



Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe
Department for the Execution of Judgments of the European Court of Human Rights
DGI - Directorate General of Human Rights and Rule of Law
Council of Europe
F-67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX
DGI-execution@coe.int

Budapest, 24 October 2019

**Communication from
the Hungarian Working Group Against Hate Crimes**

Dear Madams / Sirs,

Under Rule 9 (2) of the Rules of the Committee of Ministers for the supervision of the execution of judgments, the Hungarian Working Group Against Hate Crimes (hereinafter referred to as: Working Group) hereby submits this communication letter on the implementation of the judgments of

1. BALÁZS v. HUNGARY (Application no. 15529/12) Judgment of 20 October 2015
and
2. 2. R. B. v. HUNGARY (Application no. 64602/12) Judgment of 12 April 2016
and
3. 3. KIRÁLY AND DÖMÖTÖR v. HUNGARY (Application no. 10851/13) Judgment of 17 January 2017
and
4. 4. M.F. v. HUNGARY (Application no. 45855/12) Judgment of 31 October 2017.

The Working Group Against Hate Crimes¹ was established by Hungarian human rights NGOs in January 2012 to join forces for a more effective state response to hate crimes. Member organizations of the Working Group are: *Amnesty International Hungary*, the Hungarian section of the international NGO fighting for the recognition of human rights, *Háttér*, a support provision NGO fighting for equal rights and social acceptance for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex (LGBTQI) people, *Hungarian Helsinki Committee*, an NGO aiming to protect human rights and constitutional values and ensuring justice for the oppressed, refugees and detainees, *Hungarian Civil Liberties Union* (HCLU), an NGO fighting against undue interference and misuse of power, and striving to educate citizens about their basic human rights, and ensuring enforcement. Besides the representatives of the organizations, individual experts also take part in the work of the Working Group.

The Working Group regularly makes proposals to strengthen state responses to hate crimes. It develops curricula and conducts training programs for professionals dealing with hate crimes. NGOs

¹ See <http://gyuloletelen.hu/about-us>



participating in the Working Group also provide legal advice and representation for victims of hate crimes. Finally, the Working Group fosters good professional relations with national and international organizations, the national police, the public prosecutor's office and other public authorities.

Introduction

The four cases are dealt with in a standard procedure as a group of cases under the leading case *Balázs v. Hungary* (<http://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=004-10593>) concerning violations of the prohibition of discrimination read in conjunction with the prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment on account of the authorities' failure to carry out effective investigations into the question of possible racial motivation behind the ill-treatment inflicted on the Roma applicants by law enforcement agents in their official capacity or off-duty; or violations of the right to respect for private life on account of inadequate criminal investigations into offences allegedly committed in the context of anti-Roma demonstrations (Article 14 read in conjunction with Article 3; Article 8).

An action report by the Hungarian Government for the case of R.B. was received by the Committee on 2 August 2017 (DH-DD(2017)900). A submission from the Hungarian Civil Liberties Union – HCLU was received on 8 September 2017 (DH-DD(2017)1081). Hereupon, the Hungarian authorities submitted a revised action report on 25 September 2017 (DH-DD(2017)1091). A submission from the Working Group was received on 18 January 2018 (DH-DD(2018)100).

With regard to general measures, the judgment in the case of R.B. was translated and published on the website of the Government. The Government further submitted that shortly following the events in the complaint, the Criminal Code was amended to provide sufficient protection against similar actions in the future (for the details see the action report). These amendments took effect as of 7 May 2011.

In response to the above-mentioned submission by the HCLU, the authorities submitted that “the Public Prosecutor’s Office pays paramount attention to the investigation of racist motives of crimes. Procedures to follow in criminal proceedings initiated on charges of hate crimes are guided by the public prosecutors’ protocol, based on recommendation of the 2010 working papers of OSCE ODIHR, made available for all public prosecutors and forming part of the training material provided by the Hungarian Public Prosecution Centre. ”

The Working Group Against Hate Crimes informed the Committee in its submission of 22 May 2019 of some developments.

The Government submitted its group action report on 26 September 2019 (hereinafter: action report). It has to be acknowledged that the Hungarian Government has taken significant steps in order to efficiently police hate crimes, but shortcomings in the application of the law stemming primarily from the lack of sufficient training and the intolerant, harassing tone used and campaigns carried out by the Government against vulnerable groups still substantively hinder the fight against hate crimes.

In the light of the foregoing, we respectfully draw the attention of the Committee of Ministers to the fact that despite significant developments, important issues of concern are still at stake. As a result of



this, the Working Group is of the view that the procedure should not be closed at this point in time and further progress shall be required from the Hungarian Government.

General measures adopted: police and prosecutor instructions on hate crimes

The action report states (11-13.) that the relevant department of the National Police Headquarters prepared a draft of the instruction on police tasks related to the handling of hate crimes protocol, and it is under approval by the National Police Chief. In fact, the protocol (ORFK 30/2019. (VII. 18.) sz. utasítás) was published in the Official Bulletin (Hivatalos Értesítő) on the 18th of July 2019 and entered into force on the 1st of August.

As we outlined in our previous submission, the police started to develop the protocol in 2018 on the initiative and in cooperation with our Working Group. However, unfortunately, the police unilaterally terminated the cooperation with the Working Group in the summer of 2018 without substantial explanation. Therefore we could not participate in the drafting process of the protocol. While the National Chief of Police promised the Working Group in his letter dated 1 December 2018 that the Working Group will have the possibility to comment on the draft of the protocol before it is finalized, the protocol was published in the Official Bulletin without such consultation.

However, despite the lack of civil participation, our Working Group welcomed its entry into force as a significant step towards the effective investigation of hate crimes in Hungary.

The protocol specifies the Hate Crime Special Network's (*szakvonal*) - composed of a responsible officer on departmental level - tasks and prescribes that a mentor has to be appointed at each police department at the local level. The protocol also prescribes that trainings should be organised for the police personnel on the protocol and the use of the bias indicator list developed by the Working Group.

However, the work of the Hate Crime Special Network and that of the mentors will only be effective if:

- appropriate care is taken to select network leads and mentors who are competent and committed to the issue
- the current massive fluctuation within the Network is halted and prevented
- measures are taken in order to motivate network leads and mentors on long term
- financial compensation and / or extra time is allocated for the work of police officers acting as network leads and mentors
- Network leads' competences are strengthened through regular and specialized trainings, the implementation of the protocol and the use of the bias indicator list becomes part of their everyday work
- police patrols get acquainted with the protocol, especially the bias indicators
- the Network and the mentors operate in a transparent manner: data on their work is published regularly and their contact information is publicly available
- the Network publishes an annual report on its activities



- efforts are made to identify hate groups and their activities
- the police cooperates with civil society groups and organisations which are in direct contact with the affected groups during the implementation of the protocol and the delivery of the trainings.

The action report also states (19.) that upon the request of our Working Group and in order to eliminate uncertainties in the application of the law, on 7 May 2019 the Chief Public Prosecutor's Office issued an Instruction on the evidence-related aspects of hate crimes to be applied by all public prosecutors. This Instruction was only sent to our Working Group on 22 July 2019 upon a freedom of information request submitted to the National Prosecutor's Office. This is the reason why we did not know about its existence at the time of our previous submission.

The prosecutor's Instruction is also an important element of progress, but it fails to incorporate several important issues raised by jurisprudence that it should be complemented with; most importantly: the interpretation of the different forms of the criminal provision 'violence against a member of the community', the interpretation of the criminal provision 'incitement to hatred', the possibility of mixed motives behind hate crimes and other standards stemming from the case-law of the ECtHR, and the tasks of prosecutors in relation to hate crime investigations at the police.

In addition, the Prosecutor's Office should officially inform the police about its Instruction and should publish it on its website.

I. Recognition and investigation of hate crime

It is of utmost importance to underline that NGOs (and authorities) can only report on cases which receive publicity through the media or in which hate crime specific investigation was launched, or cases that are reported to NGOs by the victims. However, the majority of hate crime cases remain unreported, or reported but not classified as hate crimes and thus remain out of scope. The most marginalized groups, especially migrants and Roma have scarce opportunities or tools to enforce their rights and the level of awareness is generally extremely low. Therefore the main task of the Hungarian state should be to empower and support these social groups. Unfortunately, they are rather targets of exclusionary policies and face a denial of citizenship. The adoption of the investigative protocol could be a significant development regards the awareness of police officers and the express obligation to recognize and deal with bias motivated crimes targeting minorities. However the protection of marginalized groups is only possible if the attitude of the police changes and governmental campaigns stirring up hatred ceases.

(i) Failure to undertake law enforcement measures prescribed by law

There has been a significant increase in the number of hate incidents during this years' Budapest Pride Month, which signals a shift from the previous, isolated attacks to a more systematic and organised campaign committed by a certain group of the Hungarian extreme right scene. Between June and at the time of writing the Working Group counted ten separate attacks against events organised by and/or the Hungarian LGBTQI community. The incidents were carried out by a well-known extreme



right figure, György Budaházy and his followers aiming to disrupt the events and intimidate the organisers and participants. Despite the significant increase in the number of incidents, the police failed to respond appropriately leaving the organisers and participants of the events unprotected.

For many years the police by default were present at every event organised around the Budapest Pride Month, but this year they only covered approximately 25% of all the events, in some cases leaving even those events unprotected where previously known, clear security risks existed (e.g. extreme right sites were publicly calling for disruption). Even though the organisers of Budapest Pride contacted the police after the first incident and asked for enhanced security measures, the police only started to take the issue seriously after further incidents happened.

In the majority of the cases the police on the spot was hesitant and insecure and acted only as „bystanders” even when 15-20 extreme right activists were threatening the participants. Despite the clearly unlawful acts of the perpetrators and repeated calls from the organisers, the police refused to take any action (e.g. ID checks or short term arrests) creating the feeling of uncertainty and the impression that the police do not want to protect the LGBTQI community. In some cases when people were trying to make an official report to the police on the spot, they were redirected to the local police station, which sent the message that the police do not want to deal with them.

On October 1, 2019 the Working Group and a representative of the Budapest Pride met the police and the representative of the Office of the Prosecutor General to discuss how police and the other authorities could protect better the future events. At that meeting, the police acknowledged that mistakes were made which – according to them – was mostly due to the lack of experience and not a sufficient amount of training for the patrols reporting to the scene. The Working Group reassured that it is ready to continue supporting the police with trainings and developing materials that could be helpful in their work.

The lack of police actions to violations taking place in the course of the Budapest Pride events well present the frequent shortcomings of policing hate crimes: still the police often fail to take the necessary measures (e.g. failure of carrying out ID checks and short term arrests) against far-right, extremist perpetrators intimidating protected groups even though that the necessary evidence has manifestly emerged that protected groups were unlawfully violated. In such an event, the extremely slow and complicated nature of the police complaint procedures, caused partially by the refusal of the police to sustain complaints, renders the legal remedy against this failure ineffective.

(ii) Failure to undertake investigative steps

The Working Group pointed out in its submission of January 2018 that authorities fail to carry out all necessary investigative actions in order to find the perpetrator and prove the bias motive (e.g. to question the witnesses, to collect CCTV evidence prior to its deletion, to conduct background investigations into the social networks and lifestyle of offenders to uncover the motives of the crime, and to pose questions pertaining to motivation during the questioning of the offenders).

In the cases where Working Group members acted as representatives of the victims in the past years, some improvements in the authorities work could be detected. It has to be underlined, however, that



representation is generally provided in the capital where the application of the law is evidently more progressive than in other areas of the country. Besides the undoubted improvement, Working Group members also experienced serious shortcomings during the investigation: CCTV recordings are often not collected, confiscation of mobile phones or computers is delayed, eventual perpetrators are not identified as suspects and not heard as witnesses because of the uncertainty of their status. These shortcomings give a leeway to the perpetrators to remain unidentified or hide the real intention motivating the crime. The failure to collect information that may serve as evidence can also easily result in a situation where the prosecutor or the court is unable to establish the hate/bias motivation and classify the case accordingly because of the lack of such evidence. These shortcomings run against ECtHR standards relating to the effective investigation of hate crimes² and continue to result in rights violations.

(iii) Under-classification of hate crimes

By under-classification the Working Group refers to the situation in which the bias motivation is disregarded during a procedure and as a consequence the offender is sentenced for a significantly less severe act.

There are still no disaggregated data available in official criminal statistics published by the Ministry of the Interior³ regarding the different types of 'violence against a member of the community' (the sui generis hate crime clause - Section 216 of the Criminal Code). Based on these statistics between 1 January 2013 and 30 June 2018 altogether 215 'violence against a member of the community' cases were registered by the authorities, half of them in the capital. In 2018, 21 cases, in 2017, 38 and in 2016, altogether 33 cases were registered. Without analysing the criminal data or the general criminal situation in Hungary, it seems obvious in the light of these low numbers that under-classification still prevails.

Human rights' NGOs providing representation for victims generally experience that the initial qualification of the crime disregards the bias motivation and authorities tend to requalify the crime to hate crime (violence against a member of a community) only when circumstances are clear that the act was committed by bias motivation. This is a shortcoming, since the ignorance of the eventual bias

² *Nachova and Others v. Bulgaria* (Application No. 43577/98, 43579/98), judgment of 6 July 2005, *Šečić v. Croatia* (Application No. 40116/02) judgment of 31 August 2007, *Angelova and Iliev v. Bulgaria* (Application No. 55523/00), judgment of 26. October 2007, *Stoica v. Roumania* (Application No. 42722/02), judgment of 4 March 2008, *Milanović v. Serbia* (Application No. 44614/07) judgment of 10 December 2010, *Fedorchenko and Lozenko v. Ukraine* (Application No. 387/03) judgment of 20. September 2012, *Đorđević v. Croatia* (Application No. 41526/10) judgment of 24 October 2012, *Begheluri and Others v. Georgia* (Application No. 28490/02) judgment of 7 January 2015, *Identoba and Others v. Georgia* (Application No. 73235/12) judgment of 12 May 2015.

³ https://bsr-sp.bm.hu/SitePages/ExcelMegtekinto.aspx?ExcelName=/BSRVIR/Regisztr%C3%A1lt%20b%C5%B1ncselekm%C3%A9nyek%20sz%C3%A1ma%20az%20elk%C3%B6vet%C3%A9s%20helye%20szerint_ver20180713094758.xlsx&Token=MTE3K3NLRU1dziUWGEwZ0JwckjtQ2xacks4NE9EODVqNVRTZGZwWUh2c3ZhUml4T1VSMjNwZVF2bU9MMWJoWWdsc3YvZ2x0S1dtSWVSM01LQUt6S1MzcGJ1dEN6UTBqeTE1TFRHb1VsSDFXL3c0b2JQnVkJMEQ2clFyd3hlWU0



motivation might prevent the authorities to extend the investigation to factors which might prove the bias motive.

Section 332 of the Criminal Codes criminalizes the incitement against a community. The Ministry of Interior's statistics show that between 2013 and 2018 merely 18 cases were registered. Following the case-law of the Hungarian courts, this crime is committed only if the danger created by a speech or expression is not merely hypothetical but involves the direct possibility of a violent act. The practice of the police and the prosecution applies a very restrictive approach to what constitutes a direct threat of danger and disregards the case-law of the ECtHR⁴. As a result, nearly none of the reported expressions, not even those inciting hatred, fall under the scope of this crime. This practice is highly questionable as it renders the provision practically unapplied and even extremely hostile expressions remain unpunished.

The Criminal Code punishes illegal patrolling (Section 352). The provision was introduced in the Code after the patrolling of extremist groups intimidating Roma. Between 2013 and 2018, including the era of the refugee crisis in 2015 when in the surroundings of Hungary's southern border far-right groups patrolled, only 2 cases were registered by the authorities.

The Government Action Plan states that police must consider and assess the existence of bias motivation in all proceedings (§ 16.). It has to be noted that the bias indicators existed even before the introduction of the investigative protocol and it was the duty of the police to recognize these. The protocol will serve as a tool for better establishing the hate crime classification if necessary, if it is systematically implemented and enhanced by thorough training for the criminal justice actors.

II. Awareness-raising, training

(i) Lack of prevention and promotion of tolerance by government

In our Working Group's previous submissions we informed the Committee that the Hungarian government is responsible for generating intolerance against vulnerable groups, in particular by its anti-immigration campaign launched in 2015 against asylum seekers and migrants, as well as by its campaign targeting György Soros in 2017-2018 with an obviously an anti-Semitic overtone. During this latter campaign, independent NGOs such as the members of the Working Group were also targeted and stigmatized which led to the interruption of good cooperation between the police and the Working Group.

The growing number of homophobic and transphobic statements by leading government politicians since the beginning of the year makes it likely that the LGBTQI community is targeted by the Government. It has also to be added that recently prominents of the Government, such as for instance the Speaker of the Parliament in May 2019 have expressed their homophobic views publicly. All this has an encouraging effect on extremist groups as presented above.

⁴ *Seurot v. France* decision on the admissibility of 18 May 2004, *Pavel Ivanov v. Russia* decision on the admissibility of 20 February 2007, *Norwood v. United Kingdom* decision on the admissibility of 16 November 2004, *Belkacem v. Belgium* decision on the admissibility of 27 June 2017



(ii) Lack of special trainings for police officers, prosecutors, judges and lawyers

Hate crimes do not feature prominently in the basic training of police officers, judges, prosecutors and lawyers. While some introductory social science courses include information on prejudices and how they can lead to violence, the discussion often remains on a very abstract level detached from the work of professionals. Hate crime provisions are part of the Criminal Law courses, however, they receive minimal attention even compared to other crimes affecting vulnerable groups, such as partnership violence or human trafficking. The Faculty of Law Enforcement at National University of Public Service offers BA, MA and PhD level courses on hate crimes, these courses are optional; only a small portion of graduates take it. Furthermore, these courses are offered at the university level, frontline officers who meet the victim for the first time, and who play a crucial role in documenting bias indicators typically do not receive university education.

While some contingent, not systematic specialized training courses on hate crimes were organized in recent years targeting police officers, prosecutors and judges, these reached only a very low number of professionals and were often organized by NGOs (mostly the members of the Working Group) without any funding from the Hungarian state. The police protocol adopted in July 2019 contains a requirement for all police officers working in criminal and public order departments to undergo training on bias indicators by the end of 2019, NGOs with experience in delivering such trainings have been asked to contribute in only one county so far. There is no similar training duty for prosecutors and judges. The Council of Europe HELP programme developed an elearning course for Hungarian judges and prosecutors on hate crimes, and the course was piloted in 2016, but based on information from the tutor of the course, the platform has not been used ever since.

The experience of NGOs shows that those participating in such trainings handle the investigation significantly more professionally, however, cases often get stuck at the local level, and never get to the trained investigators. Therefore, the Working Group is of the opinion that training on effective responses to hate crimes should become a core part of the systemic and basic training of lawyers, police officers, prosecutors and judges.

III. Collection of statistical data

Data collection on hate crimes was significantly improved in July 2018, however it still suffers from serious deficiencies that do not allow for the comprehensive and timely compilation of statistics. There is no specialized data collection by public authorities on hate crimes. Data on crimes reported to the authorities are collected in the Unified System of Criminal Statistics of the Investigative Authorities and of Public Prosecution (Egységes Nyomozóhatósági és Ügyészségi Bűnügyi Statisztika, ENYÜBS). In July 2018 two new fields were introduced in the statistical form: a yes-no question on whether the crime is a hate crime, and a question on the protected characteristic (race, nationality, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, other) if the crime is a hate crime. This is a significant improvement to the previous system that only allowed to identify hate crimes if they fell under Art. 216, and the list of protected characteristics was inconsistent.

It is still, however, problematic that the categorization of the crime as hate crime is based solely on the decision of the authorities, thus in case the authorities do not recognize the bias motivation, the



crime will not show up in the relevant category. Furthermore, recording only protected characteristics, but not the group targeted lumps together highly different forms of hate crimes (such as anti-semitic, anti-muslim and anti-christian crimes under 'religion') making it difficult to have a real understanding of the problem. There are also three general problems with ENYÜBS that significantly undermine its usability altogether. First, data on registered crimes is recorded in the statistical system upon the decision of prosecutors to prosecute or suspend investigation in the case; therefore, in case of a long investigation the crime appears in the system only months or years after its occurrence. Second, the system only contains data on investigation and prosecution, but not on sentencing, for which a separate statistical system is in place, that is lot less detailed and does not allow the tracking of a case from reporting to sentencing. Finally, researchers claim that the accuracy of the system is very low: there are many statistical forms which are not fully completed or contain mistakes.

While ENYÜBS is set up to publish crime data every month, there have been no data released since the introduction of the new system in July 2018. At present it is not clear whether data on hate crimes will be available with the regular public updates or will only be available upon a special request.

In the Working Group's view, based on the current method of data collection and in lack of regular victimization surveys, it is impossible to understand the real number of bias motivated crimes which, in effect, leads to the distortion and bagatellisation of the scale of the problem.

IV. Victim support, victimological research

(i) Lack of effective victim support services

Since the 2018 January submission of the Working Group, the situation in the field of victim support services has not changed. Victim support is offered by the public Victim Support Service (VSS) and NGOs, however, no specialized support programs exist for victims of hate crimes. The services available range from financial aid (instant monetary aid, state compensation) to legal aid and psychological support. The legislation does not prescribe psychological help to be offered by the public VSS. Some VSS have recognized the need for such form of support and invested in employing or contracting psychologists, but there are several counties where psychological services are still not available at all as part of the victim support package, and even where such services are available, they actually are only accessible in a very limited time-frame. Neither staff members of the VSS, nor affiliated psychologists receive targeted training on how to deal with victims of hate crimes. Researchers suggest that the effectiveness of VSS is relatively low compared to other EU countries. Some VSS have cooperation agreement with non-state victim support services, but the intensity of the cooperation primarily depend on the enthusiasm of the VSS's staff. No NGOs specifically focusing on supporting hate crime victims have such cooperation agreements with VSS, and these NGOs receive no public funding for their work. VSS are incorporated in the district Government Offices, however the methodological assistance and professional management is carried out by the Ministry of Justice. This structural complexity causes serious shortcomings in the effective operation of the VSS.

NGOs of our Working Group providing legal representation for victims have never encountered a case when the victim support services were recommended by the police in an accessible way in the course of the investigation, although it is a legal obligation of the officer to do so. Therefore we can conclude



that the VSS is not accessible to the victims particularly that the VSS does not contact the victims as potential clients based on its own initiative.

(ii) Research on victims

The Government action plan (§ 27) makes a reference to the fact that detailed and comprehensive research on hate crime is carried out by the National Institute of Criminology and that the annual reports of the Institute contain analysis and research results related to victim groups.

The website of the Institute does not enable searches and the latest annual report from 2018⁵ does not at all contain the word “hate crime” and refers to “victim” only once. The most current available summary of the Institute’s research projects accomplished until 2018⁶ refers to no specific research on hate crimes, or victims, or protected groups, or crimes committed by extreme right-wing perpetrators. The last representative survey on victimization carried out by the National Institute of Criminology took place more than 15 years ago, in 2003, and contained no question on hate victimization. There was one representative survey conducted in 2005 (EU ICS) that did contain a question on hate victimization, but this was carried out by a polling agency without the involvement or financial contribution of any Hungarian public body, and the data is nearly 15 years old.

V. Publication and dissemination of ECtHR judgments

The Government states in its action plan under §28 that judgments of the ECtHR are available on the Ministry of Justice’s website. The translated judgments are uploaded on the website, however it has to be noted that the information is not at all easily accessible: only a small pool of experts are aware of the website, since the Government is not keen on promoting the collection. Furthermore, the compilation of the judgments is listed in an alphabetical order, to be downloaded in a zipped format. The judgments are not organized by the Articles of the Convention and it is impossible to search in the content.

The Working Group submits that based on its experience and personal communication, it is the common observation of practicing lawyers that actors of the justice system are not aware of the ECtHR case-law, even those professionals who were directly involved in a case adjudicated by the ECtHR such as police officers, prosecutors or judges are not familiar with the judgments. An easily accessible and searchable database of translated judgments would contribute to the dissemination of ECtHR case-law.

⁵ https://www.okri.hu/images/stories/INTBESZAMOLOK_UJ_2017/2018_intbeszamolo.pdf

⁶ <https://www.okri.hu/index.php/kutatas/kutatasok>



VI. Recommendations

Considering the above, the Working Group respectfully recommends the Committee to call on the Government of Hungary to:

1. Take measures to ensure the effective operation of the Hate Crime Special Network by providing the members specialised and regular training. Trainings should aim the implementation of the hate crime police protocol. Ensure that the Hate Crime Special Network publishes a yearly report on its activities and results.
2. Take measures to ensure the effective operation of hate crime mentors appointed at all police offices by providing them specialised and regular training. Trainings should focus on the implementation of the hate crime police protocol.
3. Ensure that contact details of the Hate Crime Special Network members' and hate crime mentors, along their duties are available for the public. Prevent the massive fluctuation of the Special Network members by providing compensation and extra time to carry out their duties.
4. Ensure that special trainings are devoted to the issue of hate crimes during the training of lawyers, police officers, prosecutors and members of the judiciary.
5. Develop the prosecutor's protocol of hate crimes to cover further important issues raised by jurisprudence and the tasks of prosecutors in relation to hate crime investigations at the police. Ensure that the Prosecutor's Office publishes its protocol on its website.
6. Take steps towards the proper application of the 'incitement against a community' criminal clause by police officers and prosecutors through training and education.
7. Take steps towards effective data collection on hate crimes, including timely and comprehensive criminal statistics disaggregated by victim groups, as well as regular victimization surveys; and ensuring that such data are publicly available.
8. Take steps towards enhancing the effectiveness of the Victim Support Services and towards the introduction of special support programs for victims of hate crimes.
9. Adopt a national hate crime strategy and action plan to guarantee comprehensive and coordinated action of all relevant public bodies to prevent and respond to hate crimes and intolerance.
10. Make efforts to identify hate groups and their activities.
11. Ensure that the government and its representatives refrain from hate speech or any kind of stigmatization of vulnerable groups as well as NGOs representing the rights of these groups. Ensure that law-enforcement authorities cooperate with human rights NGOs which are in direct contact with the affected groups.
12. Ensure that a Hungarian translation of ECtHR judgments are published in an accessible and searchable format.

Respectfully,

In representation of the Working Group:
Eszter Jovánovics, Head of Equality Programs, HCLU