOI: 10.2811/3671582

FRA – EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

Schwarzenbergplatz 11 – 1040 Vienna – Austria

T +43 158030-0 – F +43 158030-699

- Website
- LinkedIn
- Instagram
- Facebook
- YouTube
- X

Introduction

> **Reliable and comparable data on antisemitic incidents are crucial to assess the spread of antisemitism in Europe and to tackle it effectively. Recording of reported incidents is often inconsistent as Member States use different methodologies and data can therefore not be compared (…) FRA will help Member States improve and align their methodologies for recording and collecting data on hate crime, including on antisemitism.**
>
> *EU strategy on combating antisemitism and fostering Jewish life (2021–2030)*

Jewish people in the EU face antisemitism on a nearly constant basis – 96 % of respondents to the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights' (FRA) latest survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews experienced at least one form of antisemitism in the year before the survey, which was conducted between January and June 2023. Yet very few of them report incidents to any authority or body, whether these occur offline or online. As a result, perpetrators are often left in relative impunity and victims do not get the redress they are entitled to under EU law (see Legal corner for more information on the relevant legal framework).

For the EU and its Member States to address antisemitism effectively, every link in this chain needs to be strengthened: reporting, recording, investigation, prosecution and sentencing. Indeed, for victims of antisemitism to get redress, victims and witnesses need to be encouraged to report incidents, whether to the relevant authorities or to trusted and reliable third parties. In this respect, it can be noted that FRA has encouraged Member States to raise awareness among Jewish people of the redress mechanisms that are available to them, in the context of encouraging the reporting of antisemitic incidents.

Antisemitic incidents need to be recorded properly, with law enforcement officers trained to recognise and record bias indicators. This, in turn, will support the investigation of antisemitic incidents, which is essential for prosecution: without solid evidence of antisemitism, perpetrators cannot be adequately prosecuted. Finally, offenders need to be served effective, proportionate and dissuasive sentences. Responding to calls made by the Council of the European Union and the European Commission for FRA to help Member States improve data collection on antisemitism, this publication focuses on what law enforcement authorities can do to improve the recording of

antisemitic incidents, and what steps national authorities could take in this respect (see Ways forward).

The reason is that 'proper recording of hate crime by law enforcement authorities can lead to a better understanding of the nature and prevalence of the phenomenon, and of its impact on victims and their communities. This, in turn, can assist the authorities in developing and monitoring policies and measures they put in place to combat prejudice and to offer support to victims of hate crime.' (FRA, 2018, Hate crime recording and data collection practice across the EU, p. 9).

The information presented in this publication draws on evidence the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) and its predecessor (the EU Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia) have been collecting on the recording of antisemitic incidents since 2004. The publication first draws attention to commitments the EU and its Member States have made in this respect and then briefly describes the state of play of recording in EU Member States and countries that participate in the work of FRA as observers (Albania, North Macedonia and Serbia). The publication highlights possible ways forward to improve the recording of antisemitic incidents, drawing on existing guidance tools and structures. As such, this publication should be read in conjunction with FRA's body of work on addressing hate crime.

Legal corner

The EU human rights legal framework binds Member States to address antisemitism. This obligation stems from Articles Article 2 and Article 3(1) of the Treaty on European Union, Article 19(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and from the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Articles 1, 2, 10, 11 and 21).

With respect to hate speech and hate crime, the Framework Decision on racism and xenophobia (Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA) obliges Member States to penalise incitement to violence or hatred on the basis of a person's (perceived) race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin and to penalise the public condoning, gross trivialisation or denial of the Holocaust. For other criminal offences, the racist or xenophobic motivation must be considered an aggravating circumstance, which courts can consider in the determination of penalties.

The Victims' Rights Directive (Directive 2012/29/EU) establishes minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of hate crime. The directive requires Member States to facilitate the reporting of crimes, including through third-party reporting, which involves civil society organisations. At the time of writing, the Victims Rights' Directive was in the process of being revised, including with respect to improving the recording of crime.

Concerning the principle of equal treatment, the Racial Equality Directive (Council Directive 2000/43/EC) prohibits discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin across a range of areas of life, while the Employment Equality Directive (Council Directive 2000/78/EC) prohibits discrimination on the ground of religion or belief in employment.

With respect to antisemitism online, the Digital Services Act (Regulation (EU) 2022/2065) includes rules for how online service providers and platforms must deal with illegal hate speech online.

Related to this, the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (Directive (EU) 2018/1808) stipulates that Member States must ensure that video-sharing platform providers take appropriate measures to protect the general public from audiovisual content and commercial communications that contain incitement to violence or hatred.

EU Member States and FRA observer countries are also bound by the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). In this respect, the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has ruled in several cases that states are obliged to unmask the bias motivation behind hate crimes. As noted by FRA, 'whenever there is an indication of a possible bias motivation for a criminal offence, [States] are obliged to do whatever is reasonable in the circumstances to collect and secure the evidence, explore all practical means of discovering the truth and deliver fully reasoned, impartial and objective decisions, without omitting suspicious facts that may be indicative of a bias motivation.' The ECtHR has also ruled on cases of hate speech that relate to antisemitism or Holocaust denial, revisionism and trivialisation.

In addition, nearly all EU Member States as well as Albania, North Macedonia and Serbia have signed or ratified the First Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems.

States have also made political commitments to address hate crime (including antisemitic hate crime) in the framework of their participation in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE).

Finally, in the context of the UN, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination obliges all States Parties to take measures to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms.

1. Existing commitments to record antisemitism

The EU and its Member States have made several commitments to improve the recording of antisemitic incidents, including those that do not meet the criminal threshold. In addition, at the time of writing, 23 Member States had adopted national strategies or action plans to combat antisemitism, as detailed by the European Commission. Despite these commitments, there remain significant gaps and discrepancies in how Member States record antisemitic incidents, as FRA has been documenting, with all relevant reports available on FRA's website.

Improving the recording of antisemitic incidents should, however, not be seen as an end it itself. Doing so is a means to acknowledge victims of antisemitism and to show that the State takes the phenomenon seriously. Better knowledge of how and where antisemitism manifests itself can also support efforts to prevent it. For tools that national authorities could use to help them identify antisemitism, see tools developed by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance to counter distortion and to help recognise antisemitism. Adequate reporting of antisemitism acts as a signal that people have the right to live an openly Jewish life, in a State that strives to uphold their rights.

This is particularly true in a context where reactions to the Hamas attacks and the ensuing military intervention in Gaza led to spikes in recorded incidents of antisemitism in the EU, as FRA noted in its third survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews, and as Table 1 and Table 2 indicate. The country overviews that accompany this publication provide more detailed information on the nature of these incidents, on year-on-year fluctuations in recorded incidents and on the sources of the data that are presented in these tables. The data presented in the tables below are not comparable, since every Member State and civil society organisation that collects these use different definitions and classifications for antisemitic incidents.

Still, the tables show increases in the number of recorded incidents in the year 2023 compared to 2022, and that the number of recorded incidents generally remained high or even increased in some countries in 2024 compared to 2023. 'Official data' (Table 1) refers to data recorded by law enforcement agencies, authorities that are part of criminal justice systems, relevant ministries, and equality bodies. 'Unofficial data' (Table 2) refers to data recorded by civil society organisations, including Jewish community organisations.

Table 1 shows EU Member States where there was a noticeable increase in officially recorded antisemitic incidents. Official data from all other countries is presented in Table 3.

Table 1 – Number of antisemitic incidents recorded after the 7 October 2023 Hamas attacks, by year – official data, where available [a]

Country	2022	2023	2024	Source and type of data
Austria	225	263	347	Federal Ministry of the Interior – crimes with an antisemitic bias motivation
Belgium	57	121	277[b]	Unia, national equality body – reported incidents of antisemitism
Denmark	(c)	176	222	Danish National Police – antisemitic hate crimes and antisemitic incidents that do not meet the criminal threshold
France	436	1 676	1 570	National Directorate of Territorial Intelligence – antisemitic acts and threats
Germany	2 641	5 164	6 236	Criminal Police Reporting Service in Cases of Politically Motivated Crime – crimes with a presumed antisemitic motive
Italy	94	316	304	Observatory for Security Against Acts of Discrimination – cases of antisemitic criminal conduct
Netherlands	549	880	880	Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, Article 1 and Ministry of Justice – criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents
Sweden	145	n/a	312	Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention

Alternative text: The table presents countries where a noticeable increase in officially recorded antisemitic incidents was observed. It shows changes in the number of incidents in 2023 compared to 2022, and indicates that in some countries incident levels remained high or increased further in 2024 compared to 2023. Information is only provided for countries where official data are available. 'Official data' refers to data recorded by law enforcement agencies, authorities that are part of criminal justice systems and relevant ministries. Every country applies different definitions and classifications of antisemitic incidents.

Notes:

(a) Data for the year 2022 are included to show fluctuations that occurred after 7 October 2023.

(b) The Belgian equality body (Unia) points out that the biggest part of the increase between 2023 and 2024 is due to the large number of complaints it has received about one incident, with many other reported incidents relating specifically to the 'Israeli-Palestinian conflict' (Unia, 2024, Analyse des chiffres des signalements et dossiers individuels, p. 77).

(c) No data are provided as the recording practice changed in 2023. Following the Hamas attacks on 7 October, police districts were required to record antisemitic hate crimes along with antisemitic incidents that do not meet the criminal threshold.

n/a: Data not available

Source: FRA, 2025.

Table 2 – Number of antisemitic incidents recorded after the 7 October 2023 Hamas attacks – unofficial data, where available [a]

Country	2022	2023	2024	Source and type of data
Austria	719	1 147	1 520	Jewish Community Vienna – antisemitic cases
Belgium	34	144	129	Antisemitisme.be – antisemitic incidents reported to Antisemitisme.be
Czechia	2 277	4 328	4 693	Federation of Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic – antisemitic incidents recorded by this organisation
Denmark	9	121	207	Jewish Community in Denmark, Department for Mapping and Sharing Information on Antisemitic Incidents (AKVAH) – antisemitic incidents recorded by AKVAH
Germany	2 616	4 782 [b]	8 627	Federal Association of Departments for Research and Information on Antisemitism (RIAS) – incidents reported to RIAS
Hungary	45	128	644	Action and Protection Foundation (TEV), Brussels Institute – antisemitic hate crimes and incidents
Italy	241	455	874	Antisemitism Observatory – antisemitic incidents recorded by the observatory
Netherlands	155	379	421	Centre for Documentation and Information Israel (CIDI) – antisemitic incident recorded by CIDI

Alternative text: The table presents countries where a noticeable increase in unofficially recorded antisemitic incidents was observed. It shows changes in the number of unofficially recorded incidents in the year 2023 compared to 2022, and indicates that in some countries incident levels remained high or increased further in 2024 compared to 2023. Information is only provided for countries where unofficial data are available. 'Unofficial data' refers to data recorded by civil society organisations, including Jewish community organisations. Every organisation applies different definitions and classifications of antisemitic incidents when recording those data.

Notes:

(a) Data for the year 2022 are included to show fluctuations that occurred after 7 October 2023.

(b) Not comparable with the previous year due to a change in the recording methodology.

Source: FRA, 2025

Tools developed by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance to counter distortion and to help recognise antisemitism

The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) has developed a toolkit to help counter Holocaust distortion. Designed to be used by policymakers and civil society organisations, the toolkit against Holocaust distortion covers three areas of activity:

- raising awareness of Holocaust distortion;

- learning and informing about Holocaust distortion;
- promoting historically informed policymaking.

Furthermore, the IHRA has developed a working definition of Holocaust denial and distortion, partly because of the viral spread of Holocaust distortion online.

In addition, the IHRA has developed a working definition of antisemitism, which is recognised as a practical tool to raise awareness of what constitutes antisemitism. Except for Malta, all EU Member States have adopted or endorsed this working definition, as well as did Albania, North Macedonia and Serbia. Cyprus is a liaison country in the IHRA, with Albania and Malta currently observers.

The IHRA and the European Commission jointly published an EU handbook for the practical use of the IHRA working definition of antisemitism, which draws on evidence collected by FRA on the situation of data collection on antisemitism.

In this context, it should be noted that the Council of Europe's European Commission against Racism and Intolerance stressed that the IHRA working definition of antisemitism must not be used to 'stifle, or stigmatise as antisemitic, legitimate criticism of Israel and its policies, in particular towards the Palestinian people and in the context of the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories', in its opinion on the definition, adopted at the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance's 84th plenary meeting on 2 December 2020.

2. Recording of antisemitic incidents by national authorities

This section highlights gaps in how national authorities record antisemitic incidents, along with the continued broad diversity that exist in current recording practices. The section also briefly considers challenges that relate to recording online antisemitism.

Official systems for collecting data on hate crimes are generally based on police records or criminal justice data. As noted, under these systems, the responsible authorities record different types of data and apply different definitions and classifications of antisemitism, as Table 3 indicates. These differences reveal a great level of variation in recording practices on antisemitism, which prevents any meaningful comparisons from being made between countries. Here, it can be noted that FRA has mapped hate crime recording and data collection practice across the EU, which provides more detail on what may constitute an adequate recording system.

Table 3 – Officially recorded antisemitic incidents in EU Member States and EU candidate countries participating as observers in the work of FRA, 2019–2024 [(a)]

Country	Recorded incident	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Austria	Antisemitic offences motivated by right-wing extremism	30	36	53	33	43	59
Austria	Crimes with an antisemitic bias motivation	n/a	n/a	269	225	263	347
Belgium	Cases of Holocaust denial and revisionism	14	28	15	10	13	12
Belgium	Incidents of antisemitism reported to the national equality body	n/a	n/a	96	57	121	277
Bulgaria	Convictions of antisemitic crimes	0	0	0	0	–	0
Cyprus	Antisemitic incidents	0	0	2	0	5	3
Czechia	Criminal offences motivated by antisemitism	23	27	37	25	18	33
Germany	Politically motivated crimes with an antisemitic motive	2 032	2 351	3 027	2 641	5 164	6 236
Denmark	Extremist crimes targeting Jews	51	79	93	37[(a)]	176	222
Estonia	Antisemitic crimes	2	0	1	0	0	0
Greece	Incidents motivated by antisemitism	10	9	5	5	6	4
Spain	Antisemitic incidents	5	3	11	13	23	37
Finland	Antisemitic crimes	12	18	17	10	34	21

France	Antisemitic actions and threats	687	339	589	436	1 676	1 570
Croatia	Criminal acts motivated by antisemitism	2	0	0	2	1	0
Ireland	Antisemitic incidents	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	–	15
Italy	Antisemitic criminal conduct	91[a]	101	101	94	316	304
Lithuania	Antisemitic incidents	5	3	1	5	8	13
Luxembourg	Antisemitic incidents under investigation or prosecution	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	–	–
Latvia	Antisemitic incidents	2	1	0	0	6	0
Malta	Antisemitic incidents	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands	Criminal discriminatory antisemitic incidents	768[a]	517	627	549	880	880
Poland	Antisemitic incidents	128	81	111[a]	130	103	125
Romania	Incidents pertaining to antisemitism	16	18	31	51	42	63
Sweden	Crimes with an antisemitic motive	n/a	170[b]	n/a	145	n/a	312
Slovenia	Antisemitic incidents	1	0	0	1	3	1
Slovakia	People sentenced for crimes motivated by antisemitism	3	0	4	24[a]	0	n/a
Albania	Antisemitic incidents	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
North Macedonia	Antisemitic incidents	0	0	0	0	0	0
Serbia	Antisemitic incidents	1	3	4	0	n/a	1

Alternative text: The table shows the numbers and types of officially recorded incidents of antisemitism over the period of 2019 to 2024. The table indicates that responsible authorities record different types of data, such as numbers of incidents, offences, crimes, investigations, prosecutions or convictions. The table also shows that recording practices change in some countries change, which prevents year-on-year comparisons to be made within some countries. The available data show that most countries record very low numbers of incidents. France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands record the highest numbers of incidents.

Notes:

(a) Data not comparable between countries due to differences in recording practices.

(b) Data not comparable with the previous year due to changes in recording practices.

n/a: Data not available

Source: FRA, 2025.

As Table 3 indicates, how countries record antisemitism is characterised by major gaps and inconsistencies in official recording systems: each country captures different types of acts, incidents, offences, threats and convictions according to its own categorisation and definition of antisemitism. Indeed, there are ‘differences in national definitions and classifications of

antisemitic incidents, gaps in data recording and collection, and high levels of under-reporting prevent comparison between countries. For example, some Member States record the overall reported number of incidents motivated by antisemitic bias that came to the attention of official data collection channels. Others report only those antisemitic incidents that were prosecuted,' as FRA noted in the overview of antisemitic incidents recorded in the EU that it published in 2023. The country overviews that accompany this publication provide more detail on what information is recorded in different countries.

While France, Italy, Germany and the Netherlands tend to record the highest numbers of incidents, this should not be taken as an indicator that antisemitism is more prevalent in these countries compared to others. Indeed, the size of the Jewish population in any given country and other factors affect how many incidents are recorded. These include the willingness and ability of victims and witnesses to report incidents, and trusting that the authorities will deal with such incidents appropriately. Higher numbers of recorded incidents could also reflect improvements and the increased efficiency of the recording system that is in place. For more information on practices that can lead to better recording and reporting of hate crime, see the compendium of practices on hate crime compiled by FRA.

In many countries, the number of recorded incidents remains low, with some also not recording any incidents at all. Where this is the case, this should not be taken as an indicator that antisemitism is not an issue of concern. Rather, low or inexistant numbers would be an indication of recording systems that do not adequately capture antisemitic incidents. This observation is confirmed by the fact that the numbers of antisemitic incidents recorded by civil society organisations tend to be much higher than those recorded by official sources, as the country overviews that accompany this publication show.

To reiterate, many countries operate official recording systems that do not capture the full extent to which antisemitism is widespread in their societies. This could be because recording systems simply lack a tool that enables the flagging of an antisemitic bias motivation, or because of restrictions on the recording of sensitive personal data, for example. Indeed, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights' practical guide on hate crime data collection and recording mechanisms highlights that 'data-protection laws may restrict authorities' powers to record the ethnicity or religious affiliation of a victim, thus apparently preventing them from recording the basis of a hate crime' (p. 18).

In this respect, it should be noted that sensitive personal data can be collected for substantial reasons of public interest, under strict safeguards, which are stated in Article 9 of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (Regulation (EU) 2016/679). Furthermore, the European Commission's guidance note on the collection and use of equality data based on racial or ethnic origin provides practical information on how to collect such data in full compliance with the GDPR and national data protection rules, as does the European Commission's note on collecting and using equality data in full compliance with EU GDPR and national data protection rules.

Overall, it can be said that current practice in recording by the relevant authorities within the criminal justice system, combined with low reporting rates, contributes to a gross underestimation

of the extent, nature and characteristics of antisemitism in the EU and in countries that participate in the work of FRA as observers. Indeed, 'very few victims report antisemitic incidents [they encounter] to any relevant authority or body, [FRA's] survey findings show. [The respondents in the survey] report 26 % of online antisemitism encountered, 28 % of incidents of antisemitic harassment, 49 % of incidents of antisemitic violence and 11 % of antisemitic discrimination'. Section 3 in this report, Ways forward, provides indications on how what could be done to improve recording systems.

An example of bringing stakeholders together to harmonise data collection on antisemitism is provided below.

Bringing Member States and other stakeholders together to harmonise data collection on antisemitism

Since May 2022, Austria has been convening like-minded EU Member States in a European Conference on Antisemitism (ECA), which 'aims at enhancing national efforts and international cooperation, exchanging best practices, addressing existing challenges, and harmonising methodologies for collecting and analysing data on antisemitic incidents.'

The ECA has been meeting once a year since then, bringing together special envoys and coordinators combating antisemitism and members of the European Commission's Working Group on the implementation of the EU Strategy on Combating Antisemitism and Fostering Jewish Life, as well as representatives of the European Commission and FRA.

In the meantime, 15 Member States have signed the Vienna Declaration on enhancing cooperation in fighting antisemitism and encouraging reporting of antisemitic incidents: Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, France, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Romania, Slovakia and Spain.

Related to this, FRA, the EU Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), the ECA and the European Network on Monitoring Antisemitism (ENMA) have organised workshops that bring together civil society organisations and law enforcement authorities. The aim of these workshops is to encourage cooperation and exchanges between civil society organisations and law enforcement agencies to help improve the recording of antisemitic incidents, including through data sharing agreements. Being able to draw on robust data can assist the relevant authorities in enhancing the measures they implement to prevent and combat antisemitism.

Recording antisemitic incidents online

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, the recording of incidents of antisemitism online presents its own challenges, not least due to the scale of the phenomenon. Findings from FRA's third survey on antisemitism show that 90 % of respondents experienced antisemitism online. Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic, Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine and reactions to the Hamas attacks and the ensuing military intervention in Gaza fuelled antisemitic narratives online, including Holocaust denial, distortion and trivialisation, and conspiracy theories (for more information on online antisemitism, see Institute for Strategic Dialogue, 2024, Research Compilation on Online Antisemitism).

Related to this, the Digital Services Act (Regulation (EU) 2022/2065) fully entered into force on 17 February 2024. Under this act, platforms are obliged to provide ways for people to easily report illegal online content, including antisemitic content. In this respect, FRA suggested that 'Member States should help put measures in place to strengthen the capacity and ability of law enforcement and judicial authorities to detect, investigate and prosecute illegal online antisemitic content'.

In this context, it should be noted that evidence collected by FRA shows that algorithms used for offensive speech detection may put too much weight on certain terms and words. For example, whereas using the word 'Jew' or 'Jewish' in posts sometimes leads the algorithms to flag non-hateful content as hateful, they also miss other, more subtle expressions of antisemitism, where those terms are not used. 'The very fact that such algorithms overreact to certain terms is understood by users of online platforms, who use this knowledge to avoid their offensive comments being singled out or to avoid being blocked. For example, some users posting hate speech use the word 'Juice' instead of 'Jews' to avoid detection,' as FRA noted in its report on bias in algorithms (p. 66). For more information, see FRA, 2023, Online content moderation – Current challenges in detecting hate speech.

An example of a network created to monitor antisemitism is provided below.

The European Network on Monitoring Antisemitism

Established in April 2024, the European Network on Monitoring Antisemitism (ENMA) brings together Jewish and non-Jewish civil society organisations from across Europe. ENMA has developed a 'common methodology of low threshold, victim-oriented and scientifically standardised monitoring of antisemitism'. This was developed following the IHRA working definitions of antisemitism and Holocaust denial and distortion with the aim of raising awareness of different forms antisemitism. For more information on these working definitions, see Tools developed by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance to counter

distortion and to help recognise antisemitism.

Currently, its members include the Bundesverband RIAS e.V. (Germany), the Żydowskie Stowarzyszenie Czulent (Poland), the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde Wien (Austria), the Fondazione Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea (Italy) and the Federace židovských obcí v ČR (Czechia). Victims or witnesses of antisemitism in these five countries can report incidents on the websites of these five organisations, using a standardised form.

Since its establishment, ENMA and its member organisations have also cooperated with law enforcement agencies at both the national and the transnational level to enhance the identification of antisemitic hate crimes. For instance, ENMA has provided training for police officers from across the EU on contemporary forms of Holocaust denial and distortion and on victim perspectives regarding these issues, in cooperation with FRA and with CEPOL.

ENMA released its first report in May 2025, on Holocaust Distortion in Europe: Documentation and analysis from five countries – Towards a common framework.

3. Ways forward to improve the recording of antisemitic incidents

The evidence presented in this publication points to gaps that exist in recording practice with respect to antisemitic incidents in EU Member States and in countries that participate in the work of FRA as observers. This section provides an overview of existing guidance tools and practices that national authorities could draw on to help them improve or establish recording systems, and thereby ensure that victims of antisemitism can seek redress.

Addressing antisemitism effectively – including online – is predicated on the availability of robust data on the phenomenon and therefore also on the proper recording of antisemitic incidents, not least by law enforcement authorities. In this respect, it should be noted that the European Commission, EU agencies (in particular CEPOL and FRA), national authorities, international organisations, civil society organisations and Jewish community organisations have been working and continue to work closely together in different fora to develop practical tools that the relevant authorities and other stakeholders can use to improve the recording of antisemitic incidents.

While several of these guidance tools were developed (and endorsed by Member States) in the context of improving the recording of hate crime, their underlying principles can be transferred to the specific context of antisemitism, including as regards online content.

Setting up data collection mechanisms

Enabling the proper recording of antisemitic incidents entails setting up efficient data collection systems. In doing so, relevant authorities can draw on existing guidance tools that have been endorsed by Member States and countries that participate in the work of FRA as observers. For example, the OSCE ODIHR developed a guide on hate crime data collection and monitoring. This guide includes 10 practical steps that national authorities can take to set up efficient hate crime data recording and collection mechanisms. Among others, the guide highlights 'the importance of adopting a common, simple and comprehensive definition of hate crime for monitoring purposes and sets out the types of data that should be captured by police recording mechanisms'. The guide recommends for data collection systems to be as specific as possible, which would entail having a category that would specifically capture the antisemitic bias motivation, rather than a generic bias motivation that targets religious groups (see p. 41).

Related to this, the subgroup on methodologies for recording and collecting data on hate crime under the former EU High-Level Group on combating racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance developed key guiding principles on improving the recording of hate crime by law enforcement authorities. Building on exchanges with practitioners in the field, this guidance stresses 'that any mechanism with which to record hate crime must be grounded in the reality of

the work of law enforcement officers and not put significant additional burden on them'. The EU High-Level Group on combating racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance has been superseded by the High-Level Group on combating hate speech and hate crime.

Recognising and recording antisemitic bias motivation

Police officers need to be able to identify the antisemitic bias motivation of incidents when they record incidents that are reported to them. In this respect, ODIHR developed a practical tool to enable law enforcement authorities to use and recognise bias indicators. The aim of this tool is to 'guide investigators in deciding whether a particular bias indicator type is present in the case before them'. Related to this, the European Commission developed a guidance note on the practical application of Council Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia. This note also covers the gathering of evidence that can prove 'the offender's alleged bias motives', including online.

Furthermore, the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) and the European Commission jointly published an EU handbook for the practical use of the IHRA working definition of antisemitism, which draws on evidence collected by FRA on the situation of data collection on antisemitism.

Exchanging practices to improve recording

Experience has shown the usefulness of exchanges between countries to learn from good practices to improve the recording of hate crime, and by extension the recording of antisemitic incidents. Both the EU High-Level Group on combating hate speech and hate crime and the European Commission's Working Group on the implementation of the EU Strategy on combating antisemitism and fostering Jewish life offer ready-made fora to facilitate such exchanges and peer learning.

These groups bring together representatives of the European Commission, EU agencies, international organisations, national authorities, civil society organisations and Jewish community organisations, and can therefore benefit from multiple perspectives. In this respect, statutory bodies such as national human rights institutions and equality bodies could also be invited to participate in these groups, as relevant.

Related to this, FRA has developed a compendium of practices on hate crime 'to help policymakers and practitioners such as law enforcement officers understand what is being done elsewhere in the EU to combat hate crime, and which elements could be adapted for use in their own national contexts'.

Cooperating with civil society organisations

Under the terms of the Victims' Rights Directive, Member States should facilitate the reporting of crimes through third-party reporting, thereby providing victims and witnesses with an additional or alternative channel through which to report incidents. Involving civil society organisations in this process can help lower the threshold for victims and witnesses to report incidents, as many are reluctant to file a complaint to the police due to the (perceived) associated burdens.

In this respect, it can be noted that FRA's surveys consistently show that the main reasons for which people – of any population group – do not report incidents are the perception that nothing would change as a result of reporting; that incidents are too minor or happen all the time; that reporting procedures are too time consuming, bureaucratic or inconvenient; that victims and witnesses do not trust the police; or that they do not know who to turn to, to report incidents (FRA, 2022, Encouraging hate crime reporting – The role of law enforcement and other authorities, pp. 30–35).

Involving civil society organisations and Jewish community organisations in the process also requires building trust between these organisations and law enforcement authorities, along with ensuring that adequate resources are made available for both. This is where the key guiding principles on cooperation between law enforcement authorities and civil society organisations developed by the EU High-Level Group on combating hate speech and hate crime become relevant.

With respect to improving the recording of antisemitic incidents, the following principles are particularly relevant: 'enhance comparability and compatibility of recording methodologies through systematic use of bias indicators' and 'share data collection methodologies and set up a system for regular information exchange'. At the time of writing, Austria, Belgium, Czechia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain had established cooperation mechanisms with civil society organisations or Jewish community organisations in the specific context of recording antisemitic incidents.

Developing multistakeholder partnerships

Improving the recording and encouraging the reporting of antisemitic incidents involves a variety of stakeholders that need to be brought together in a structured and systematic way. This includes representatives of law enforcement authorities, criminal justice systems, civil society organisations and Jewish community organisations.

In this respect, it can be noted that FRA has cooperated with ODIHR to support countries in strengthening their hate crime recording and data collection capabilities by organising needs-based national-level workshops. Bringing together law enforcement and criminal justice

practitioners, these workshops serve ‘to identify and address gaps in existing hate crime recording and data collection practices and discuss ways to improve these practices through practical steps and specific operational measures’.

Drawing on this methodology, the relevant national authorities could host such workshops with a specific focus on how antisemitic incidents are recorded in their countries, with a view to developing concrete actions that will help them improve data collection on antisemitism. Such workshops could be organised in close cooperation with civil society organisations and Jewish community organisations.

Conducting surveys on the lived experience of antisemitism

The EU and its Member States need to take the lived experience of antisemitism among Jews into consideration. Whereas FRA has conducted three large-scale surveys of people’s experiences of antisemitism to date (in 2013, 2018 and 2023), the Council of the European Union acknowledged in 2024 that national surveys are also needed: ‘The Council of the European Union, bearing in mind the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, invites the Member States to improve the recording of antisemitic incidents and, as appropriate, conduct periodic, national or regional surveys on antisemitism, drawing on robust and reliable survey methodologies concerning hard-to-reach population groups, such as those methodologies developed by FRA, while respecting Member States’ autonomy in determining the specific modalities for data collection.’

Conclusion

More than 80 years after the Holocaust, Jewish people across the EU continue to regularly experience antisemitism. The EU and its Member States are bound by EU law to take any action they can to ensure that Jewish people across the EU can fully enjoy their rights.

In this regard, it is useful to recall that the EU and its Member States have made specific commitments to improve the recording of antisemitic incidents. However, significant gaps persist, as this report shows. The relevant national authorities can draw on existing practical tools and guidance that can be applied in the context of combating antisemitism.

Member States have contributed to developing these tools and guidance in the context of the fight against hate crime, both in the framework of the OSCE and in that of the EU High-Level Group on combating hate speech and hate crime. By coming together in such fora, Member States also have the possibility to exchange practices on what they do to improve the recording and encourage the reporting of antisemitic incidents and on how best to provide support to victims of antisemitism. The importance of involving civil society organisations, Jewish community organisations and statutory bodies such as national human rights institutions and equality bodies in these endeavours should also be underlined.

Taken together, these actions would help ensure that victims of antisemitism can seek and get redress and live their life in dignity.

Annex – Country overviews

- Antisemitism overview – Austria (PDF, 425KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Belgium (PDF, 374KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Bulgaria (PDF, 214KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Croatia (PDF, 188KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Cyprus (PDF, 168KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Czechia (PDF, 343KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Denmark (PDF, 365KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Estonia (PDF, 169KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Finland (PDF, 289KB)
- Antisemitism overview – France (PDF, 428KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Germany (PDF, 492KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Greece (PDF, 367KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Hungary (PDF, 385KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Ireland (PDF, 163KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Italy (PDF, 414KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Latvia (PDF, 190KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Lithuania (PDF, 230KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Luxembourg (PDF, 316KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Malta (PDF, 156KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Netherlands (PDF, 580KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Poland (PDF, 328KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Portugal (PDF, 146KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Romania (PDF, 353KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Slovakia (PDF, 133KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Slovenia (PDF, 192KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Spain (PDF, 380KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Sweden (PDF, 383KB)

- Antisemitism overview – Albania (PDF, 154KB)

- Antisemitism overview – North Macedonia (PDF, 136KB)
- Antisemitism overview – Serbia (PDF, 238KB)