



D.2.3. TRANSNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE REPORT

WP2: Restorative justice in current Europe: Qualitative and quantitative transnational research

Research Team:

Olga Jubany (coord.), Ignacio Elpidio Domínguez, Malin Roiha and Oscar Guasch
(University of Barcelona)

Jose Antonio Langarita, Jordi Mas Grau, Carme Montserrat and Pilar Albertín
(University of Girona)



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA



OCTOBER 2020



Funded by the European Union's Justice Programme (2014-2020).
The content of this document represents the views of the authors only and is their sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

Table of contents

Table of contents	2
Introduction	3
1. Methodology	5
2. Comparative legal framework regarding restorative justice and the rights of LGBT victims of crime	9
2.1. Analysis of the rights of LGBT people	9
2.2. Analysis of the legal measures against bias-motivated violence and discrimination	11
2.3. Victim rights and Restorative Justice at the European Level	15
2.4. Analysis of the legal framework regarding restorative justice	20
2.5. Analysis of the main facilitators and barriers that facilitate/hinder the application of restorative justice in case of anti-LGBT hate crimes	27
3. Preventing and combating LGBT violence through public policies and restorative justice. The perspectives of key professionals throughout Europe	29
3.1. Legislation and policy	29
3.2. Knowledge, beliefs and practices of professionals in relation to restorative justice	35
3.3. Strategies of restorative justice in relation to (anti-LGBT) hate crimes	40
3.4. Cooperation and training	44
4. The opinions of NGOs professionals regarding the application of restorative justice: quantitative analysis	49
Conclusions	56
References	60
ANNEXES	62
Annex 1. Qualitative analysis. Profiles of professionals interviewed	62
Annex 2. Quantitative analysis. Survey data	78
Annex 3. Main strategies/activities/programmes that could be relevant to the workshop- and training activities	86

Introduction

LetsGoByTalking. Protecting and defending the rights of victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes: Innovative paths through restorative justice is an action-research project that aims to explore and analyse innovative paths of restorative justice with a particular emphasis on the victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination, in order to contribute to the promotion of victims of crime in the European Union. The project seeks to research and analyse the existing legal frameworks for LGBT-related hate crimes and discrimination and for restorative measures in six European countries (Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, and Spain), with an approach focused on ethnographic in-depth research, combined with quantitative survey data. Following a research stage, the project aims to collect and exchange good practices and experiences between and among professionals, through a series of workshops in all six countries, as well as a transnational workshop. A further aim is the preparation of training materials for professionals in different settings, such as NGOs, justice systems, and other public administrations. The ethnographic research provides detailed information on explicit and perceived training needs for a wide range of professionals so that anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination may be adequately tackled with restorative measures, and the training stage responds to said needs. Finally, throughout the project different dissemination materials and activities focus on the divulgation of the project's findings to both academic and general publics.

This report constitutes one of the main outputs of the research phase of the project (WP2). This phase serves to provide an overview of the situation in the analysed countries in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses, which will be useful for the development of the action phase. Thus, the research has the following objectives: a) To map European and national legislations regarding restorative justice and the rights of victims of crime, taking into account the degree of reinforcement of the application of RJ in the case of anti-LGBT hate crimes; b) To analyse the experiences and needs of victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes, as well as key professionals who deal with anti-LGBT violence and/or RJ programmes (policy makers, criminal justice practitioners, RJ mediators, representatives of NGOs, law enforcement authorities) in order to facilitate the application of RJ in anti-LGBT hate crimes; c) To identify RJ programmes in cases of hate crimes (with an emphasis on anti-LGBT hate

crimes) put in place in European countries, taking into account their transferability to other national contexts.

To achieve these objectives, a mixed methodology (qualitative/quantitative) has been applied, by means of desk research on legal and political frameworks, as well as in-depth interviews and an online survey to gather and analyse the opinions of professionals linked to (anti-LGBT) hate crimes and restorative justice. Following the elaboration of six national reports, a comparative and transnational analysis has been carried out in order to respond to the European added value goal of this research project. As *LetsGoByTalking* seeks to unravel both commonalities and differences among varied European countries, this report is a cornerstone of the research phase: it takes into consideration how different legal and organisational contexts affect different outcomes regarding the development and use of restorative justice measures broadly speaking and specifically applied to hate crimes. Moreover, this report also focuses on the different possible strategies for restorative practices and programmes that can be shared as good practices and further developed in the framework of training courses.

1. Methodology

Due to the research project's focus on victims of crime and on the professionals who work with them, the methodology employed has underscored the relevance of experiences, perceptions, and expectations. The key methodology has been ethnographic research, as a path that unveils not only discourses and practices but also dissonances, perceptions, and the relations among them. The research has combined an early desk research, which focused on the analysis of legislation linked to anti-discrimination, hate crimes and restorative justice, with in-depth interviews with NGOs, victim support stakeholders, and justice professionals in the six participant countries. In addition to this, a survey has been conducted with the aim to gather the opinions of the main LGBT associations and other civil society organisations that fight against discrimination and/or work with the application of restorative justice in hate crimes. This survey has allowed not only for an extension of the research sample, complementing the ethnography, but also for an initial mapping of the existing programmes on restorative justice in the participating countries, critical for the successive project phases, which aim to implement the exchange of best practices and training programmes.

The comparability is a fundamental aspect of this report, due to the transnational and European dimension of both the research and the project as a whole. Thus, the desk research, the interviews and the survey have been structured around guiding themes, as a part of the methodological strategy to be applied throughout the project in order to achieve comparability of findings, as well as homogenisation and efficiency of the activities. The guiding themes constitute key areas of concern, which structure the data-gathering and data-analysis processes across the project tasks. This way, the different countries, disciplines and institutions involved recognise shared areas of concern which, in turn, allow us to identify common trends and differences for each area. These indicators are dynamic and flexible, following the qualitative and reflexive nature of this project. This means that, on the one hand, the indicators evolve according to the development of the research and actions in terms of including, dismissing or changing any of them, and that on the other hand they allow for adaptations according to the national contexts and the project development.

Consequently, the research has been structured according to the following themes: Legislation and policy; Information, knowledge, beliefs and practices of professionals in

relation to restorative justice; Experiences, expectations and notions of restorative justice of victims of (anti-LGBT) hate crimes; Strategies of restorative justice in relation to (anti-LGBT) hate crimes; and Cooperation and training.

These themes have been analysed both in the six national reports and in this report, with the exception of the research on victims. The interviews with victims have been postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, as the online contact and interview process could not guarantee the necessary conditions of trust and comfort for said interviews. Interviews with vulnerable groups, such as victims of hate crimes, require a comfortable and friendly atmosphere, with the conversation developed in a safe and intimate place, where their privacy can be guaranteed. The consortium deemed that all these requirements could not be met by means of online interviews. However, several important issues of this theme have already been tackled throughout the interviews with professionals - primarily through the interviews with representatives of LGBT associations - and through the survey responses: the contact with victims, the development of support services amidst a pandemic, victims' views on restorative justice, and so on.

The interviews conducted in each of the six participant countries have thus been adapted to the COVID-19 pandemic, and as such they have been initially limited to professionals. In this regard, a total of 104 professionals were interviewed, using mostly online tools such as Skype, Zoom, Microsoft Teams, as well as phone calls, and a few face-to-face interviews in Bulgaria, Belgium, and Italy. Most of the professionals included in the sample were contacted through a snowball method, after initial interviews or after counsel by key stakeholders. Depending on the country, the COVID-related situation affected either positively or negatively the response rate and contact with professionals: whereas in the Netherlands the research team found a low response rate that was understood as a consequence of changing work and communication habits in response to the pandemic, the political situation in Poland was understood as the key factor to a high response rate for both the interviews and the survey. Online interviews have also allowed the research teams to cover a larger geographical territory within their countries, without spending travel resources.

The interviews with professionals have explicitly aimed to gather a representative sample among the different background and profiles who may work with justice systems, restorative justice services, hate crimes, and victims. All research teams interviewed samples composed of restorative justice experts such as scholars and theoreticians, practitioners, advocates, and mediators; NGO professionals, such as lawyers, psychologists, and other workers; justice professionals such as lawyers, prosecutors; policy makers and professionals from public institutions such as ministries; technicians and other professionals from victim support services and other public anti-discrimination bodies. Despite the explicit goal of significant representativeness, different factors have affected said objective. The research team from Poland highlighted the relevance of the political situation in the country, as no representatives of the Ministry of Justice and other public justice institutions were interviewed due to the absence of consent of an immediate superior. Similarly, the COVID-19 pandemic and the necessary work and communication adaptation may have also biased the representativeness of our sample, as professionals more knowledgeable in or adapted to online forms of communications may have been more readily available.

On the other hand, the survey has been developed using a questionnaire structured according to the project guiding themes in order to: i) ensure that all objectives are addressed and to ii) guarantee the triangulation between quantitative and qualitative data. In addition, the questionnaire has been elaborated with the aim of gathering the viewpoints of the main LGBT associations and other civil organizations fighting against discrimination and hate crimes. Finally, the questionnaire has also contributed to establishing a knowledge base on the restorative justice existing programs in the participating countries (which is fundamental for the following phases of the project).

Taking into consideration these objectives, the questionnaire has been divided into five sections: a) Socio-demographic questions; b) Organizational questions; c) Knowledge about restorative justice; d) Training needs; e) Organization positioning about restorative justice.

The survey was conducted in each participant country (Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland and Spain), in the country language, using the Limesurvey online software, and was made available from 15 April to 31 May 2020. Each national partner elaborated a comprehensive list of civil society organizations likely to respond to the

questionnaire. Before making the survey publicly available, it was tested by a professional from an LGBT organization. Once the questionnaire was ready, an introductory email was sent to the potential participants. The communication served to introduce the project and to invite potential participants to respond the survey. After this email, two further reminders were sent to the organizations of the comprehensive list. Finally, the obtained data were analysed by means of SPSSv25.

Table 1. Number of contacted organizations and responses per country

Organizations	Bulgaria (BG)	Spain (ES)	Italy (IT)	Netherlands (NL)	Belgium (BE)	Poland (PL)	Total
Nº contacted organizations	31	198	182	75	167	84	737
Nº responses per country	21	81	55	48	20	63	288
Response rate	67,7%	40,9%	30,2%	64%	11,9%	75%	39%
Nº valid responses per country	20	60	46	44	16	53	239

As table 1 shows, **the minimum threshold established during the elaboration of the project methodology (180 responses) has been largely reached**. 737 organizations received the questionnaire, and 288 finally responded (which constitutes a **response rate of 39%**). Nonetheless, there are important differences regarding the response rate of the participant countries: from 75% (Poland) to 11.9% (Belgium). Among the 288 questionnaires received, 239 have been analysed, given that the other ones (49) did not contain the minimum information required (with one or no answers).

2. Comparative legal framework regarding restorative justice and the rights of LGBT victims of crime

2.1. Analysis of the rights of LGBT people

As evidenced by the LGBTI Survey 2019 —elaborated by the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights— LGBTI people still experience violence and discrimination on the grounds of their sexual orientation and/or gender identity/expression (SOGIE) in all areas of life. However, this Survey has detected some overall progress in comparison with the precedent version (2012). Taking into account that the EU averages mask important differences between countries, in the past 12 months 42% of LGBT people in the EU have felt personally discriminated, 60% in the case of transgender persons. Moreover, 11% of respondents have experienced physical attacks due to them being LGBTI in the past 5 years, a percentage that rises to 17% amongst transgender people. Considering these data, and bearing in mind that heteronormativity and cisnormativity structure our societies' social and cultural life, one cannot argue that the rights of LGBT people are fully guaranteed.

In spite of this, the beginning of the XXI century in Europe entails a progressive recognition of LGBT civil rights, even though this progress has not occurred equally in all countries, as this project shows. Amongst the participant countries, Belgium (in 2000) and the Netherlands (in 2001) have been world pioneers in the legislation of the so-called love rights, that is, same-sex marriage and adoption. This recognition has also been granted in Spain, which modified its Civil Code in 2005. These countries also stand out for other love rights. This is the case of Belgium, where lesbian individuals or couples who want to have children through artificial insemination by anonymous donors, can receive public medical access (Eeckhout and Paternotte, 2011).

On the other hand, in Bulgaria and Poland the law establishes marriage as a union between man and woman, and this constitutional principle prevents same-sex marriages. In Italy, the legislator is not obliged by the Constitution to recognise the right to same-sex marriage (same-sex unions are however regulated). The case of Poland is particularly relevant: it was a relatively tolerant country in the early 20th century (homosexuality was decriminalised in

1932), and today it has become one of the European countries most reluctant to accepting sexual and gender diversity at legal and political levels.

Regarding transgender rights, these pivot around the legal recognition of experienced gender and the public assistance to health care. As is the case with love rights, the participant countries present diametrically different situations. For instance, Poland and Bulgaria do not have a legal gender recognition law and consequently, the legal change depends on a court decision (in Bulgaria, judges tend to request the sterilisation of the transgender person). In Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain, the experienced gender is recognised thanks to the approval of specific “gender laws”. Nonetheless, some medical requirements are established in these countries, such as a psychiatric diagnosis, which consolidates a pathologising model that excludes non-binary genders and gender-fluid people.

Concerning the availability of gender affirmation medical treatments, important differences can be observed amongst the analysed countries. At one end of the spectrum, Spain — where regions have full powers in health matters— has experienced the establishment of a depathologised model to public health assistance in some regions, such as Catalonia (although there is a long waiting list for surgeries). At the other end, Bulgaria does not cover medical treatments provided by the National Health Fund. Different situations can also be identified in relation to the principle of non-discrimination on the basis of gender identity and expression. Whilst Italy and Poland¹ do not protect transgender people in the main social spheres (employment, health, education, housing, goods and services), the rest of the participant countries protect transgender persons against discrimination.

¹ Poland treats discrimination on the grounds of gender identity, gender expression and sex characteristics as a form of gender discrimination in general. But the actual use of these grounds of discrimination remains basically untested as there is scarcity of relevant case law (cf. FRA 2015: 71-72). Yet, on September 29, the Polish district court used a category of gender, which is a protected ground in the Equal Treatment Act, to rule against discrimination of a transwoman in her workplace.

2.2. Analysis of legal measures against bias-motivated violence and discrimination

Despite the fact that the analysed countries have deployed anti-discrimination laws, not all of them include SOGIE as protected criteria in their legal frameworks, nor have they all elaborated specific legislation (e.g. through the Penal Code) for protecting LGBT people and prosecuting LGBTphobia.

Belgium

Since 2007, Belgium has implemented strong antidiscrimination legislation by means of three laws: The Gender Act, the Antiracism Act and the Antidiscrimination Act. These laws identify 19 protected discrimination criteria, which also include sexual orientation and gender identity/expression. After the implementation of the antidiscrimination legislation, the Belgian Government decided to create two independent inter-federal agencies in the lead to monitor discrimination (including SOGIE), and assist victims (including LGBT people): the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism (Unia) and the Institute for the Equality of Women and Men (IGVM).

Although the Belgian Penal Code does not define “hate crime”, it provides for several penalty-enhancements in case of specific offenses if the motive for crime is hatred, contempt or hostility towards a person because of one or more protected characteristics, such as sexual orientation. The Penal Code also refers to this as the “reprehensible motive”. While in 2014 the notion of direct discrimination on the basis of gender included gender identity and gender expression (Act of 22 May 2014 amending the law of 10 May 2007), the Belgian Penal Code has not been amended to include gender identity and gender expression as references.

Bulgaria

Even though Bulgarian law recognises some hate crimes, the list of motivations constituting aggravating circumstances does not include sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. If reported, hate crimes targeting LGBT people are treated as hooliganism. The Penal Code proscribes hate crimes in Chapter III: Crimes against the Rights of the Citizens. In the absence of a definition of “hate crime”, the term used is “crimes against the rights of the citizens”. There is no general penalty enhancement for hate crimes, although the law

criminalises some deeds motivated by hatred, or instigation of hatred towards people based on race, ethnicity or nationality, religious or political belief.

The Bulgarian Protection against Discrimination Act protects citizens from discrimination on the grounds of sex and sexual orientation, not on gender identity or sex characteristics. An amendment of the Act from 2015 states that the protected characteristic “sex” under art. 4, para. 1 includes cases for change of sex. However, the Act does not specify what is considered “a change of sex”. Therefore, it remains unclear whether the person is supposed to have undergone only social transition or any medical transition procedures. The Act uses the Bulgarian word “пол/пол”, which is used both when addressing sex and gender.

Italy

The Italian Constitution does not explicitly prohibit discrimination based on SOGIE, but its arts. 2 and 3, dedicated to human rights protection and to a general principle of equality and non-discrimination, could be interpreted to offer protection to LGBT people’s rights in the whole system.

Nonetheless, on the criminal law, LGBT people only are offered limited protection: Italy has hate crime laws, but the aggravating circumstance for hate crimes, considering ethnicity, race, nationality or religion as protected grounds, does not include SOGIE. Therefore, anti-LGBT hate crimes, when reported, are investigated as common crimes and punished accordingly to their common discipline.

Netherlands

The concept of hate crime in the Netherlands is not included as such in the Criminal Code. The 'Discrimination Guideline' applies to general offenses (e.g. violence, assault, etc.) with a discriminatory aspect, which must coincide with one of the grounds referred to in the Article 137c of Penal Code, what is called CODIS-crime (Race / Religion or belief /Straight or homosexual orientation / Physical, mental or mental disability / Gender identity). However, besides sex crimes, domestic violence or child victims, there are no specific rights addressed to victims of hate crime in the Netherlands. One therefore has to rely on other, more general, sources for an inventory of the rights of victims of hate crime, such as the Articles

51a to 51h of the Criminal Procedure Code, or the Designation of Victims' Rights, the Decree regarding Victims of Crimes.

Next to general victims' rights — i.e. rights applying to all victims — there are certain procedural rights which have been developed specifically for victims of hate crime and other vulnerable victims. According to the Prosecutorial Guidelines regarding Discrimination, for instance, victims of hate crime have the right to be informed about decisions (including the reasons for these decisions) not to prosecute (or to discontinue prosecution), to dismiss or conditionally dismiss a case.

Poland

The Polish criminal law does not define hate crime or hate speech in legal terms. Nonetheless, the Penal Code includes some crimes which belong to this category, as for instance: the use of and incitement to violence or unlawful threat towards a group of people or an individual person on grounds of their national, ethnic, racial, political or religious affiliation or because of their lack of religious belief (art. 119); public insulting of a group of people or an individual person on grounds of their national, ethnic, racial or religious affiliation or because of these grounds the physical inviolability of another person is infringed (art. 257). However, there is no general penalty enhancement for hate crimes in the Penal Code. Consequently, there is no obligation to provide higher penalties for such offenses as homicide, arson, damage to property or theft, even if they are motivated by racism or xenophobia, even though such crimes may be considered jointly with the crimes described in the above articles.

The exhaustive character of the aforementioned list makes it impossible to read SOGIE into the list by a court of law. Still, provisions which make the court consider motivation and the manner of conduct of the offender or take motivations deserving particular condemnation into account, are at times applied by judges in order to treat an anti-LGBT motive as the aggravating circumstances. Furthermore, in chapter 32 of the Penal Code, "Crimes against public order," which pertains to active participation in an unlawful assembly, knowing that the participants are jointly committing a violent assault on a person or property (art. 254), the protected characteristics are not explicitly listed, which opens possibilities for their wider use.

Spain

The Spanish Criminal Code does not specifically refer to “hate crimes”. Nonetheless, several articles take into consideration bias-motivated offences. In this sense, article 22 regulates the aggravating circumstances of crime, in which gender, sexual orientation and sexual identity are considered as particular circumstances, among others, which deny the principle of equality. Sexual orientation and gender identity are also covered as protected categories in the following provisions: art. 134, which regulates discrimination in work and employment; art. 510, which was amended in order to include penalties for the incitement to discrimination, hatred and violence against persons and/or groups characterized, *inter alia*, by their sexual orientation or identity; art. 511 and 512 on discrimination in services; art. 170.1 on threats against groups; and the art. 173 on crimes against moral integrity (Aguilar, 2015). It is important to take into account that the Organic Law 1/2015, of 30 March, introduced the concept of “gender identity” among the protected categories by the Criminal Code, with the aim of covering transgender people (previously the Code only mentioned “sexual orientation”).

In addition to the Criminal Code, in Spain other specific laws have been enacted to ensure equality and non-discrimination (including SOGIE) in different areas of social life, such as employment, education, public spaces, sport, society services and electronic commerce. Other than these specific non-discrimination laws and provisions of the Criminal Code and Constitution, Spain does not have any generic law for LGBT equality in its legal framework. However, most of the Spanish regional governments have already developed their own laws to promote SOGIE and combat LGBTphobia.

2.3. Victim rights and Restorative Justice at the European Level

Three instruments at the European level are particularly important in the field of victims' rights and restorative justice, and its application to hate crime. First, *Directive 2012/29/EU establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime* is the first binding EU legislation that addresses restorative justice, which goes beyond mere mediation. This instrument was also crucial to the development of restorative justice in its inclusion of a definition of restorative justice: *any process whereby the victim and the offender are enabled, if they freely consent, to participate actively in the resolution of matters arising from the criminal offence through the help of an impartial third party.* Second, *CM/Rec (2018) 8 CoE recommendation concerning RJ in criminal matters*, though not binding, is considered to be the most innovative piece of legislation on restorative justice. The document finds a more balanced approach to victim and offender needs, calling for a broader shift to a criminal justice system that adopts a more restorative culture. Third, the EU Strategy on Victims' Rights, which frames the Commission's work for the period 2020-2025.

Directive 2012/29/EU establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA

Paragraph 9 addresses the need to consider all victims, regardless of gender expression, gender identity and sexual orientation, when accessing services, including restorative justice services. Paragraph 21 further recognises that restorative justice services must provide information in a way that is understandable to the parties.

Crime is a wrong against society as well as a violation of the individual rights of victims. As such, victims of crime should be recognised and treated in a respectful, sensitive and professional manner without discrimination of any kind based on any ground such as race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age, gender, gender expression, gender identity, sexual orientation, residence status or health. In all contacts with a competent authority operating within the context of criminal proceedings, and any service coming into contact with victims, such as victim support or restorative justice services, the personal situation and immediate needs, age, gender, possible disability and maturity

of victims of crime should be taken into account while fully respecting their physical, mental and moral integrity (Paragraph 9).

Paragraph 46 also outlines the need to ensure that safeguarding measures are put in place when working with victims. In terms of retaliation and confidentiality, these aspects may be of particular important to victims of anti-LGBTI hate crimes:

Restorative justice services, including for example victim-offender mediation, family group conferencing and sentencing circles, can be of great benefit to the victim, but require safeguards to prevent secondary and repeat victimisation, intimidation and retaliation. Such services should therefore have as a primary consideration the interests and needs of the victim, repairing the harm done to the victim and avoiding further harm. Factors such as the nature and severity of the crime, the ensuing degree of trauma, the repeat violation of a victim's physical, sexual, or psychological integrity, power imbalances, and the age, maturity or intellectual capacity of the victim, which could limit or reduce the victim's ability to make an informed choice or could prejudice a positive outcome for the victim, should be taken into consideration in referring a case to the restorative justice services and in conducting a restorative justice process. Restorative justice processes should, in principle, be confidential, unless agreed otherwise by the parties, or as required by national law due to an overriding public interest. Factors such as threats made or any forms of violence committed during the process may be considered as requiring disclosure in the public interest.

Paragraph 56 directly addresses gender identity and sexual orientation when defining victim and victim needs more generally (i.e., not specifically for restorative justice),

Individual assessments should take into account the personal characteristics of the victim such as his or her age, gender and gender identity or expression, ethnicity, race, religion, sexual orientation, health, disability, residence status, communication difficulties, relationship to or dependence on the offender and previous experience of crime. They should also take into account the type or nature and the circumstances of the crime such as whether it is a hate crime, a bias crime or a crime committed with a discriminatory motive, sexual violence, violence in a close relationship, whether the

offender was in a position of control, whether the victim's residence is in a high crime or gang dominated area, or whether the victim's country of origin is not the Member State where the crime was committed.

Paragraph 61, as well as Article 25, refer to training of restorative justice professionals. While the text does not specifically refer to LGBTI persons as a specific vulnerable group, there is recognition of special needs.

Article 1 outlining objectives also refers explicitly to restorative justice, namely that:

Member States shall ensure that victims are recognised and treated in a respectful, sensitive, tailored, professional and non-discriminatory manner, in all contacts with victim support or restorative justice services or a competent authority, operating within the context of criminal proceedings.

Article 4 on the right to receive information from the first competent authority the parties may come into contact with includes information about available restorative justice services.

Article 12, the right to safeguards in the context of restorative justice services, is the most relevant to improve the development and implementation of restorative justice in Member States, outlining the following:

1. Member States shall take measures to safeguard the victim from secondary and repeat victimisation, from intimidation and from retaliation, to be applied when providing any restorative justice services. Such measures shall ensure that victims who choose to participate in restorative justice processes have access to safe and competent restorative justice services, subject to at least the following conditions: (a) the restorative justice services are used only if they are in the interest of the victim, subject to any safety considerations, and are based on the victim's free and informed consent, which may be withdrawn at any time; (b) before agreeing to participate in the restorative justice process, the victim is provided with full and unbiased information about that process and the potential outcomes as well as information about the procedures for supervising the implementation of any agreement; (c) the offender has acknowledged the basic facts of the case; (d) any agreement is arrived at voluntarily and may be taken into account in any further criminal proceedings; (e)

discussions in restorative justice processes that are not conducted in public are confidential and are not subsequently disclosed, except with the agreement of the parties or as required by national law due to an overriding public interest.

2. Member States shall facilitate the referral of cases, as appropriate to restorative justice services, including through the establishment of procedures or guidelines on the conditions for such referral.

CM/Rec 2018 (8) CoE recommendation concerning restorative justice in criminal matters

The Recommendation recognizes the potential and positive outcomes of restorative justice, in addition to the pitfalls of traditional criminal justice. Here, restorative justice adopts the definition outlined in the Directive. The basic principles referred to in the Recommendation include the following:

- (a) Active participation of parties
- (b) Focus on addressing and repairing the harm
- (c) Voluntariness
- (d) Deliberative
- (e) Respectful dialogue
- (f) Equal concerns for all parties involved
- (g) Procedural fairness
- (h) Collective, consensus-based agreement
- (i) Reintegration and mutual understanding
- (j) Avoidance of domination
- (k) Confidential
- (l) Generally available service (to all types of crimes)

The Recommendation further addresses the need for a legal basis within the criminal justice system for restorative justice, including attention to procedural safeguards. Another element that is further explored is how to improve the operation of criminal justice in relation to restorative justice. The operation of restorative justice services addresses governance, recruitment of and guidelines for facilitators, training, and normative characteristics of restorative justice (e.g., efficient but manageable, proper preparation, provision of a safe and comfortable environment). The final section outlines steps for continuing and enhancing

the development of restorative justice, whether it be through greater awareness, more cooperation or increased flexibility when referring to restorative options.

While the Recommendation is undoubtedly innovative in nature, there are no direct references to more vulnerable groups, or victims suffering due to their gender identity or sexual orientation. While the Recommendation may improve by acknowledging the unique experiences of this group, first we must better understand how their experiences differ and what specific safeguards could be put in place.

EU Strategy on victims' rights (2020-2025). COM(2020) 258 final. From the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions

This first EU Strategy on Victims' Rights frames the Commission's work for the period 2020-2025. It also invites other actors, including EU Member States and civil society, to take action. It pays particular attention to the specific needs of victims of gender-based violence, although it also addresses victims of hate crimes.

The Strategy establishes five priorities to be met: 1. Effective communication with victims and a safe environment for victims to report crime; 2. Improving support and protection of the most vulnerable victims; 3. Facilitating victims' access to compensation; 4. Strengthening cooperation and coordination among all relevant actors; 5. Strengthening the international dimension of victims' rights.

2.4. Analysis of the legal framework regarding restorative justice

In general terms, in the analysed countries restorative justice is still far from having a solid legal framework clearly determining in which cases it should be applied. With the exception of Belgium and the Netherlands, even if there are some legislative frameworks that allow for the application of restorative justice, these tend to refer to specific fields of justice (e.g. minors). Moreover, they do not provide a strong framework with scopes and procedures for its application. Therefore, restorative justice is still not an alternative — under equal conditions — to punitive justice.

Belgium

In Belgium, discussions leading to the development of restorative justice were largely related to the norms around rehabilitation and reintegration (Dunkel, Grzwyta, & Horsfield, 2015). Abolitionist thinking guided the process, where the traditional system was considered to be insufficient in addressing the resolution of conflicts. Diversion, rehabilitation and reintegration were emphasized over the more punitive way of thinking around punishment. Moreover, Belgium adopts a victim-oriented approach, meaning that where parties wish to participate in such procedures, professionals will attempt to resolve conflicts in this manner, rather than focusing on the potential positive implications for the offender or the offence characteristics when deciding when to apply restorative justice.

In general, Belgian legal professionals, namely judges and prosecutors, are well aware of restorative justice, a practice many of them accept (Aertsen, 2015). Furthermore, mediators are skilled and trained, as organizations recognise the importance of ongoing education and viewing mediation as a separate skill, which requires trained professionals. Many agencies and key actors working on crime control and criminal justice more generally also acknowledge and utilise restorative justice values and principles.

While restorative justice has come a long way in Belgium and has benefitted from a wide range of research, legislative and policy attention, there is still a gap between the law in the books and law in action (Aertsen, 2015). This is largely due to the dependence of restorative justice on the criminal justice system as a referring body. Despite the endorsement of the values and principles of restorative justice by professionals across Belgium, the country still lacks a broad implementation of RJ. Furthermore, though restorative justice programs do

adhere to the equality principle in the sense that they are offered to all victims and offenders, regardless of the offence or the phase of the criminal procedure, RJ cannot yet be considered as a service that is applied equally in practice, despite the legal framework — chiefly, the Mediation Law — that lays out its systematic application.

Bulgaria

There is no national policy on restorative justice in Bulgaria. Unlike in other countries, restorative justice practices cannot be implemented without political support due to the particularities of the Bulgarian legal system. In Bulgaria there is no comprehensive strategy about restorative justice. There are no unified standards on restorative justice, however, there are sporadic implementations of restorative justice practices in schools and in prisons, but they constitute an exception. Nevertheless, what can be outlined as a positive feature is that all mediators need to undergo a training for mediators, which is established in the Mediation Act.

In the absence of a comprehensive legal framework on restorative justice, the Mediation Act is the only legal framework providing measures for out-of-the court settlement of disputes. Article 3, (point 2) of the law envisions that mediation can also be applied in cases regulated by the Penal Code, which makes it applicable to anti-LGBTI hate crimes or hate speech. At the same time, point 3 of the same article states that mediation cannot be applied if another law, or another normative act envisions a different way for concluding an agreement.

The law envisions the creation of a common register of mediators at the Minister of Justice. A mediator can be any able-bodied natural person, who has not been convicted of a crime of general nature, and who has not been disenfranchised from working, and who has graduated successfully through a mediation course, provided by a licensed training provider. The Minister of Justice approves all licensed training providers that meet the normative criteria. The law allows lawyers and other jurists to take part in the mediation process alongside with the mediator.

Italy

The Italian legal system does not explicitly recognise restorative justice. Anyhow, the criminal procedure holds fragmented and heterogeneous hypothesis especially in juvenile

justice and in proceedings in front of the justice of peace which can lead — not effortlessly — to a restorative approach (Abbamonte and Cavaliere, 2016; Parlato, 2017).

For the latter, the minor nature of crimes involved and the need for judicial deflation authorize alternative methods of resolution, in which opportunities of comparison between the victim and offender are encouraged. In general terms, it can be stated that in this case a conciliatory spirit, aimed at fostering reconciliation and discouraging the offender from committing similar crimes characterise the practice. These proceedings impose a mandatory attempt of conciliation for crimes prosecutable upon lawsuit. Actually victim-offender mediation procedures can be carried out by public or private authors within the territory (Picotti, 2002). In more general terms, in criminal justice proceedings, mediation procedures can get relevant as far as *remission of the lawsuit* (art. 340 Code of Criminal procedure), and *probation* (art. 464 bis Code of Criminal Procedure) are concerned.

First of all, for a group of smaller crimes prosecutable on lawsuit, the remission accepted by the accused determines the extinction of the crime, that is, the possibility to establish a dialogue between victim and offender outside the trial and to restore the victim recognising the damage suffered could lead to remission. Secondly, since 2014 *Probation*² it is possible for crimes punished with pecuniary penalty or prison sentence up to 4 years (art. 168 bis of the code of criminal procedure) (Bove, 2014).

Lastly, during the phase of execution of the final judgement, mediation procedures aimed at offenders' rehabilitation can be carried out, but the profile of the relation with the victim is in the background since the activities are focused on the relation with the community (Bernardi, 2014; Mannozi, 2016). The analysis of these patchy legal hypotheses highlights the lack of a general discipline acting as general legal framework for restorative justice.

The Netherlands

The practice of restorative justice practices in criminal justice is gaining ground in the Netherlands. In recent years the Ministry of Security and Justice and various relevant

² Probation is a proceeding that combines a restorative function, since its aim is to re-educate and re-insert the offender in its own community through mandatory social activities and criminal mediation with a deflationary function for criminal proceedings.

criminal justice actors have voiced their support for the introduction of mediation in criminal justice. A major impulse for the emergence of victim-offender mediation in criminal law in The Netherlands is due to the increased attention for victims of a crime. The victim title of the Code of Criminal Procedure contains an article 51 that fully focuses on victim-offender mediation in criminal law. This article states that the Public Prosecution Service needs to promote mediation between victim and offender, before and after conviction, and states that if the mediation has led to an agreement, the judge must take this into account.

In the fall of 2016, the House of Representatives in The Netherlands decided to roll out mediation in criminal cases across the country. As of 1 April 2017, for the first time in history, the legislator has included a definition of 'restorative justice' in Article 51a paragraph 1 under d of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Sv) for the purpose of the Directive on minimum standards for victims: "enables victim and the suspect or convict, if they voluntarily agree, to participate actively in a process aimed at resolving the consequences of the offense, with the assistance of an impartial third party. "

The Dutch Ministry of Justice has invested since 2013 in enabling restorative justice practices in all phases of the criminal justice procedure. They have conducted several victim offender mediation pilots in all phases of the criminal justice proceedings: in the police where mediation can be an alternative to criminal proceedings; in the officer and judge phase with mediation that is part of the criminal proceedings; after conviction where the mediation is complementary to the criminal trial and therefore has no influence on it.

The 8 January 2020, the current Minister of Justice and Security Sander Dekker informed the Dutch Parliament about his new policy framework on RJ in the criminal process. The Minister wants to modernize the Code of Criminal Procedure, and proposes to remove Article 51h and create a new general chapter on restorative justice (more specifically mediation in criminal matters).

Poland

The introduction of restorative justice into executive criminal proceedings has been discussed in Poland since the mid-1990s, and accommodated by the criminal law at the turn of the 20th and the 21st century. The latest developments relate to implementation of the

Directive 2012/29/EU and pertain basically to mediation. Currently, the Code of the Criminal Procedure meets required standard laid down in the Article 12 of the Directive. The Article 23a of the Code serves as a legal basis, which has been furthermore supplemented by other legal acts, primarily by the Regulation of the Minister of Justice of 7 May 2015 on mediation proceedings in criminal matters. The mediation in criminal cases is defined as negotiations between a damaged person and a defendant with the participation of a professionally prepared mediator. The mediation proceeding can be launched both in a public and a private prosecution proceeding regardless of their stage. Costs of mediation are covered by the state budget.

A court or a court referee in the trial proceeding, or a prosecutor or another body in charge of the pre-trial proceeding (e.g. the police), may, on the initiative or with the consent of the victim and the defendant, refer the case to the authorized institution or a person in order to conduct mediation proceeding. The interested parties are instructed about objectives and principles of the mediation, including illegality of questioning a mediator as a witness. The mediation proceeding should not last longer than one month, and its duration is not calculated into the time limits of pre-trial proceeding.

The participation of the damaged person and the defendant in mediation is voluntary. The consent of both parties to proceed with mediation must be preceded by clarification (by the mediator or by the body referring the case to mediation) about the mediation mechanics and the possibility of withdrawal of such consent before the mediation proceeding is completed. The case files required to proceed with mediation are made available to the mediator. Mediation activities should provide for individual as well as joint meetings with the damaged person and the defendant. Impartiality and confidentiality of the mediation proceeding are absolutely binding.

If the mediation results in an agreement, it must be signed by the victim, the defendant and the mediator, and annexed to a final report. The agreement may cover measures for remedying the damage caused by the offender; compensation for the harm suffered, including the manner of remedying or compensating the damage or redress; and the date to perform these obligations. The mediator is obliged to verify the performance of obligations resulting from the agreement. But it is a court or a court referee who, upon the request of

the mediator, append an enforcement clause, and thereby secure the victim's enforcement claim. Whereas in a public prosecution proceeding the mediation agreement has no legal force and a judgment must be delivered, it has still an impact on the punishment. In a private prosecution proceeding the mediation agreement results in closing the case.

Spain

The Spanish Constitution establishes a criminal justice model based on the principles of legality and retributive justice, leaving limited scope for the introduction of restorative justice. Furthermore, neither the Criminal Code nor the Criminal Procedure Law make explicit reference to restorative justice and its techniques (Ruiz Sierra, 2020). Notwithstanding, some regulations of the Spanish criminal and procedural system allow for the application of restorative justice.

While the Criminal Code does not mention restorative justice, art. 21 on the Circumstances that mitigate criminal accountability includes, among these circumstances, "when the convict has repaired the damage caused to victim, or has lessened the effects thereof, at some phase of the procedure and prior to the trial taking place". Nevertheless, the Code does not specify what the repair should consist of.

The Organic Law 1/2015, of 30 March, amending the Criminal Code, offers a way to implement restorative justice practices in case of minor criminal acts. This legal reform mentions for the first time the "criminal mediation" between adults, allowing for more flexible regulations concerning the suspension of prison sentences not exceeding two years. In accordance with art. 80.1. the Judge may decree the suspension of these sentences under certain conditions, assessing the circumstances of the case, and in particular, the efforts made by the offender to repair the damage. Following art. 84.1, the Judge or the Court may link the suspension of the sentence to the compliance of the agreement between the parties after a mediation process, in those cases where it is legally possible.

The regulation that sketches out the contours of restorative justice in the Spanish legal system is the aforementioned Victims' Statute of 2015. Consistent with the victim-focused approach of the Statute, restorative justice is here conceptualised around the victims and their needs. The Preamble stresses the moral inequality between victim and offender which

is inherent to crime, so that restorative justice should be focused on the material and moral reparation of the victim. Following this, art. 3 determinates the victims' right to take part in restorative justice services, and art. 5 establishes that victims should be informed about the available services.

Regarding restorative justice services, art. 15 establishes some requirements to be met for their application: a) the victim must give their informed consent while the offender must recognise the criminal facts committed; b) the mediation process must not pose a risk to the victim's safety, or cause new material or moral prejudices to them; c) restorative justice must not be explicitly prohibited by the specific law which regulates the crime. Furthermore, the Statute stipulates that the content of the mediation sessions must be confidential, and that the mediators are subject to professional secrecy.

In spite of this legal development, as for restorative justice in Spain, the only field in which the Spanish legal system has decidedly bet on -specifically, criminal mediation - is the criminal prosecution of minors, by means of the Organic Law 5/2000 regulating the Criminal Responsibility of Minors, and the Royal Decree 1774/2004 which develops the regulation of this Law. The OL 5/2000 consolidates the use of mediation between victim and offender based on two principles: firstly, the criminal process should only be carried out in the most serious offences, while non-punitive measures should be implemented for the rest of offences; secondly, the mediation meets the educational purpose of the minors' criminal law (Rosales Pedrero, 2017).

2.5. Analysis of the main facilitators and barriers that facilitate/hinder the application of restorative justice in case of anti-LGBT hate crimes

As mentioned above, one of the main barriers for the application of restorative justice in the analysed countries is the lack of a strong legal framework that clearly determinates its application and offer legal certainty to the parties involved. This gap leaves the application of restorative justice to depend on the will of specific administration or judges. In addition, legal practitioners have, in general, a weak awareness of criminal mediation, and have a limited perception about which crimes can be dealt through restorative justice. For this reason, the need of professional training was identified in all participant countries, particularly in cases of anti-LGBT hate crimes.

The lack of recognition of anti-LGBT offences as hate crimes is another barrier detected in most countries, while the legal frameworks in Italy, Bulgaria and Poland make it an even more relevant factor. Without this recognition, specific measures and responses cannot be developed, and the justice system has not the adequate skills to deal with violence on the basis of SOGIE. Moreover, there is a problem of under-reporting of anti-LGBT hate crimes. The low confidence in the law-enforcement and judicial authorities, the will to avoid secondary victimisation and the fear of retaliation are the main factors that hinder victims from reporting the offences experienced.

The last factor identified in almost all countries is the preponderance of a culture of punishment. According to this, professionals from most countries described a prevailing social perception according to which it seems that only a criminal conviction can restore the damage caused. This is especially significant in the case of hate crimes. In this type of crimes, there are many voices that demand a strong message of social condemnation, so that restorative justice tends to be seen as a “soft” response to this need. However, this social perception or punitive perspective is neither static nor homogeneous among countries and backgrounds.

In spite of these barriers, this report shows that there are successful initiatives and programs of restorative justice — for various types of crimes and situations — in the participant countries, sometimes carried out by regional and local governments. Criminal mediation would represent a useful tool for both victim and offender, since these crimes are often

suitable for a restorative approach that allows the recognition of the violated rights of the victim and the underlined responsibility of the offender and of the whole community in relation to criminal issues.

In the Netherlands some studies suggest that victims of hate crime are in favour of receiving the offer for victim-offender mediation (*cf.* Van der Aa, Clasesen and Hofmann, 2020). In certain cases, victims of hate crime see mediation as a more meaningful intervention than (exclusively) criminal proceedings. The added value of mediation is also regularly mentioned as the potential impact on the perpetrator and related-victim awareness. An important need for many victims is that the criminal act stops and that recidivism is prevented. If the offender is only punished, there is a chance that they will continue their offence once the sentence is over.

3. Preventing and combating LGBT violence through public policies and restorative justice. The perspectives of key professionals throughout Europe

3.1. Legislation and policy

Despite the fact that the Directive 2012/29/EU, often referred to as the "Victims' Rights Directive" includes a definition of restorative justice, as well as the right to restorative services, it has not necessarily facilitated a shared understanding of this concept among professionals. Most interviewees across the six countries acknowledged either a lack of detailed knowledge about the notion of restorative justice or a series of conflicting definitions or ideas about it. The professionals in Italy and Spain, for instance, were all knowledgeable of the existence of restorative justice and conceived it in contrast to traditional forms of justice, but with different understandings of its possibilities, characteristics, and of the different agents' roles. The Spanish NGO professionals, on the one hand, had a similar broad image about these practices to that of restorative justice practitioners, but on the other hand they held doubts about its feasibility and usefulness. Similarly, the Belgian professionals responded that there is a basic or limited knowledge about the matter among most professionals, with preconfigured or simple notions based on victim-offender mediation practices. In the Netherlands a majority of professionals interviewed were unaware of the concept or thought that it was a new or recent concept, despite the fact that the Netherlands is the country with the most detailed and comprehensive development of restorative justice in its legislation.

Regarding the national legislation and the professionals' views on this, the six countries have different situations, that could be placed as positions within a continuum whose limits are a thorough development of the EU Directive and of restorative justice services, on the one hand, and the lack of any development whatsoever, on the other. The Netherlands is the country with the fullest development of the restorative justice part of the Victims' Rights Directive, with a series of modifications in the Dutch Code of Criminal Procedure, as well as related jurisprudence. The professionals explained how both mediation inside and outside of the criminal process were recognised and included as restorative justice, even though a professional criticised the fact that *"this Directive was more concerned with*

the safeguards in RJ than with the promotion of RJ” (NL-P-10). On the other side of the continuum we could place the current Italian legislation on restorative justice, for which there have been discussion and a preparatory commission, Tavolo 13, however without any legislative discussions or changes yet, according to the professionals interviewed.

It was highlighted by some Italian professionals, however, that there is space open for restorative practices in the national criminal code, and this is a reality mentioned also by professionals in Poland, Spain, and Bulgaria. Despite the lack or the scarcity of specific regulations in these countries, professionals are aware of the possibilities left open, particularly regarding mitigation and mediation. A Bulgarian judge interpreted this fact as a positive one, when asked about the country’s regulation of said measures: *“We can put the question differently: is there any legal or other regulatory obstacle to do it (practice RJ)?”* (BG-P-16). A similar case was made by a Spanish equality public official, whose work is defined by an administrative law that does not include references to restorative measures and nevertheless she applies these measures for cases deemed feasible (ES-P-2).

Between the three aforementioned cases, professionals from Spain, Belgium, and Bulgaria described varying degrees of restorative justice regulation. In Spain the direct implementation of the Dir. 2012/29/EU included scarce mentions to the right to restorative justice services, while the rest of the related legislation misconstrued, according to the interviewed experts, restorative practices as mediation among equals. However, the lack of a clear legal definition also allows the practitioners to employ restorative measures with serious crimes — besides a Spain-wide ban on restorative justice in cases of gender-based violence — and to combine in some regions the restorative and mitigation possibilities of either the Penal Code or regional administrative laws.

As for Belgium, a 2005 law explicitly regulated the procedure and use of mediation, defining the characteristics of public services that have been developed by two clear institutions, *Mediante* in Wallonia and *Moderator* in Flanders. In Belgium, as well as in other countries, the mediation services and legislation for adults are distinct from those for minors, which tend to have a more thorough and comprehensive legislation, e.g. in Spain. Finally, Bulgaria has no specific restorative justice legislation, but there is a 2005 Mediation Act that entails the regulation of conflict resolution outside of courtrooms. The transposition of the Victims’

Rights Directive in 2016-2017 further improved some legal texts, without any specific regulation of restorative measures. The lack of clear laws has led, according to the interviewed professionals, to a lack of standards, trained professionals, national programmes and efforts towards the implementation of restorative practices.

Under current legislations, the six countries have varying experiences of restorative justice and similar services, with different procedures and responsible agents. For instance, under the Dutch legislation every victim receives an individual assessment of their protection and service needs that can entail restorative measures from the public justice system, whereas in Belgium it is largely the two aforementioned regional operators provide widespread services that focus on victim-offender mediation and family group conferencing — the most well-known and used techniques throughout the six countries. On the other hand, in Italy the current services are provided by centres for criminal mediation, NGOs and local small projects, whereas in Bulgaria the existing services are equally fragmented and dependent on small initiatives. As a middle point, restorative justice services in Spain, theoretically guaranteed by a country-wide law, depend on the existence of local or regional services managed by either public administrations or NGOs and universities. For instance, in Catalonia and the Basque Country there are public restorative justice services connected to victim- and offender-focused services and professionals, whereas in other regions only some court districts or prison institutions have similar services.

Even though only a small part of the interviewed professionals were judges or prosecutors, most professionals from NGOs, restorative justice services, and other related institutions directly or indirectly engaged with judges and prosecutors as per their responsibilities and frequent practices. As such, the role of judges and prosecutors was analysed or described by several professionals, with varying degrees of importance according to the country and to the professionals' experiences. According to Italian professionals, judges, lawyers, and prosecutors can have either a positive or a negative effect on restorative processes depending on their sensitivity, their awareness and knowledge of the processes' potential benefits, and on their view of the relation between restorative and traditional justice. Spanish and Polish professionals, on the other hand, explained that most judges were also participating from a misconception of restorative justice as they tend to only refer cases that are deemed minor or with some specific characteristics, such as kinship or closeness.

Professionals from most countries, while describing the limitations of current restorative justice legislation, also spoke of the relation between measures and other practices that are more consolidated and widely used throughout their countries. The limits between what professionals think that most people understand as restorative practices — victim-offender mediation, conferences and circles — and what could be understood as other restorative practices was highlighted by interviewees from Italy, Spain, Belgium, and Bulgaria. They all argued for the importance of additional alternative measures, outside of the traditional or punitive justice, such as social work, early education, and sensitivity and diversity training sessions. Early education with students was mentioned by professionals from all countries, as a measure particularly well-suited for long-term effects regarding respect and tolerance. Significantly, most Spanish NGO professionals acknowledged using little to none restorative measures but plenty alternative measures that were, on the other hand, clearly considered as restorative practices by the restorative justice experts interviewed from the same country.

The legislation differences among the six analysed countries, as well as their respective political and social climates, also explain the different stages and claims for legal reform regarding restorative practices. Italian professionals underscored the potential unpopularity of any policymaker who pushes for restorative-oriented legislation, due to the lack of generalised culture or understanding of this matter, while the existing legislative openings focus on the offender and not on the victim. Some Spanish professionals, on the other hand, argued for the extension of the tools and laws that regulate restorative measures for minors to those for adults, with a defined explicit law. Professionals from Italy and Belgium also highlighted the legislation differences with minors' restorative measures, which are widely more developed and are explicitly focused on the re-education rather than on the punishment. However, another Spanish professional, a restorative justice practitioner and scholar, argued against the *"big threat"* of a *"crystallised and too narrow normativisation"* under judges' and prosecutors' ideas of clear, closed laws, while she defended open, flexible, and case-specific measures (ES-P-11). As for Bulgaria, the current government has recently included restorative justice in the justice strategy for criminal policy for 2020-2015, and for said goals justice professionals are currently pushing for restorative justice-oriented legislative reforms. In the Netherlands, during the years 2016-2018 a working group drafted

a legislative proposal for incorporating restorative justice practices, in the form of victim-offender mediation and group conferences, into the (new) Dutch Code of Criminal Procedure that has to come into force in 2022.

As for the existing legislation regarding anti-LGBT hate crimes, the six analysed countries also offer a wide range of different sets of laws and social acceptance. On the one hand, countries such as the Netherlands, Belgium, and Spain have explicit antidiscrimination legislation and institutions, such as bureaus, specific police units, government departments, and so on. In all three countries almost all professionals are knowledgeable about the existing antidiscrimination laws and their differences — for instance, in Spain there are both country-wide penal legislation and specific LGBT- and trans-related regional laws. These countries also have either national or regional specific victim support networks or reporting institutions, such as the Dutch special police unit *Roze in Blauw* (Pink in Blue), with longstanding trajectories of collaboration with NGOs. On the other hand, Italy, Bulgaria, and Poland have a more limited legislation affecting anti-LGBT hate crimes. These countries' legal systems do not include SOGI or SOGIESC criteria into their penal codes and hate crimes legislation, and as such anti-LGBT hate crimes are registered as common crimes or hooliganism, and are even more underreported than in the other three countries.

Finally, and regarding the intersection of anti-LGBT hate crimes and restorative justice practices and legislation, in all six countries the professionals mentioned the lack of explicit programmes, with varying degrees of adequacy of existing guidelines and wider programmes. Even in the Netherlands, whose professionals highlighted the degree of legal development and knowledge about restorative justice, they underscored how little is currently done with anti-LGBT hate crimes. Both Dutch and Italian professionals, as well as Spanish ones, referred to the lack of a widespread culture of restorative justice, as both justice professionals and public are more attuned to a punitive idea of justice institutions and processes. Professionals from most countries mentioned the key role of a sociocultural understanding of justice as a zero-sum game from a punitive perspective. As such, both justice operators, NGO professionals, victims, and societies as a whole are expected to be less inclined to use or demand restorative measures, particularly if understood as a stark contrast to justice, broadly speaking.

The lack of SOGI or SOGIESC antidiscrimination legislation combines in some countries with a generalised comment by professionals from all countries: the underreporting of anti-LGBT hate crimes, which renders LGBT-related crimes and restorative justice practices invisible under other categories. Different professionals mentioned key factors for this underreporting, ranging from the lack of legislation in some countries, to the combination of shame, stigma, fear, lack of trust in the police forces or in the justice system, secondary victimisation, or the fact that LGBT hate crime victims may feel that they are used to some levels of everyday violence. The diverse legal aspects of hate crimes throughout the six countries is a key issue: besides the countries without specific legislation for anti-LGBT cases, the different forms and types of reporting may be a limiting factor. For instance, Dutch professionals explained that victims may file either a *notification* or an *official complaint* at a police station, and the fact that only the latter tends to end up with results is a demotivating factor. Similarly, Belgian professionals said that the lack of credibility of the complaints acts as a barrier for denouncing and for measures such as restorative ones. The role of the local LGBT NGOs may also be a crucial factor: whereas in most countries they are understood as an interested party and even a driver for the filing of complaints and for reporting crimes and discrimination, Belgian professionals said that certain LGBT organisations prioritise a victim-based approach that focus on psychological support, and as such they may discourage reporting.

3.2. Knowledge, beliefs and practices of professionals in relation to restorative justice

Throughout the interviews, professionals from all six countries displayed different levels of theoretical and practical knowledge, experiences, and ideas about restorative justice, its possible techniques, and its foreseeable outcomes. The comparison between the six countries indicates how the professionals' knowledge about the concept of restorative justice depends on a series of factors, such as their corresponding country's implementation and divulgation of restorative justice, the professional's educational background and past and present fields of activities, as well as their past experiences. The fact that in a country such as the Netherlands restorative justice has been so thoroughly developed, legislation-wise, for instance, does not avoid a generalised misunderstanding about what restorative justice is, according to some professionals.

This misunderstanding or misconstruction of the concept was also analysed by several restorative justice practitioners from Spain, who also described the main misconception to be based on an idea of victim-offender mediation between equals with a neutral mediator, most likely derived from Spain's mandatory labour conflict mediation. Another common element shared by professionals not only from these two countries, but also by those from Bulgaria and Belgium was a generalised favourable opinion of restorative justice, with few exceptions. Despite the aforementioned misconception, most professionals praised the goals and procedures of restorative justice, even though some of them questioned its appropriateness for some crimes or circumstances.

The interviews showed commonalities and differences among categories or backgrounds of professionals, as well as different series of dichotomies between broad groups of professionals who shared a view on restorative justice, directly or indirectly opposed to that of another group. For instance, the research distinguished in Italy between a "scholastic" notion of restorative justice shared by lawyers and legal practitioners — who understood the practices as offender-centred benefits from a utilitarian or pragmatical perspective, and a more "humanistic" approach by restorative experts and practitioners who focused on both victims and offenders, as well as on the related communities. The researchers in Poland, on the other hand, unveiled differences among restorative justice practitioners themselves, who could be further characterised as "theoreticians" with university and policy backgrounds — with an overall positive and optimist view on the current state of restorative

practices in the country, or, alternatively, as “practitioners” who conduct said practices and who share a more negative view of the Polish restorative scene and justice system. The professional experiences and the direct contact with the field, with the judiciary, and with the police forces, appear to be the key factors in this specific distinction.

Within these and other countries the restorative justice experts acknowledged experiences and information on their field understandably different from those from NGO professionals. Their views and knowledge were also predictably more nuanced, as a consequence of their professional background. For instance, Belgian professionals discussed different views on restorative justice, such as debates on the nature of conflict — seen by some of them as a property that has to be given back to the involved parties — and on the role of the victim-offender relationship and of apologies. NGO professionals, on the other hand, showed a more limited knowledge and experience with the concept and practice of restorative justice, except when some of them or their colleagues had had experience or training sessions, as was the case of some NGO professionals from Italy and Spain. The widespread lack of clear or specific knowledge of restorative justice among these professionals coincided with both a clearer notion of mediation for most professionals and doubts about the feasibility or appropriateness of restorative practices for LGBT NGO or victims — as expressed by some Belgian, Spanish, and Polish professionals.

However, some restorative justice experts and practitioners acknowledged and responded to these doubts as they were used to them. Spanish restorative justice experts, for example, understood said doubts as consequences of the protector’s role of the NGO professionals and as an effect of common misconstructions of restorative justice as neutral mediation among equals. Italian restorative justice professionals, on the other hand, highlighted the need for a broader knowledge of this field among all involved parties: law practitioners, restorative justice experts, and so on. Dutch, Belgian, Spanish, and Polish professionals acknowledged a lack of experiences or cases of restorative justice for LGBT-related cases, and this could be understood as a key factor for this knowledge- and experience-gap between different professional backgrounds. However, throughout the different interviews in the six participant countries several binary oppositions or conflicting viewpoints were unveiled and analysed, and as such they can be seen as consequences of different paradigms

or understandings not only of restorative justice but of justice itself, as shared and realised by the professionals.

Regarding the victims' use and awareness of restorative justice services, most professionals were aware of the potential benefits and usefulness of restorative processes, particularly when compared to traditional justice. According to Polish and Spanish professionals, for instance, restorative processes can give the agency back to the victims, as in traditional trials they tend to have a limited and unsatisfactory role, with frequent secondary victimisation. According to these professionals, victims may be productively and satisfactorily heard and understood with restorative measures, while they may also be understood and even contact the offender, if they are willing and prepared to do so. More professionals, both from within and without restorative justice services, explained the necessary requirements for said procedures to be taken into consideration, such as informed consent, the victim's will and preparedness, a safe environment, constant supervision and care, and a detailed attention to the procedure's best timing and place.

Professionals from most countries, while praising the concept or practice of restorative justice, did not limit this paradigm's benefits to those for the victim. Besides a more active role, a better understanding, and a more satisfactory experience for the victim, they mentioned ulterior advantages related to both the offender and society as a whole or as a collection of groups. First, several professionals mentioned the reduction of the offender's recidivism as a key effect of restorative justice, as compared to traditional punitive justice measures. They explained said effect as a consequence of the process of making offenders understand the damage caused. Second, they also mentioned the role of community involvement via organisations or representatives as a way to provide a more satisfactory and effective justice and social change.

The victims' willingness to participate and awareness about restorative justice processes was also discussed by the professionals, with varying remarks depending on their professional background and experiences, particularly from those with direct contact with victims. Most professionals argued that victims do not tend to be aware of the existence of these procedures and services, due to the lack of public campaigns and information and to the difficulty of accessing pertinent information. Both Belgian and Polish professionals explained

that this lack of awareness is generalised among victims of any type of crime, while some Spanish NGO lawyers also argued for the role of a widespread lack of knowledge about basic rights and legal information. However, most restorative justice practitioners argued that once the victims become familiar with these procedures, they tend to be interested in participating in them, even though it may vary according to their specific situation. Some professionals mentioned the role of the case's severity, while others considered the role of age, cultural capital, and other demographic factors, despite the lack of clear data on the matter.

The offender's willingness to participate and their remorse were also mentioned by the professionals as relevant factors, and some of them explained that even though they are a requirement for direct practices, not all restorative measures need a direct encounter or confrontation. This direct encounter, or victim-offender mediation, is the most frequent technique conceived and practiced by the interviewed professionals, and tends to be conducted by trained mediators from NGOs and public institutions. Practitioners with more experience in the field described other techniques and practices that go beyond this encounter, such as the more collective restorative circles and conferences, and family groups conferences, in which different parties with differing roles and responsibilities share a space. The need to adapt the techniques and measures to the circumstances of each case — argued for as the *adequacy paradigm* by a Spanish restorative justice practitioner and scholar (ES-P-11) — explains the wide range of direct and indirect measures described by the professionals. Some of them, with an indirect approach, respond to the lack of the offender's willingness to participate or remorse, but also to the lack of willing and prepared victims for processes with prison inmates, for example.

Spanish restorative justice experts, for instance, described the use of restorative interviews, joint encounters, circles, conferences, but also offenders writing letters to real or imaginary victims, the use of surrogate or proxy victims or offenders, and so on. While discussing the potential benefits of collective measures such as conferences they also mentioned the need to include more involved agents, such as community representatives, prison staff, neighbours, and NGO members. Polish professionals described specific cases in which the mediators and facilitators provided tailored measures to the cases' circumstances: for instance, a sentence for antisemitic hate crime included the mandatory viewing of a specific

film for a group of football hooligans, whereas an antidiscrimination organisation oversaw the collective cleaning and painting over hate speech and racist symbols graffitied on the walls of a Nigerian restaurant in Warsaw.

These and many other types of restorative practices go beyond the frequent image or idea of a victim-offender mediation encounter, and precisely several Bulgarian professionals discussed a current ongoing debate on whether mediation should be considered a restorative method at all. Some of the interviewed professionals argued that while mediation aims to achieve an agreement, restorative measures should focus on the victim's reparation and wellbeing. To this type of argument several Spanish restorative justice practitioners responded with the chief importance of analysing each case and situation in order to ascertain when is the best moment for a mediation or encounter, if there is, or in order to devise other measures if the direct encounter is not feasible.

3.3. Strategies of restorative justice in relation to (anti-LGBT) hate crimes

The professionals interviewed from all six countries were unable to mention a single specific restorative justice programme for anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination, and in most countries this absence was also extended to hate crimes in general. The professionals, both from restorative justice services and from other institutions and organisations, acknowledged the role of the previously described factors: the lack of specific LGBT-related legislation in some countries, the widespread unawareness about restorative justice, notions about this paradigm or services that hinder their application or referral by the interested parties, and so on. Professionals from countries without SOGI or SOGIESC factors or criteria in their legislation explained that the lack of specific protection and legislation made all possible cases to be registered under common crimes and other categories.

In those countries with specific LGBT-related and hate crime legislation the lack or scarcity of known experiences was understood as a consequence of the unawareness of the existing services and possibilities by victims, justice operators, and NGO professionals, but also of the underreporting of anti-LGBT crimes and their lack of public visibility and notoriety in most settings. As such, it may be seen as a consequence of two types of unawareness among different professionals from various backgrounds and fields, but also among the countries' societies as a whole. The political climate was also mentioned as a key factor in Poland, whereas the impact of a generalised understanding of justice as punishment, or a vindictive or punitive justice culture, was mentioned by professionals from more countries, such as Italy and Spain. Italian restorative justice practitioners, when asked about this absence of explicit programmes for anti-LGBT hate crimes, argued that they would not be necessary due to their defence of a case-by-case analysis and methodological design.

In contrast to the lack of existing experiences, the professionals were able to discuss at length their views on the feasibility and appropriateness of restorative measures for anti-LGBT discrimination and hate crimes cases. Broadly speaking most professionals praised the theoretical possibilities of restorative justice for most cases, whereas some of them — depending on the country, either some or most LGBT NGO professionals — ruled out the possibility of the application to anti-LGBT hate crimes in general or limited them to the absence of some circumstances. For example, a single professional from Italy and several ones from Belgium and Poland considered that major crimes in general should be excluded

in order to avoid secondary victimisation, whereas several NGO professionals from Spain argued that cases with physical violence, extremist ideologies as a motivation, and victim-offender power imbalances should not be tackled with restorative measures. Some of the participants from the Netherlands, on the other hand, explained that their experience as LGBT NGO professionals show them how LGBT people frequently believe that the justice system in itself is not for them, and as such even restorative measures would be difficult to implement. Similarly, participants from countries without specific SOGI- or SOGIESC-related legislation argued for the difficulty of the victims trusting the justice system.

Opposed to these doubts, professionals that drew mostly from their experience as restorative justice mediators and facilitators, as well as from victim support services and other institutions, argued for the appropriateness of these measures for anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination. Most of these professionals — and to some extent some of those from NGOs, depending on the country — argued for the measures' benefits as compared to traditional trials and justice procedures. For instance, most Bulgarian and Polish professionals highlighted that human rights issues are particularly well-suited for restorative measures, as they entail the analysis and transformation of motives, beliefs, and worldviews, as well as specific individual and collective relations. In fact, a Polish public official argued that *"it is hard to find better crimes for the use of restorative justice"* (PL-P-18). Related to this idea, Italian professionals precisely argued for the usefulness of these measures with cases that involve fundamental rights and dignity, as compared to minor crimes with which they may be less productive.

On the other hand, most Italian professionals also argued for a case-by-case criterion in order to analyse appropriateness of restorative measure, and this is a perspective also defended by all restorative justice practitioners from Spain and several ones from the Netherlands. This paradigm or criterion was particularly described or defended in opposition to categorical or broad limitations of restorative measures by NGO and judiciary professionals. One of the Dutch professionals highlighted a key aspect: that of the victim's will and informed decision. Besides the case-by-case analysis, it was argued that the victims must freely and consciously choose whether they are ready and willing to participate in a specific restorative process, after having been given enough information, and without feeling any form of imposition.

Despite the lack of explicit restorative justice programmes for these cases throughout the six countries, the professionals from most of them recommended the adaptation and use of already existing restorative measures, as a consequence of their known and foreseeable effects. For instance, a Dutch professional advocated for a *step approach* based on what is already being used in the Netherlands for racist and religious hate crimes: the programme includes several steps in succession that are individually assessed, starting with proper knowledge about the group discriminated by the offender, the contact with the group or a surrogate, a more detailed knowledge about the group's needs and problems, and ending with the offender's remorse and public apology. Other Dutch professionals mentioned the relevance of thematic meetings between offenders and mediators or facilitators, as techniques without the direct contact with victims that can be used to change the attitudes and empathy of both professionals and offenders.

Belgian professionals, on the other hand, advocated for the relevance of broad principles or values that must take precedent when analysing and designing restorative measures for hate crimes: the centrality of the victim, a functional communication, and the acknowledgment of the offender's actions and hate motivation. One practitioner argued for the usefulness of an existing practice known as the *flag system*, which aims to facilitate the communication between practitioners and children and their parents, thanks to the employment of flags when talking about difficult topics such as sexuality, relationships, and violence. Another practice they advocated for was the use by the police in Belgium of a checklist for the report of judicial facts and possible hate motivations behind crimes. The checklist was elaborated in collaboration between the Belgian Equality Body Against Discrimination (UNIA), the diversity department of the Antwerp police force (PZA), and the judicial follow-up service of PZA, with the goal of facilitating a constructing dialogue with the victim, as compared to a more classic question-answer method.

Finally, professionals from the Netherlands, Spain, and Bulgaria advocated for the particularly promising potential of collective restorative measures, such as conferences and circles. Several organisations are already using them with minors, imprisoned offenders, and other target groups, with differing characteristics such as the inclusion of other indirectly involved parties, or the implementation of health and social services for the participants. These professionals argued for the role they may provide for LGBT NGOs and communities,

that may be present via representatives as a part of the process or as a direct or indirect victim. This possibility was explicitly defended by Spanish restorative justice practitioners as a way to include the LGBT NGO that tend to act as gatekeepers for the victims' participation, and as a way to ease their doubts about the usefulness of restorative practices. This incorporation of NGO representatives to restorative circles and conferences, however, would require a different role from those they are used to, such as psychologists and lawyers in charge of the first immediate attention and of the traditional trials. Italian professionals also recommended collective measures with the participation of LGBT NGOs as useful instruments for defeating anti-LGBT stereotypes and biases.

3.4. Cooperation and training

All professionals underscored the relevance of cooperation as part of their usual activities, both within and without restorative justice and LGBT-related tasks and practices. Several professionals analysed or evaluated the success of said cooperation from the perspective of their goals and roles, and as such their opinions were more positive or more negative depending on the results of the practices and schemes. Several professionals praised existing cooperation programmes and practices in their countries that were mostly local or regional examples, and as such they were recommended for further implementation and development. For instance, Italian professionals explained that in some cities (Milan, Brescia, Bergamo, Piacenza, Reggio Emilia, Florence, Bologna, and so on) there are organisations offering restorative services that work with offices for criminal execution and prosecution, social services, and, broadly speaking, with the justice system. These and other organisations also cooperate with the education system as they involve schools, universities, students, and staff in seminars and activities that explain the main concepts and ideas around restorative justice.

Regarding the situation in the Netherlands, the participants highlighted the existence of current cooperation experiences, despite the fact that the different practices and ways of working of the organisations determine more or less satisfactory evaluations and outcomes. The Dutch professionals recommended existing cooperation practices between police forces, NGOs and antidiscrimination offices, such as the Pink in Blue police corps, as well as the triangle meetings between police, prosecution and a city's or region's mayor or government. As for specific examples, the Rotterdam Alliance Natural Together inter-agency cooperation was mentioned: it focuses on the safety of LGBT people, and includes different NGOs, police officers, antidiscrimination office, and the local municipality. Similarly, they recommended the existing protocol for anti-LGBT hate crimes in Groningen, with which care and support for the victim are the first step, after which a multilateral meeting is held between the mayor, the head of the police department, the Pink in Blue police, and a Netherlands-wide LGBT NGO. The involved agencies and institutions avoid providing premature information to the press, and only after a thorough data-gathering do they provide it after discussing all options with the victim. Similarly, in Belgium the professionals mentioned the existence of strong interagency cooperation for anti-LGBT hate crimes, with a slower or less significant track record for these cases with restorative justice measures. The professionals mentioned

the fact that the existing restorative services, such as Mediate, have recently begun questioning their methods in order to better acknowledge the lack of LGBT-related cases. For instance, they are offering their services to victims even when they do not report the crime or discrimination to the police. However, to do so they need better cooperation practices with existing LGBT NGOs, and according to the professionals they are starting to do so.

The Spanish professionals mentioned several cooperation practices for either restorative justice services or anti-LGBT hate crimes, but none that combined both fields. Regarding the former, several restorative justice services, such as the ones in Getafe and Leganés in Madrid and in some prisons in Castille and León are in fact the product of cooperation programmes between scholars and public institutions. As for the cooperation for anti-LGBT hate crimes, most professionals discussed it in terms of a satisfaction that depended on the fulfilment of their goals — denounces, sentences, compensation for the victims. Most NGO professionals criticised the lack of understanding among justice professionals such as prosecutors and judges, even though most of them mentioned satisfactory relations that were mediated by acquaintances or long-standing work relations with specific police agents or prosecutors. Further satisfactory programmes that were mentioned regarded the existence of specific police divisions similar to the Dutch Pink in Blue: the municipal police force of Madrid has a diversity-focused division (*Unidad de gestión de la diversidad*) that was lauded by several LGBT NGO professionals, as they specialise in all types of hate crimes and in a different treatment of the cases and of the victims. An NGO lawyer (ES-P-10), for instance, praised the fact that this division's offices do not look like a police precinct and that the police officers do not wear uniform and are used to a specific terminology.

Regarding Poland, the professionals mentioned the necessity for the cooperation between all parties involved in restorative justice practices, and they provided two different evaluations of the current state: while the scholars and theoreticians believed that the existing cooperation is functioning well, those practitioners who directly work as mediators or facilitators were more sceptical with the nation-wide cooperation programmes. As with other countries, the specific local and regional examples were highly praised, such as the case of cooperation between Wrocław-based restorative justice practitioners, police forces, municipal institutions, NGO professionals, and probation officers. In relation to anti-LGBT

hate crimes, the professionals highlighted the fact that large Warsaw-based LGBT NGOs cooperate in various research, monitoring, and reporting projects, with the assistance of international institutions and organisations. At a local level, different smaller LGBT organisations underscored the relevance of the support they receive from the large Poland-wide NGOs with which they share experiences, knowledge, and initiatives.

As for Bulgaria, the professionals could mention examples of good cooperation within different restorative justice programmes, but none regarding anti-LGBT hate crimes. This can be understood as a consequence of the legal situation of LGBT people and their protection. The professionals highlighted restorative practices in which the main partners are juvenile delinquency services, social services, victim support services, prisons, and other NGOs. One of the interviewees, a regional judge in the town of Lukovit (BG-P-17), was mentioned as a good reference and example by other participants, as she has created a network between local institutions in order to cooperate with them on different cases, including both for carrying out restorative measures and the execution of the sentences. The professionals highlighted the uniqueness of the example: a consequence of both the judge's and other agents' motivation and willingness and the size and social networks of Lukovit.

Besides the existing cooperation practices, all professionals underscored the need for more and better cooperation, as well as other activities. While Italian professionals argued for awareness-raising campaigns for promoting restorative practices among LGBT people and NGO professionals, Spanish NGO professionals argued that the lack of personnel and of funding — both in public administrations and in grants for NGOs — are to be blamed for the current state of cooperation practices. Significantly, Polish professionals spoke more of the cooperation within the fields of restorative justice and of anti-LGBT hate crimes, but not as much of that between both realms. This divide is coherent with the arguments by Dutch and Belgian professionals for more and better communication between the aforementioned fields, as a way to promote restorative justice services and to provide a more satisfactory experience for victims and professionals. Bulgarian professionals explained that in many occasions the institutions and organisations address different aspects of the same issues with their practices and projects, but they do not cooperate in their everyday work, outside of specific projects. In this regard Polish professionals praised the role of international

cooperation and research projects as a form of networking, training, and cooperation that positively affects the whole restorative justice sector in the country.

Training is one of the most frequent existing cooperation practices throughout the six countries, and it is a field in which LGBT NGOs, justice operators, restorative justice experts, and/or policy makers have frequent exchanges. The existing training programmes can be divided into those focusing on LGBT- and hate-crime related contents and themes, and those related to restorative justice. Professionals from Italy, Poland, Belgium, and Spain, for example, mentioned existing or projected training courses and initiatives that, drawing from LGBT NGOs or public institutions, provided sensitivity and diversity training for police officers, prosecutors, education professionals, judges, and so on. As with other forms of cooperation, several Spanish LGBT NGO professionals described their perceived satisfaction with the training as linked to their goals: for instance, those NGO professionals who had provided hate crimes-related training to police officers described them as a failure if some posterior sentences or actions by justice operators were not what they had expected.

As for the restorative justice-related training, professionals from the Netherlands, Poland, and Belgium described existing practices that focus on the possibilities of restorative measures, their needs and procedures, the different possible techniques, as well as existing good practices. These training programmes described by the professionals were provided by NGOs, scholars, practitioners, and public officials, depending on the country's and region's legislation and situation regarding restorative measures. Most of the mentioned training programmes focused on victim-offender mediation, family group conferences, and similar techniques. Bulgarian professionals spoke similarly about the regulated training procedures for mediators, under the Mediation Act. Said legislation sets some standards and creates a network of professionals and organisation to be connected and available for public institutions.

Among the Spanish LGBT NGO professionals only two had received specific restorative justice-related training, and one of them mentioned that she found little to no use of said training. The disconnection or gap between LGBT- and restorative justice-training practices and professionals from both fields was mentioned by professionals from all six countries. This was an explicit training need for professionals from different backgrounds and activities,

who underscored the relevance of bridging the knowledge gaps and of providing the necessary information so that the professionals better understand other perspectives. As such, professionals recommended LGBT-related training for restorative justice practitioners — as part of the already existing training with justice operators, as well as restorative justice-related training for NGO professionals.

Italian professionals mentioned the need for diverse perspectives in said training programmes, as well as the need for different spatial settings for them, in order to facilitate the geographical distribution of professionals with the appropriate knowledge and experience. This argument responds to the geographical disparity of existing restorative justice services that can be found in most countries. Professionals from all countries also recommended similar dual- or bridging-training for other involved parties, such as judges, prosecutors, and lawyers, as they can have a key supportive role towards the promotion of restorative measures. Some professionals also mentioned the need for widespread awareness campaigns that could be understood as part of a wider training or outreach so that not only professionals, but also potential victims are more aware of the existing restorative and victim support services.

Regarding the contents for these recommended training practices, professionals from the Netherlands mentioned the need for the exchange of best practices and the dissemination of successful restorative experiences (NL-P-5), whereas Spanish and Belgian professionals explicitly advocated for the distinction between the training needs of victim support and NGO professionals and that of restorative justice professionals. For example, Spanish LGBT NGO professionals and restorative justice practitioners advocated for restorative justice-related content for the former, and diversity and LGBT-related content for the latter, as well as diversity, sensitivity, and empathy-building courses for police forces, judges, and prosecutors. A restorative justice expert and scholar from Spain also recommended for the training the use of practical guidelines or tips for evaluation cases and for referring them: she highlighted the importance of practical tips in order to assess the feasibility or the timing for a case, regarding both the victim's and the offender's circumstances and state (ES-P-11). LGBT NGO professionals from both Spain and Bulgaria, on the other hand, underscored the need for practical information so that restorative justice practitioners are better prepared for the problems and situations faced by LGBT victims.

4. The opinions of NGO professionals regarding the application of restorative justice: quantitative analysis

One of the main objectives of the research is to analyse the experiences and needs of key professionals who deal with anti-LGBT violence and/or RJ programmes (policy makers, criminal justice practitioners, RJ mediators, representatives of NGOs, law enforcement authorities) in order to facilitate the application of RJ in anti-LGBT hate crimes. To meet this objective, two methodological instruments have been applied: the in-depth interviews and the survey. The survey has been conducted with the aim of gathering the opinions of the main LGBT associations and other civil organisations that fight against discrimination, in relation to the application of restorative justice in hate crimes. This survey allows us to extend the research sample as well as the data obtained by means of the ethnography. It also grants the possibility to know about the existing programmes on restorative justice in the participating countries, which will be critical for the successive Work Packages based on the exchange of best practices and training.

As mentioned above, the questionnaire has been divided in five sections: a) Socio-demographic questions; b) Organizational questions; c) Knowledge about restorative justice; d) Training needs; e) Organization positioning about restorative justice.

The profile of respondents and their organizations³

Regarding the socio-demographic profile of respondents, their average age is 41 years old (with an age range 16-71 years old), their main self-experienced gender is male (44,8%), their main sexual orientation is homosexual (46,9%), most of them are atheistic or agnostic (50,2%), their educational level is high (70,8% have a BA, MA and/or a PhD), while their ideological average is 7,18 (where 1 is far-right and 10 far-left). Regarding the work position of the respondents in their organisations, 33,7% of them are executive workers, 11,6% non-executive presidents, 10,5% chief executive officers and 7% heads of department (37,2% responded “other”).

In relation to the field of the organisations to which the respondents belong, 50% work in LGBT issues, 40,4% are transversal organisations (working in all fields of discrimination),

³ See the Annex 2 for all survey data.

20,7% fight against racism and xenophobia, 16,6% work against social exclusion and aporophobia, and 15,5% are religious organisations. The profile is an organisation with a national scope, based in just one location, partially funded by public funds and operating in a big or medium city (from 300.000 inhabitants). The majority of them (77,4%) deals with hate crimes (67,6% with anti-LGBT hate crimes). The main services provided by all the organisations which have responded are counselling, emotional and psychological support, legal advocacy and reporting violence and discrimination.

Knowledge about restorative justice

In general, it should be stressed **the low confidence of respondents regarding their knowledge in relation to restorative justice** (see table 2). On a five degrees' scale (1. None; 5. Totally), 32,7% of respondents admitted to having little or no confidence regarding their knowledge about restorative justice, whilst 22,4% responded "to a large extent" or "totally". However, the majority of respondents admitted knowing restorative justice to a "moderate extent" (34,9%).

Table 2. To what extent do you feel confident in your understanding of restorative justice? (From 1=None; to 5=Totally)

	N=166	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
1. None		2	6	2	8	2	0	20	12,0
2. To a small extent		7	14	6	12	2	10	51	30,7
3. To a moderate extent		4	14	13	12	2	13	58	34,9
4. To a large extent		0	7	5	6	2	9	29	17,5
5. Totally		4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4,9
Total		17	41	26	38	10	34	166	100%

Similarly, **the overwhelming majority of respondents (75,7%) admitted not being aware of the restorative justice programs put in place in their country** (table 3), and even the 7,9% responded –mistakenly- that there are no restorative justice programs in their country. Only the 16,4% of respondents knew some existing restorative justice programs.

Table 3. Do you know which restorative justice programs exist in your country?

N=165	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
I don't know	12	34	16	32	5	26	125	75,7
There are not RJ programs in my country	3	2	4	0	1	3	13	7,9
Yes	2	5	6	5	4	5	27	16,4
Total	17	41	26	37	10	34	165	100%

In relation to the existing restorative justice programs and/or organisms mentioned by the respondents from each country, it should be noticed that **they tended to mention the restorative justice techniques, rather than the programs put in place by specific public or private bodies**. In this sense, the Bulgarian respondents stressed that these programs are only carried out by NGOs, such as the programs for Family Group Conferences (in several cities), Circles for support and accountability in work and reintegration into the community of perpetrators of sexual crimes, and the Restoration circles in prisons. The Italian respondents mentioned the juvenile criminal mediation, and the offices for criminal mediation. The Dutch respondents pointed out the mediation for young people in schools, the victim support agency and the mediation between victim and the offender, yet they did not mention any specific program. Similarly, Belgian respondents tended to mention the techniques put in place: victim-offender mediation for youths and adults, restorative groups, prisons, schools and city projects. The exceptions to this tendency are the cases of Spain and Poland, where respondents were able to mention specific programs. In the first case, the restorative justice program developed by the Catalan Government, the techniques put in place amongst victims and members of ETA, and the case of juvenile justice were cited. In the case of Poland, the activities of the Wroclaw Centre of Restorative Justice and the Polish Centre of Mediation were mentioned.

Training needs

In this section, participants were asked to respond to how relevant some topics to be covered in a training on LGBT issues are for their organization (on a scale from 1: not at all; 10: totally):

Table 4. In your opinion, how relevant for your organization are the following topics to be covered in a training on LGBT issues? (From 1 = not at all; to 10 = totally)

BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
----	----	----	----	----	----	-------

N=158	Mean (Sd)						
LGBT people and vulnerable intersections (age, race, ethnicity, disability)	7,47 (2,718)	8,85 (1,565)	8,05 (2,104)	9,08 (1,278)	9,44 (1,014)	8,18 (2,468)	8,54 (1,989)
Social prejudices against LGBT people	7,18 (2,877)	8,36 (2,345)	8,00 (2,862)	9,16 (1,236)	9,44 (1,014)	7,62 (3,321)	8,27 (2,548)
LGBT concepts and terminology, inclusive language	6,88 (3,181)	7,90 (2,269)	8,05 (2,681)	9,22 (1,228)	9,44 (1,014)	7,29 (3,407)	8,08 (2,599)
Specific needs of LGBT victims	6,41 (3,083)	8,53 (1,704)	8,14 (2,356)	7,86 (2,406)	8,44 (2,186)	8,30 (2,616)	8,03 (2,411)
Identification of anti-LGBT hate crimes	6,88 (3,039)	8,21 (2,195)	7,77 (2,671)	8,24 (2,362)	7,11 (2,934)	8,03 (2,767)	7,91 (2,569)
Strategies to avoid secondary victimization of LGBT victims	6,12 (3,389)	7,82 (2,327)	8,09 (2,348)	7,89 (2,505)	7,56 (2,506)	8,73 (2,050)	7,87 (2,525)
Social, emotional and psychological assistance to victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes	6,00 (3,500)	8,10 (2,447)	7,64 (2,718)	8,00 (2,121)	6,89 (2,934)	8,61 (2,549)	7,82 (2,664)
Legal assistance to victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes	7,24 (2,728)	8,03 (2,032)	7,91 (2,635)	7,69 (2,528)	6,00 (3,279)	7,88 (2,837)	7,70 (2,571)
Strategies and techniques for applying restorative justice in anti-LGBT hate crimes	6,41 (3,280)	7,62 (2,243)	7,71 (2,552)	7,84 (2,489)	7,22 (2,048)	7,97 (2,651)	7,60 (2,549)
First contact with victims of LGBT hate crimes	6,00 (3,446)	8,13 (2,262)	7,64 (2,536)	7,62 (2,842)	6,11 (3,060)	8,09 (2,626)	7,59 (2,760)
Barriers to access to restorative justice by victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes	6,94 (3,344)	7,77 (2,032)	7,32 (2,514)	7,81 (2,364)	7,44 (1,810)	7,64 (2,881)	7,58 (2,499)

As the table 4 shows, in general terms **the relevance to receive training on LGBT issues was high (7,7/10)**. However, while the majority of countries score 8 and 9 in most of the topics, Bulgaria stands out for its relative low scores (around 6). In this country, two issues seem not be very relevant, especially if we compare their score (6) with the overall table: social, emotional and psychological assistance to victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes, and the first contact with those victims.

Regarding the specific LGBT topics to be covered, the most relevant ones were the adoption of an intersectional perspective of oppressions (8,54), social prejudices against LGBT people (8,27%), LGBT concepts, terminology and inclusive language (8,08), and specific needs of LGBT victims (8,03). In the other side, the least relevant were the barriers to access to restorative justice by victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes (7,58), the first contact with victims of

LGBT hate crimes (7,59), and strategies and techniques for applying restorative justice in anti-LGBT hate crimes. According to these results, it should be highlighted that among these NGO professionals **two of the least demanded topics for training were linked to restorative justice.**

Organization positioning around restorative justice

In the last section of the survey, several questions regarding the professional and organization positioning about restorative justice were posed. First of all, it was asked if the issue of restorative justice has been discussed in the organization. Regarding this question, the **vast majority of respondents (78,2%) stated that their organization had never discussed restorative justice.** Among those organizations that have addressed issues related to restorative justice, the topics differ in each country. Nonetheless, common issues have been discussed in all countries, such as the need to restore the victim, the efficiency of restorative justice and the ways to apply it taking into account national legal frameworks. Moreover, the application of restorative justice in specific types of crime, such as Romaphobic (Spain and Poland), LGBTphobic (Spain and Italy) and racist (Belgium and Spain) crimes, has also been debated in certain participant countries.

In addition, participants were asked to score how useful some topics regarding restorative justice are for their organization:

Table 5. How useful were the following topics regarding restorative justice for their organization? (From 1 =Extremely useless; to 5= Extremely useful)

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
N=31	Mean (Sd)						
The utility of restorative justice in the specific anti-discrimination field of your organization	4,20 (1,789)	4,60 (,516)	4,67 (,577)	4,60 (,548)	5,00 (,000)	3,50 (1,732)	4,43 (1,040)
The utility of restorative justice in hate crimes	4,20 (1,789)	4,73 (,467)	4,67 (,577)	4,40 (,548)	4,33 (,577)	3,50 (1,732)	4,39 (1,022)
The utility of restorative justice in general	4,00 (1,732)	4,36 (,674)	4,33 (,577)	4,80 (,447)	5,00 (,000)	3,50 (1,732)	4,32 (1,045)
The utility of restorative justice in anti-LGBT hate crimes	4,20 (1,789)	3,91 (,944)	4,67 (,577)	4,60 (,548)	4,33 (,577)	3,25 (1,708)	4,10 (1,136)

As we can see in table 5, **increasing the knowledge in the four topics raised is considered very useful by the respondents**, existing few differences regarding the importance between the topics. The most useful topic was the utility of restorative justice in the specific anti-discrimination field of the respondent's organization. Comparing the countries, whilst most countries exceed the score of 4/5 in all topics, Poland stands out for its relative low scores (3,5 or less).

Another interesting data is linked to the question "which actor benefits the most from restorative justice". **The majority of respondents (67,3%) believed that it is the victim the main beneficiary, the 39,2% marked the offender. Only the 8,5% believed that restorative justice benefits both actors**, whilst the 5,8% responded the society as a whole.

The final two questions of the survey were open-ended and devoted to the identification of the main benefits and barriers of restorative justice. **In regard to the main benefits of this alternative judicial practice, all responses can be organized in three dimensions: benefits for victim and offender, for the judicial system, and for society.**

The majority of respondents have pointed out several benefits of restorative justice for the two main actors of crime: victim and offender. **In this sense, restorative justice is conceived as a tool that facilitates the restoration of crime, by promoting empathy, listening and mutual recognition between victim and offender.** Whilst it is stressed that restorative justice helps the offender hearing the victim and recognise the harm caused, and therefore the risk of recidivism and social inclusion, it is highlighted that this paradigm promotes the victim's restoration and avoids their secondary victimization. Reducing the stress of having to deal with criminal justice for both the perpetrator and the victim has also been pointed out.

The second dimension of benefit is the judicial system. In this sense, respondents considered that restorative justice unloads criminal justice bodies from cases that can be resolved with the same success through alternative means. Moreover, it is stressed that restorative justice should lead to a faster and more efficient solution of the case in comparison with conventional criminal justice. The victim centred-approach of restorative justice and its efficiency could generate to the victim more confidence in the justice system, and thus it could contribute to decrease the hate crimes under-reporting.

Finally, and regarding the social dimension, it is considered that restorative justice creates a common knowledge and commitment of the consequences of hate crimes, conceptualizing hate crime as the responsibility of the whole community and not only of the offender. Furthermore, restorative justice is also seen as an alternative to the culturally reinforced structure of strengthening violence.

On the other hand, several barriers for the application of restorative justice have been detected by respondents. Amongst them, the lack of an adequate legal framework has been pointed out in all countries. In this sense, the absence of a legal framework which can clearly determine the cases in which restorative justice can be applied is emphasized, as well as the guarantees to the rights of all parties. Moreover, the low commitment of key stakeholders (politicians, judges, prosecutors) for legislating, developing and applying restorative justice has also been detected as a barrier. For this reason, it is required to enhance training skills of key actors.

Another factor hindering the application of restorative justice is the conceptualisation of justice as a punitive mechanism, rather than a restorative one. Following this paradigm, crime is socially perceived as an event with irreversible consequences, which can only be compensated by punishing the offender. In this punitive perspective, restorative justice is conceived as a well-intentioned mechanism that leaves crime unpunished. Similarly, other voices question offender's sincere will, pointing out that offenders may decide to get involved in restorative justice practices only to see their sentence reduced.

Much reluctance in the application of restorative justice concerning the protection and well-being of the victim. Without an adequate implementation mechanism, victim's contact with the perpetrator can be traumatizing, and thus reproduce secondary victimization. Several respondents warn that hate crimes cause deep psychological damage to victims. This must be taken into account when applying restorative justice, which should be only used by taking care of the victim.

Conclusions

The combination of qualitative in-depth interviews with professionals and quantitative survey data from NGO professionals and representatives has allowed us to triangulate a vast sum of knowledge, experiences, and remarks on restorative justice and its suitability for anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination. Throughout the interviews, the crucial differences between conflicting viewpoints were contrasted by some of the more expert professionals, unveiling a series of seemingly irreconcilable perspectives on restorative justice, anti-LGBT hate crimes, and the intersection of both fields. First, key knowledge and practical gaps were detected and analysed, as NGO professionals, on the one hand, and restorative justice experts, on the other, had differing points of view and experiences regarding the services for LGBT victims and restorative measures, respectively. Second, the potential or theoretical use of restorative justice by the professionals, and even the very thought of it, were highly mediated by wider cultural views and legislation regarding restorative justice. The data from the survey confirms and further expands the insights from the qualitative interviews.

The comparison of the six participant countries unveiled key commonalities and differences regarding the existence of specific legislation — regarding anti-LGBT hate crimes or restorative justice, of already existing programmes and institutions, and relevant underlying trends, ideas, and cultural perspectives on issues such as sexual and gender diversity, restorative justice, and justice itself. Regarding SOGI-related legislation, for the specific protection of LGBT people, half of the participant countries (Belgium, The Netherlands, and Spain) have well-known legislation, in some cases with regional and even local development, and several related institutions or programmes, such as collaboration schemes between public administrations and NGOs. The other half of the participant countries (Bulgaria, Italy, and Poland), do not have specific legislation for anti-LGBT hate crimes, and as such they tend to be registered as other types of incidents, such as hooliganism.

Regarding restorative justice legislation, on the other countries, we find a continuum between those, such as The Netherlands, with a track record of legal developments and institutions, and those with limited transpositions of the EC Victim Directive, and without comprehensive legal instruments and institutions for restorative services. Countries such as Spain or Poland have more limited or reduced legal frameworks, but there are several key current experiences of restorative justice in specific cities and regions, under either public or

private initiatives. As with SOGI-related legislation, the existence of comprehensive laws or institutions do not exclude conflicting or negative views on the current state of each country, and the professionals highlighted in all countries the role of these smaller initiatives that have developed or are developing specific programmes and tools. Some of these include cooperation schemes between institutions and NGOs, whereas others include public programmes with which restorative services are provided throughout a city or region.

The role of individual initiatives and of personal relations was also analysed in regard to cooperation. While all professionals, from all backgrounds, underscored the relevance of cooperation as a key aspect of their work, different understandings and outcomes of cooperation could be found among their experiences. The political situation in Poland, for instance, was a determining factor regarding the relation between LGBT NGOs and most public administrations, whereas personal connections were described for specific prosecutors, police officers, or judges that were understood as allied or aligned by NGO professionals. The understanding of cooperation was heavily mediated by the different professionals' goals and experiences, and as such some gaps or divides could also be found regarding the intersection between LGBT-related professionals and restorative justice practitioners. A similar divide was explicitly found in regard to training, as most professionals were knowledgeable and had received training about either LGBT-related contents or restorative justice, but not both.

This knowledge and experience gap between different sets of professionals were analysed in more detail in some countries, such as Poland, in which key differences could be found even among restorative justice experts. Similarly, NGO professionals also differed in some key aspects, such as the role of official reports and denouncing, the role of other agents and institutions, the possibilities of restorative measures, and which factors or cases limited the application of said measures. The specific training and experience of each professional or set of professionals are clear factors for these differing views, but wider cultural stances and perspectives are also accountable for. For instance, professionals from Italy acknowledged the political and public risk of advocating for unpopular restorative measures, while professionals from most countries described the widespread nature of a punitive understanding of justice that limits even the imagination of restorative measures.

Other widespread factors that were found throughout the six participant countries were those of the lack of basic legal knowledge and the role of underreporting. The former was described by professionals from several countries, as the general public is broadly seen as disconnected from the necessary basic legal knowledge and information, including the range of rights to exercise and to benefit from. This lack of knowledge was understood as systemic, and a consequence linked to the lack of victim agency in traditional or punitive trials and justice institutions. The latter, the underreporting of anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination, was highlighted particularly by NGO professionals as a cause of more limited actions and possibilities for them, but also as an effect of the widespread habituation of LGBT victims to everyday forms of violence. The role of NGO professionals regarding this factor differed among the countries: while in most of them the NGO professionals were key advocates of official and formal reports and complaints — and as such were seen by other professionals as key participants from a punitive understanding of justice, in some countries the mistrust towards the justice system or a focus on psychological support could make them barriers for the reporting of incidents.

Besides the analysis of commonalities and differences between the stances and experiences regarding both anti-LGBT hate crimes and restorative measures, the research has also produced a series of recommendations and a series of existing practices and programmes to be taken into consideration in further stages of the research-action project. Several key principles or needs can be highlighted, such as the necessary role of cooperation between professionals from different backgrounds and experiences. The knowledge gap, particularly between NGO professionals and restorative justice practitioners, is a key element to be acknowledged, as the interviews have proven that different sets of professionals have different training needs, as well as some common ones. Another key principle or factor to be drawn from the research entails the role of geographical inequality: most participant countries have disparate restorative services that are only provided in some cities or regions, due to legal and political situations and backgrounds. The existence of network-based services and programmes, such as the restorative justice service in Catalonia and the victim support network in the Valencian Community, also in Spain, are key examples in this regard.

As for specific programmes and services that can be seen as good practices, they can be divided or organised depending on their type — training, specific activities, long-standing

programmes, and so on — and on their target — offenders, victims, general public, school settings, public administrations, etc. Some of these good practices, that can be found in Annex 3, are regional and local restorative justice services and restorative-based programmes as those found in the Netherlands, Belgium, Bulgaria, or Spain. These services depend either on public programmes devised or commissioned by public administrations, whereas other ones depend on individual or private initiatives, frequently starting from universities or scholars. A different series of good practices are cooperation schemes between police forces, public administrations, and LGBT NGOs regarding the support and investigation after anti-LGBT hate crimes and incidents. Within these practices there are also specific tools and instruments used for the reporting of crimes, the communication between victims and public administrations, and more settings, that have been designed after thorough analyses and collaboration processes. Finally, several key good practices, with a restorative core or understanding, are those reparation and rehabilitation practices, particularly for anti-LGBT cases and other hate crimes. These practices include community service with NGOs, diversity and sensitivity training, and some specific practices that include audio-visual products such as films, surrogate contacts with victims, and more tailored solutions.

References

Abbamonte, L., and Cavaliere, F. (2016). "Restorative Justice, a comparative analysis of discursive practices: Dialogistic exchanges in the USA and Italy. In G. Tessuto e C. Williams (Eds.), *Language in the Negotiation of Justice: Contexts, Issues and Applications*. Ashgate Publishing.

Aertsen, I. (2015). "Belgium (country report)". In Dünkel, F., Grzywa-Holten, J., Horsfield, P. (2015). (Eds.), *Restorative justice and mediation in penal matters. A stock-taking of legal issues, implementation strategies and outcomes in 36 European countries. Volume1*. Forum Verlag Godesberg, Mönchengladbach.

Aguilar, M.A. (dir.) (2015). *Manual práctico para la investigación y enjuiciamiento de delitos de odio y discriminación*. Barcelona: Centre d'Estudis Jurídics i Formació Especialitzada, Generalitat de Catalunya.

Bernardi, A. (2014). *Il progetto di ricerca "prison overcrowding and alternatives to detention": contesto e linee programmatiche*. Riv. It. Dir. Proc. Pen. 1739ff.

Bove, V. (2014). *L'istituto della messa alla prova "per gli adulti": indicazioni operative per il giudice e provvedimenti adottabili* (27 November 2014).

Dünkel, F., Grzywa-Holten, J., Horsfield, P. (eds.) (2015). *Restorative justice and mediation in penal matters. A stock-taking of legal issues, implementation strategies and outcomes in 36 European countries. Volume 1*. Forum Verlag Godesberg, Mönchengladbach.

Eeckhout, B. and Paternotte, D. (2011). "A Paradise for LGBT Rights? The Paradox of Belgium". *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58(8).

Mannozi, G. (2016). *Le aperture alla giustizia riparativa nell'ambito delle misure alternative alla detenzione*, in Giur. It., 1530ff.

Martínez, M^a C. (nd). "La prohibición de la mediación en los supuestos de violencia de género: una apuesta por la flexibilidad aplicable a ciertos contextos de violencia". *Laboratorio de Sociología Jurídica de la Universidad de Zaragoza*. Available at:

<https://sociologiajuridica.unizar.es/presentacion>

Parlato L. (2017). "Restorative justice and criminal proceedings in Italy". In C.D. Spinellis, N. Theodorakis, E. Billis, G. Papadimitrakopoulos (Eds.), *Europe in Crisis: Crime, Criminal Justice, and the Way Forward. Essays in Honour of Nestor Courakis*, II, (p. 1841ff.). II. Ant. N. Sakkoulas.

Picotti L. (2002). Giudice di pace e nuovi strumenti di diritto penale sostanziale per una giustizia conciliativa. Considerazioni introduttive. in L. Picotti & G. Spangher (Eds.), *Verso Una*

Giustizia Penale ‘Conciliativa’? Il volto delineato dalla legge sulla competenza penale del giudice di pace.

Ruiz, J. (2020). “Breve aproximación a la justicia restaurativa en el sistema penal español. Recomendación CM/rec (2018)”. *Derecho Penal*, 07/02/2020. Available at:

<http://noticias.juridicas.com/conocimiento/articulos-doctrinales/14876-breveaproximacion-a-la-justicia-restaurativa-en-el-sistema-penal-espanol-recomendacion-cm-rec-2018>

Rosales Pedrero, S.M^a (2017). “La introducción de la justicia restaurativa en el sistema jurídico penal”. *Actas del II Congreso Internacional de la Fundación Internacional de Ciencias Penales*. Available at:

<https://ficp.es/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Rosales-Pedrero.-Comunicaci%C3%B3n.pdf>

Van der Aa, Clasesen, and Hofmann (2020). *Speciale behoeften van slachtoffers van hate crime ten aanzien van het strafproces en slachtofferhulp’ (Special needs of hate crime victims in the context of criminal proceedings and victim support)*. WODC: Ministry of Justice and Security.

ANNEXES

Annex 1. Qualitative analysis. Profiles of professionals interviewed

No	Country	Organization	Services provided by the organization	Role of the interviewee
1	Belgium	CAW, Health organization	Health services	Mediator/ sexologist
2	Belgium	Office of the Minister of Equal Opportunities	Developing policies related to discrimination and racism	Legal advisor
3	Belgium	Ligand	Provision of trainings on education and youth care with a focus on conflict resolution	Trainer
4	Belgium	Diversity department of the Federal Police		Advisor
5	Belgium	Mediante	Restorative justice (dialogues) services	Mediator
6	Belgium	UNIA	Support for LGBT victims' rights	
7	Belgium	UNIA	Support for LGBT victims' rights	
8	Belgium	Politiezone Antwerpen (PZA)	Protection to citizens living in Antwerp	Diversity officer
9	Belgium	Transgender Infopunt & Centra voor Algemeen Welzijn (CAW East Flanders)	TIP: Providing information on trans topic CAW East Flanders: Providing general wellbeing services for inhabitants	TIP: First contact person CAW: Provides information towards CAW staff on trans topic
10	Belgium	Institute for the Equality of Women and Men (IGVM)	Guaranteeing and promoting gender equality and combatting any form of gender-based discrimination	Legal file manager
11	Belgium	Lumi vzw	Helpline for people who have questions related to LGBT sexuality, identity, and gender	Manager
12	Belgium	Alba vzw	Restorative justice for kids and youth	Mediator
13	Belgium	Moderator vzw	Victim-offender mediation	Mediator
14	Belgium	Merhaba vzw	Empower LGBT+ people with a migration background	Management

15	Belgium	A-Law International Law Firm	Legal services	Lawyer
16	Bulgaria	Bulgarian Helsinki Committee	Supervision of spaces for imprisonment - prisons, arrests; legal support for prisoners and other vulnerable groups - ethnic, religious, LGBTI, women, children, migrants. Receiving complaints from prisoners, mostly asking for legal support or advocacy, related to concrete cases. Protection and prevention of torture in imprisonment spaces. Projects, related to criminal justice and hate crimes,	Lawyer, researcher, project coordinator
17	Bulgaria	South-West University "Neofit Rilski" and Institute of Conflict Resolution	South-West University - education; Institute of Conflict Resolution - Academic program, consultancy and trainings for mediators	Professor, teaching Criminal proceedings and alternative dispute resolution. Expert in Criminal procedural law at South-West University. Chairperson of the Board at the Institute of Conflict Resolution
18	Bulgaria	UNICEF Bulgaria	UNICEF in Bulgaria team is devoted to achieving a sustainable impact through the following programme components: Early Childhood Development Child care and support for families Prevention and response to Violence against children Access to Justice for Children Education Adolescents Children on the move Monitoring Child Rights Communication and public advocacy Resource mobilization	Access to Justice Officer

19	Bulgaria	La Conference and PF Bulgaria	La Conference: consultations for organizations on dealing with crisis, implementation of RJ in business, group dynamic trainings, trainings on restorative practices, psychotherapy, promotion of RJ; PF Bulgaria: Restorative programs for prisoners, and underaged perpetrators, trainings on RJ	La Conference: Manager; PF Bulgaria: Board member
20	Bulgaria	Gilma Corporation and private law firm	Gilma Corporation: Mediation, facilitation, trainings on mediation, facilitation and RJ; Private law firm: Legal services, mediation, facilitation	Gilma Corporation: trainer,, mediator, facilitator; private law firm: owner, lawyer, mediator
21	Bulgaria	Member of the Association on Psychotherapy and the Center for Settlements and Mediation at Sofia Regional Court. Private practice as psychotherapist	Mediation; in the private practice: psychological support	Mediator, psychotherapist
22	Bulgaria	Social Activities and Practice Institute	Social services in 4 cities: 2 center for children victims of violence using the Barnahus model: providing legal support, health services, social services; 2 centers for public support; center for support of children and families, crisis centers, center for working with homeless children; programs for children in high risk behaviours who are in conflict with the law; trainings on RJ; research;	Program Director "International programs and projects, international activities, analysis and children's participation"
23	Bulgaria	Crime Prevention Fund - IGA	Programs on support of prisoners and former prisoners based on restorative methods; trainings on restorative method	Research and analysis expert, legal expert, international projects manager
24	Bulgaria	Tulip Foundation	Funding and trainings for organizations on FGC	Director
25	Bulgaria	New Bulgarian University; National RJ conference	Education; Awareness raising, Research	Teacher; Organizer
26	Bulgaria	Institute for Mediation and Conflict Management	- Mediation for people who need to solve conflicts (family, commercial) - Informational sessions	Chair, board member,, outside of the organization: mediator, trainer for mediators

			for parents on how their conflicts affect their children - Research	
27	Bulgaria	Freelancer, member of non-formal community of RJ professionals	Mediation, Facilitation, Trainings	Mediator, facilitator
28	Bulgaria	Center for Study of Democracy	Research, Legal program	Senior analyst at the Law program
29	Bulgaria	Professional Association of Mediators in Bulgaria	Mediation, conflict solving services, trainings	Mediator, Mediation trainer
30	Bulgaria	Bulgarian Prisoners' Association	Legal support, awareness raising	Founder (working voluntarily)
31	Bulgaria	Appellate Court Sofia	Justice services	Judge
32	Bulgaria	Regional Court - Lukovit	Justice services	Judge
33	Italy	Arcigay	Support and advocacy for LGBT People	Member of the national board
34	Italy	ACET	Support, advocacy and awareness raising activities for Trans people	Member of the board and criminal mediator
35	Italy	Mediator	Criminal Mediation	RJ Professional
36	Italy	Employee in the Penitentiary System	Justice services	Working in a central administration office
37	Italy	Progetto COnTatto	Restorative Community	Founder
38	Italy	Gabbiano Onlus	Housing and support to minorities	Founder
39	Italy	Spondé	RJ services	Founder and RJ professional
40	Italy	RJ Professional – Team Restorative Practices UNI Sassari	RJ paths	Coordinator
41	Italy	Retelenford	Advocacy of LGBT people's rights	Treasuries and lawyer
42	Italy	RJ Professional	Education – RJ paths	Professor
43	Italy	Caritas Italiana	Social inclusion	Employee
44	Italy	RJ Professional	Restorative practices	Psychologist, founder of RJ Communities
45	Italy	Mediator	Juvenile Criminal Mediation	RJ Professional in Juvenile Justice
46	Italy	Cooperativa L'Ovile	Social inclusion services – RJ services	Responsible for the mediation service

47	Italy	Retelenford	Advocacy of LGBT people's rights	Associate - Lawyer
48	Italy	Mediator	Mediation	Mediator (family and VOM)
49	The Netherlands	Centre of Expertise for Public Safety and Criminal Justice, Avans University of Applied Sciences	Research, education and link with the relevance for practice	Lector/professor of Safety in dependency relationships
50	The Netherlands	Victims Support Netherlands (Slachtoffershulp Nederland)	It helps victims: emotional support, support in the criminal process and help to recover the damage	Project leader of the department Knowledge, Development and Research
51	The Netherlands	Victims Support Netherlands 9Slachtoffershulp Nederland)	It helps victims: emotional support, support in the criminal process and help to recover the damage	Head of Department Knowledge, Development and Research
52	The Netherlands	Transgender Network Netherlands (TNN)	Working on making society more inclusive for trans persons: representing the interests of transgender people (bringing in the sight of civil society organizations and government), empowerment/emancipation of transgender community, network building	Director
53	The Netherlands	COC Netherlands	Advocating the rights of lesbian women, gay men, bisexuals and transgenders (LGBT's). COC strives for the decriminalization of sexual orientation and gender identity and for equal rights, emancipation and social acceptance of LGBT's in the Netherlands and all over the world	General affairs officer
54	The Netherlands	Custodial Institutions Agency, Ministry of Justice and Security	Its most important task is realizing the detention of convicted individuals in order to ensure that justice is served in order to ensure a safer society. In addition, DJI is responsible for the day-to-day care of the detainees and their rehabilitation	Restorative advisor at two penal institutions (Arnhem and Nieuwegein)
55	The Netherlands	Movisie	It is offering a comprehensive approach of social issues. Together with people in practice they develop and implement knowledge of what really works well. One of the prominent theme's is LGBT	Program manager of Rainbow cities

			emancipation	
56	The Netherlands	Movisie	It is offering a comprehensive approach of social issues. Together with people in practice they develop and implement knowledge of what really works well. One of the prominent theme's is LGBT emancipation	Advisor for rainbow cities/suicide prevention/inclusive policies for local governments
57	The Netherlands	Restorative Justice Netherlands (RJN)	Promoting a more participatory and communicative society by supporting citizens to maintain control and grip on the conflict (or the nature of the underlying problems), its consequences and its possible resolution or settlement in the event of crimes and other conflicts. The ultimate goal is to restore relationships and damage from the triple perspective of victim, perpetrator and community, wherever possible	Co-founder
58	The Netherlands	NSCR Amsterdam/Leuven Institute of Criminology/KU Leuven/Tilburg University	Research and education and policy. Interested in Trying to achieve societal impact in the area of RJ or victims issues	Senior researcher/professor of RJ/Professor of Victimology
59	The Netherlands	Stichting Ondersteboven	Works on visibility and reinforcement of women with a different sexuality and/or (gender) identity. Strive for equal rights	Founder of the organization
60	The Netherlands	Maastricht University	Academic organization: mainly research, education	Senior lecturer in criminal law and criminal procedure; Professor on RJ
61	The Netherlands	Antidiscrimination bureau Radar	Giving advice and support to the reporters; provide trainings and workshops; research on equal treatment; registration of reports of discrimination incidents; advising policy	Trainer/coach, prevention employee
62	The Netherlands	Mediation agency of court and tribunal in Den Bosch	Offering mediation in criminal cases	Mediation officer
63	The Netherlands	Perspective on victim-offender mediation (Perspectief	Organizes victim offender mediations in the Netherlands. The most important target is the emotional restoration of	Policy advisor

		Herstelbemiddeling)	victim/offender	
64	The Netherlands	Police, unit Pink in Blue	National police network with a hotline for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LHBTI+) persons facing discrimination, threats, mistreatment or other criminal issues related to their sexual orientation or gender identity.	Police officer: domestic violence, honour violence LGBTI related crimes, ambassador of Pink in Blue (hot line)
65	The Netherlands	BI+ Netherlands	Doesn't provide defined services yet	Board member
66	The Netherlands	Public Prosecution Office (OM) Zeeland-West Brabant: mediation in criminal cases	In addition to the criminal prosecution of perpetrators, victim care is a core element of the comprehensive human trafficking strategy. Provides professional support to victims in exercising their rights during criminal proceedings by informing, advising and supporting them	Contact person mediation in criminal cases
67	Poland	Court Watch Poland Foundation – Fundacja Court Watch Polska	NGO of the national scale aimed at analysis of the work of the courts: court monitoring by trained volunteers participating in court hearings to check whether rights of all parties are properly executed; publishing reports on the above activities; educational activities aimed at judges and a wider public (e.g. schools); establishing restorative justice centers to act as intermediaries between the court and its social environment, to assist with penitentiary diagnosing of perpetrators, to advocate mediation, and to organize an execution of penalty in a form of community work.	A founder and a Chairperson of the Court Watch Poland Foundation.
68	Poland	The Culture of Equality Association – Stowarzyszenie Kultura Równości	LGBT NGO based in Wroclaw, Lower Silesia province, with a wide range of activities: LGBT+ community integration (e.g. a support group for non-heteronormative women); networking; running of the LGBT+ Centre Wroclaw; educational and cultural initiatives (e.g. debates, conferences and anti-discrimination trainings);	A Member of the Culture of Equality Association Board, an educator, a trainer.

			advocacy and public interventions in cooperation with lawyers; consultation for the LGBT+ in areas related to hate crimes and discrimination; psychological assistance for the LGBT+; annual organization of the Festival of Equal Rights with the March of Equality in Wrocław.	
69	Poland	Signs of Equality Federation – Federacja Znaki Równości	An umbrella LGBT+ organization established by 8 Polish LGBT-related organizations mostly from Lesser Poland and Upper Silesia regions, based in Cracow, aimed at building open and diverse society: acting against prejudice and discrimination (particularly in the area of gender and sexuality); political networking; community integration (e.g. enhancing cooperation between informal groups and NGOs); LGBT+ empowerment; providing safe space for LGBT+ persons (e.g. House EQ – Cracow Equality Center/ <i>DOM EQ – Krakowskie Centrum Równości</i>); educational and cultural activities; psychological and legal assistance to the victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination provided by 10 psychologists and 7 lawyers cooperating with the Federation.	A Chairperson of the Signs of Equality Federation Board
70	Poland	Polish Mediation Center, branch in Słupsk – Polskie Centrum Mediacji, Oddział w Słupsku	The largest Polish association gathering over 1000 mediators in over 50 branches across the country established by people who brought idea of mediation to Poland: mediations in civil, family, labor, criminal and juvenile criminal cases; developing members' skills in mediation by participating in conferences, workshops and trainings; organization of meetings, conferences, trainings and other events promoting the idea of mediation; providing free consultations for courts, prosecutor's offices, and the Commissioner for Human Rights Office and Field Offices; organization of social campaigns;	A court mediator and a mediation trainer with 16-year-long experience.

			publishing of the only Polish magazine of this type, <i>Mediator</i> ; a member of European Forum for Restorative Justice; participant of EU-funded international programs.	
71	Poland	Lower Silesian Association of Probation Officers – Frontis – Dolnośląskie Stowarzyszenie Kuratorów Sądowych Frontis	Professional NGO of regional level involved in: building a modern court guardianship; raising funds for training; implementing modern working methods; cooperating with NGOs; providing legal education program organized by the District Courts in Wrocław; organizing conferences; supporting the local public safety system; building a positive image of the Probation Judicial Service in Poland; improving citizens' trust in courts; running an Internet website to gather information on events related directly or indirectly to court guardianship; the organization is a strategic partner of the Wrocław Centre of Restorative Justice (<i>Wrocławskie Centrum Sprawiedliwości Naprawczej</i>) and a member of the European Forum for Restorative Justice; it participates in the EU-funded project "Restorative Justice: Strategies for Change".	A Vice-President of Frontis, a probation officer with 20-year-long experience.
72	Poland	Iris Association – Stowarzyszenie Tęczówka	LGBT+ NGO based in Katowice, Upper Silesia province, member of the Signs of Equality Federation (PL-P-3), aimed at integration of LGBT+ community: integrating events; networking; legal and psychological consultations; public education aimed at combating discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation and gender identity by the use of workshops, lectures, meetings and publication of educational materials; cultural activities.	Pro bono solicitors in the Iris Association.
73	Poland	Province of Equality – Prowincja Równości	LGBT+ NGO with 7 active members, based in Kielce, Holy Cross region aimed at LGBT+ community integration: consultations for the LGBT+ (e.g.	An anti-discrimination trainer active in the association for 5 years and performing organizational roles.

			<p>help in getting in touch with a psychotherapist or a lawyer); networking; educational and cultural activities; increasing public visibility of the LGBT+; organizing the first March of Equality in Kielce, which took place in 2019.</p>	
74	Poland	Never Again Association – Stowarzyszenie Nigdy Więcej	<p>Non-governmental organizational active at the national level and involved in preventing and combating racism, antisemitism, homophobia and neo-fascism: educational activities, such as national and international conferences, workshops, debates, and meetings; monitoring of occurrences, incidents and crimes of the above mentioned nature; annual publication of “The Brown Book” (<i>Brunatna księga</i>) – the only detailed report on cases of physical assaults, hate speech, and other acts of discrimination in Poland; facilitating contact of victims of hate crime with relevant organizations offering legal and psychological assistance;</p> <p>social campaigns; patronage over initiatives against homophobia etc.; cooperation with mass media to co-create public debate in Poland; it cooperates with the UN, the OSCE and the Council of Europe; participates in international anti-racist networks: UNITED for Intercultural Action, Football against Racism in Europe (FARE), Helsinki Citizens' Assembly (HCA), International Network Against Cyber Hate (INACH) and Anti-fascist Network for Research and Education (Antifanet).</p>	An activist of Never Again Association for 11 years, a co-editor of “The Brown Book”.
75	Poland	Association for Preventive Health Care One World – Stowarzyszenie Profilaktyki Zdrowotnej Jeden Świat	A non-governmental organization based in Cracow with activities addressing Lesser Poland and Subcarpathian region: health education (e.g. for imprisoned persons); trainings addressed both to people living with HIV (e.g. those who wants to have	A Chairperson of the Board, a therapist.

			children) and to people who want to work in the area of HIV/AIDS prevention; preventive measures concerning especially HIV/AIDS; research and analyses on social aspects of living with HIV; running HIV testing clinics; supporting people living with HIV; it is a part of the Signs of Equality Federation (PL-P-3) to contribute with its knowledge and LGBT-friendly psychiatric and psychotherapeutic staff.	
76	Poland	Lambda Warsaw Association – Stowarzyszenie Lambda Warszawa	One of the largest and the oldest Polish LGBT NGO based in Warsaw, involved in a wide range of activities: support for LGBT people, their friends and families, and for professionals working in the area of LGBT-related issues; psychological counselling in a form of short- and long-term psychotherapy; support and meeting groups for LGBT people with various needs; legal advice on criminal, civil and family law; educational and cultural activities; social campaigns and lobbying; publishing reports; running a national helpline; used to run a hostel, but it was closed down due to the lack of funding.	Until February 2020, a long-term Member of the Lambda Warsaw Association Board, currently is not involved in the organization's activities, a lawyer, the author and co-author of numerous publications on hate crimes (including anti-LGBT crimes) in Poland.
77	Poland	The Association for Legal Intervention – Stowarzyszenie Interwencji Prawnej	Non-governmental organization based in Warsaw offering: legal and social assistance to migrants residing in Poland; professional, free of charge legal counselling for foreigners in the field of migration, asylum, human rights, discrimination or abuse in the workplace; support of interpreters during visits to the doctor's practice, while submitting an application, during interviews at the province office or in other matters of everyday life; advocacy measures to ensure respect for the rights of foreigners and improve their situation in Poland; its activities are linked to anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination only in cases of LGBT migrants and refugees; the organization was previously involved also in other	One of the association's founders, for 14 years the President of the Association for Legal Intervention, for a year now is a Member of the Management Board, a lawyer and a criminologist.

			fields of activities, related to foster families, persons deprived of liberty, human rights protection and RJ (it ran a mediation center).	
78	Poland	Center of Research on Mediation and Other Alternative Dispute Resolution in the Public Sphere, unit at the Faculty of Law, Administration and Economics of the University of Wrocław – Pracownia Badań nad Mediacjami i Innymi Alternatywnymi Metodami Rozwiązywania Sporów w Sferze Publicznej, jednostka na Wydziale Prawa, Administracji i Ekonomii Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego	The university unit aimed at studying various aspects of mediation in the public sphere; publishing research; organizing conferences; participating in the EU-funded international projects.	A founder and the Head of the Center of Research on Mediation and Other Alternative Dispute Resolution in the Public Sphere, a research coordinator, researching mediation from 2005.
79	Poland	Team for Restorative Justice by the Mayor of Wrocław – Zespół ds. Sprawiedliwości Naprawczej przy Prezydencie Wrocławia	The Team is affiliated to the Office of the Mayor with the aim of enabling Wrocław to join the group of Restorative Cities (a project related to EFRJ); its activities comprise promoting and educating on RJ (e.g. penalty of restriction of liberty, mediation) and coordinating activities of various organizations working with RJ in Wrocław.	A Member of the Team for Restorative Justice who convinced the Mayor of Wrocław to appoint this team, the Social Advisor of the Mayor of Wrocław on Tolerance and Combating Xenophobia (<i>Doradca społeczny Prezydenta Wrocławia ds. Tolerancji i Przeciwdziałania Ksenofobii</i>), a solicitor.
80	Poland	Province Police Headquarters in Wrocław – Komenda Wojewódzka Policji we Wrocławiu	The Police ensures public safety; maintaining safety and public order (e.g. securing Marches of Equality); crime prevention; and in the case of the function represented by the interviewee, in particular preventing and combating hate crimes, including anti-LGBT hate crimes.	Plenipotentiary of the Province Police Commander for Human Rights Protection (<i>Pełnomocnik Komendanta Wojewódzkiego Policji ds. Ochrony Praw Człowieka</i>), who provides hate crime monitoring; analysis of human rights violations; cooperation with minorities (e.g. by participating in Human Library, in LGBT-related events); trainings (e.g. related to anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination, RJ); in the police force for 24 years.
81	Poland	Wrocław Integration Center – Wrocławskie	WIC is a budgetary unit of the Wrocław commune, a part of the Department of Social Affairs of	Task Coordinator for Work for the Local Community – Wrocław Center for Restorative Justice (<i>Koordynatorka</i>

		Centrum Integracji, task: Wrocław Center for Restorative Justice – Wrocławskie Centrum Sprawiedliwości Naprawczej	the Municipal Office (<i>Departament Spraw Społecznych Urzędu Miejskiego</i>) and provides assistance activities targeted at specific people (e.g. in a crisis of homelessness, unemployment), largely based on the Act on Social Employment (<i>Ustawa o Zatrudnieniu Socjalnym</i>): in-service training courses; social or professional reintegration courses; support of a psychologist and a lawyer; WCRJ is a task of the WIC aimed at organizing the penalty of restriction of liberty, which includes removing hateful symbols and inscriptions from public space; a large part of reported cases concerns LGBT.	<i>Zadania Praca Dla Lokalnej Społeczności – Wrocławskie Centrum Sprawiedliwości Naprawczej</i> .
82	Poland	Department of Public Administration System, Institute of Administrative Sciences of the University of Wrocław, Full-time Doctoral Studies in Legal Sciences – Zakład Ustroju Administracji Publicznej, Instytut Nauk Administracyjnych Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Stacjonarne Studia Doktoranckie Nauk Prawnych	The university unit related to law studies involved in teaching public administration, didactic activities, conducting scientific research.	A co-worker of the Center of Research on Mediation and Other Alternative Dispute Resolution in the Public Sphere, a doctoral candidate working on LGBT-related issues: the targets of hate speech (including the LGBT) among young people; the impact of same-sex partnership on correlations with public administration; and social family rights of persons living in same-sex relationships.
83	Poland	The interviewee did not agree to give the name of the organization in publications based on the interview.		A lawyer who deals with cases in the field of criminal and penitentiary law.
84	Poland	The Equal Treatment Team by the Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights in Warsaw – Zespół ds. Równego Traktowania przy Biurze Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich	The Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights in Warsaw protects citizens against violations by public authorities regarding fundamental rights and freedoms; the Equal Treatment Team is responsible for monitoring the implementation of actions in the field of equal treatment; this includes LGBT-	The Director of the Equal Treatment Team who coordinates the work of a 10-person team, responsible for ensuring the implementation of tasks and the organization of work; represents the Commissioner in court cases; involved in this activity for 13 years.

		w Warszawie	related issues.	
85	Poland	House of Peace Foundation – Fundacja Dom Pokoju	The NGO based in Wrocław, the Lower Silesia province which provides mediations (including peer mediations), education, and information campaigns; operates in the area of conflict transformation on multiple levels, from individual conflicts to conflicts concerning entire communities; offers programs to companies, local governments (including Wrocław municipality) etc.; a member of the Lower Silesian Center for Dialog (<i>Dolnośląski Ośrodek Dialogu</i>) active in Lower Silesian, Lubusz, and Opole provinces; it has its representative in the Team for Restorative Justice by the President of Wrocław.	The Vice-Chairperson of the House of Peace Foundation, a coordinator of the Mediation Emergency Service (<i>Pogotowie Mediacyjne</i>), one of coordinators of the Roma program, an educator, has an experience with working with crime victims, involved with mediations for about 8 years.
86	Poland	Lower Silesian Province Office in Wrocław – Dolnośląski Urząd Wojewódzki we Wrocławiu	The Lower Silesian Province Office in Wrocław ensures that the province governor can perform statutory tasks in spheres such as public safety, education and health, among others.	The Plenipotentiary of the Lower Silesian Province Governor for Equal Treatment (<i>Pełnomocnik Wojewody Dolnośląskiego ds. Równego Traktowania</i>) who held this office for 2-3 years, until the end of 2015; her activities were related to issues such as discrimination, mobbing and violence; she provided trainings on implementation of equal treatment, both to the office employees and outside the office; the interviewee neither wanted to talk about her current place of employment, nor agreed to name it in publications based on the interview.
87	Poland	“Salus” Mental Health Clinic in Długoleka – Poradnia Zdrowia Psychicznego “Salus” w Długolece	The “Salus” Mental Health Clinic in Długoleka (at the outskirts of Wrocław, the Lower Silesia province) is a private clinic offering long-term psychotherapy and psychiatric treatment.	A psychotherapist of the Polish Psychiatric Association (<i>Polskie Towarzystwo Psychiatryczne</i>), a specialist in addiction therapy, who has been working also with LGBT clients.
88	Spain	ALAS/ Observatorio Coruñés contra a LGTBifobia	Training, psychological attention, mediation with public administration, counselling	On-and-off hired specialist, otherwise a volunteer
89	Spain	Àrea per a la Igualtat de Tracte i No-discriminació de Persones Lesbianes, Gais, Bisexuals, Transgènere i Intersexuals (LGBTI),	Supervising the fulfilment of the LGBTI Law, analysing grants and funds, liaison with other public agencies, support to social movements	Chief responsible

		DG Igualtat Generalitat		
90	Spain	Arcópoli/Observatori o Madrileño contra la Homofobia, Bifobia y Transfobia	Victim attention with psychological, social work and legal teams.	Social psychologist
91	Spain	FELGTB (Lawyer)	Counselling to victims, information on their rights, and support from a group of lawyers on the rights and possible proceedings	Coordinator of the legal team
92	Spain	FELGTB (victim support)	Counselling to victims, information on their rights, and support from a group of lawyers on the rights and possible proceedings	Coordinator of the victim support services
93	Spain	Equality Ministry, Directorate General for Sexual Diversity and LGBTI Rights	Development of Spain-wide laws and policies towards full equality for LGBTI people and free development of sexual and gender diversity	Technical adviser for LGBTI policies
94	Spain	Fiscalía de Delitos de Odio en Barcelona (Public prosecutor for hate crimes)	Public prosecution of hate crimes in Barcelona	Head of the public prosecution for hate crimes in Barcelona
95	Spain	Sociedad científica de justicia restaurativa (Restorative Justice Scientific Society), linked to Amepax (RJ services in Castille and Leon)	Research, analysis, RJ programmes with penal and penitentiary settings, counselling for public and private entities	Society's president. Programme manager and facilitator
96	Spain	Instituto de Mediación – Psychologists of Madrid, and RJ and mediation practices with minors	Mediation, RJ services	Psychologist and RJ practitioner
97	Spain	Kifkif	Legal, health, psychosocial counselling. Within the legal services they also manage asylum and residence claims	Coordinator of the legal team
98	Spain	Intrajudicial Mediation Service of the Universidad Carlos III de Madrid (UC3M)	Mediation and RJ services for the courts in Getafe and Leganés (Madrid)	Head of the service and Law professor in the UC3M

99	Spain	Àrea de Reparació i d'Atenció a la Víctima, Departament de Justícia de la Generalitat de Catalunya (Area of Victims Compensation and Support, Department of Justice of the Generalitat de Catalunya)	Programme of Restorative Justice Victim Support Offices	Head of the Area of Victims Compensation and Support
100	Spain	Àrea de Reparació i d'Atenció a la Víctima, Departament de Justícia de la Generalitat de Catalunya (Area of Victims Compensation and Support, Dept of Justice of the Generalitat de Catalunya)	Programme of Restorative Justice Victim Support Offices	Coordinator of the Programme of Restorative Justice
101	Spain	Xarxa d'oficines d'assistència a les víctimes del delictes, Generalitat Valenciana (Network of crime victim support offices)	Psychological, legal and social support for crime victims	Lawyer at the Castelló office
102	Spain	Servicio Vasco de Justicia Restaurativa (Basque RJ service)	Intrajudicial mediation, RJ services	Chief of the RJ part of IRSE-EBI
103	Spain	Diversitat/ Observatori Valencià contra la LGTBfòbia	Legal and psychological support	Lawyer
104	Spain	Diversitat/ Observatori Valencià contra la LGTBfòbia	Legal and psychological support	Psychologist

Annex 2. Quantitative analysis. Survey data

Part A: Socio-demographic questions

A.1 How old are you?

<i>N=212</i>	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
M (SD)	40,11 (9,609)	40,24 (11,959)	42,67 (12,297)	46,31 (13,778)	38,86 (14,130)	38,34 (10,707)	41,44 (12,327)

Age range 16-71 years old.

A.2 What is your highest educational qualification?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
MA or combined BA/MA	6	15	21	17	6	24	89	37,3
BA	3	25	6	18	3	8	63	26,4
Post-secondary education	4	6	9	4	2	3	28	11,7
Secondary education	1	4	5	0	3	4	17	7,1
PhD	4	1	2	2	0	8	17	7,1
<i>Missing data</i>	2	9	3	2	2	5	23	9,6
Other (*)	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0,8
Total	20	60	46	44	16	53	239	100%

A.3 What is your country of birth?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
Poland	0	0	0	0	0	48	48	20,1
Netherlands	0	0	0	40	2	0	42	17,6
Italy	0	0	41	0	0	0	41	17,2
Spain	0	37	0	0	0	0	37	15,5
Bulgaria	18	0	0	0	0	0	18	7,5
Belgium	0	0	0	1	11	0	12	5,0
Other (*)	0	14	2	1	1	0	18	7,5
<i>Missing data</i>	2	9	3	2	2	5	23	9,6
Total	20	60	46	44	16	53	239	100%

A.4 What gender do you identify with?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
Men	8	29	22	24	7	17	107	44,8
Women	10	17	19	16	5	29	96	40,2
Would rather not say	0	2	1	0	1	0	4	1,7
Other (*)	0	4	1	1	1	2	9	3,7
<i>Missing data</i>	2	8	3	3	2	5	23	9,6
Total	20	60	46	44	16	53	239	100%

A.5 What is your sexual orientation?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
Gay / Lesbian	3	28	30	25	5	21	112	46,9
Heterosexual	14	18	10	7	5	13	67	28,0
Bisexual	0	2	2	5	3	10	22	9,2
Would rather not say	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	1,7
Other (*)	0	0	1	3	1	3	8	3,3
<i>Missing data</i>	3	9	3	4	2	5	26	10,9
Total	20	60	46	44	16	53	239	100%

A.6 What is your religion?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
No religion (atheistic, agnostic)	5	29	23	28	8	28	121	50,2
Christian (Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox,...)	10	13	15	10	4	12	64	26,8
Would rather not say	2	4	1	0	1	5	13	5,4
Jewish	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0,8
Muslim	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0,8
Other (*)	1	3	3	3	0	3	13	5,4
Missing data	2	9	3	2	3	5	24	10,0
Total	20	60	46	44	16	53	239	100%

A.7 On an ideological scale, where 1 is far-right and 10 far-left, where would you position yourself?

N=213	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
M (SD)	5,76 (1,751)	7,33 (1,381)	7,00 (1,746)	7,00 (1,361)	7,71 (1,684)	7,67 (1,419)	7,18 (1,577)

Part B: Organizational questions

B.2. In what country is the headquarters where you work?

Headquarters In:	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
Spain	0	42	0	0	0	0	42	17,6
Poland	0	0	0	0	0	39	39	16,3
Netherlands	0	0	0	36	0	0	36	15,1
Italy	0	0	26	0	0	0	26	10,9
Bulgaria	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	7,1
Belgium	1	0	0	0	11	0	12	5,0
Other: At multiple Countries / USA	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	1,2
Total	18	43	26	37	11	40	175	100%

B.3 In what anti-discrimination field and/or promotion of civil rights does your organization work in?

	N=198 (+)	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
LGBT NGO		3	23	15	25	7	26	99
Transversal NGO (all types discrimination)		10	20	8	19	3	20	80
Race/ethnicity		5	18	3	10	5	12	53
Religion		0	2	6	9	4	9	30
Aporophobia, social exclusion		3	8	3	9	3	7	33
Other		4	5	4	9	3	5	30

Multi-response (N=198).

B.4 What is the scope of your organization?

	N=198	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
International		6	5	4	8	1	6	30
National		14	16	15	18	7	23	93

Regional	3	19	5	24	6	16	73
Local	3	12	10	8	4	9	46

B.5 How many locations does your organization have?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
1	11	23	16	21	8	23	102
2	1	5	1	4	0	6	17
3-10	2	3	0	3	3	5	18
More than 10	3	8	5	9	0	0	25
I don't know	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Other (*)	1	2	0	1	0	5	9

B.6 Is your organization funded with public funds?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
No	7	10	14	4	0	20	55	32,0
Yes, partially	7	29	12	19	5	17	89	51,7
Yes, totally	4	3	1	13	6	1	28	16,3
Total	18	42	27	36	11	38	172	100%

B.7 Does your organization collaborate with public administrations in the provision of services?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
Yes	9	33	13	33	9	14	111	65,3
No	9	9	11	4	1	25	59	34,7
Total	18	42	24	37	10	39	170	100%

B.8 How would you describe the location of your organization where you work?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
In a big city (more than 1.500.000 of inhabitants)	13	14	9	8	2	14	60	34,9
In a medium city (from 300.000 to 1.500.000)	3	12	7	16	6	16	60	34,9
In a town or a small city (from 30.000 to 300.000)	2	13	11	11	3	7	47	27,3
A country village (less than 30.000 inhabitants)	0	2	1	1	0	1	5	2,9
Total	18	41	28	36	11	38	172	100%

B.9 What is your role in the organization?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
Executive worker	4	17	2	22	7	6	58	33,7
President (non-executive)	2	4	1	2	0	11	20	11,6
Chief Executive Officer	7	3	1	2	0	5	18	10,5
Head of department	0	6	2	2	0	2	12	7,0
Other (*)	4	13	20	9	3	15	64	37,2
Total	17	43	26	37	10	39	172	100%

B.10 How long have you been working in your organization for?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
1 to 5 years	4	18	12	16	4	19	73	41,9
More than 10 years	8	9	8	11	3	8	47	27,1
6 to 10 years	5	7	5	7	2	8	34	19,5
Less than 1 year	1	9	1	4	2	3	20	11,5

Total	18	43	26	38	11	38	174	100%
-------	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	------

B11. Does your organization provide services for victims?

	N=174	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
Yes		7	33	11	27	7	20	105

B.12 What kind of victims' services does your organization provide?

	N= 105	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
Counselling		7	31	9	25	6	17	95	90,5
Reporting		5	20	2	16	1	12	56	53,3
Emotional and psychological support		2	28	3	16	3	18	70	66,7
Housing		0	9	1	0	1	3	14	13,3
Legal advocacy		6	21	8	8	3	14	60	57,1
Social support		0	24	7	10	1	5	47	44,8
Financial support		0	6	1	0	0	1	8	7,6
Other (*)									

B13. B14. Does your organization usually deal with ...

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
B.13 Victims of hate crimes? (N=102)	6	28	8	23	4	10	79
B.14 Victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes? (N=105)	4	21	8	25	2	11	71

Part C: Knowledge about restorative justice

C1. To what extent do you feel confident in your understanding of restorative justice?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
1. None	2	6	2	8	2	0	20	12,0
2. To a small extent	7	14	6	12	2	10	51	30,7
3. To a moderate extent	4	14	13	12	2	13	58	34,9
4. To a large extent	0	7	5	6	2	9	29	17,5
5. Totally	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4,9
Total	17	41	26	38	10	34	166	100%

C2. Do you know which restorative justice programs exist in your country?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
I don't know	12	34	16	32	5	26	125	75,7
There are not RJ programs in my country	3	2	4	0	1	3	13	7,9
Yes	2	5	6	5	4	5	27	16,4
Total	17	41	26	37	10	34	165	100%

C3. Could you mention any restorative justice program put in place in your country?

BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
2	5	5	4	4	4	24

C4. Are there any specific restorative justice programs for hate crimes in your country?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
I don't know	0	2	1	5	1	2	11	
No	1	1	4	0	1	2	9	
Yes	1	2	1	0	2	1	7	
							27	

C5. Could you mention any specific restorative justice program for hate crimes put in place in your country?

BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
1	1	0	0	2	0	4

C6. Do you know what restorative justice techniques are put in place to deal with hate crimes in your country?

N=7	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
Victim/Offender Mediation or Dialogue	0	1	1	0	2	0	4
Conferencing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Peace making circles	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Other (*)							

C7. At what stage of the criminal procedure are being applied the restorative justice programs for hate crimes in your country?

N=7	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
Before the trial	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
During the trial	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
After court sentence	0	2	1	0	1	0	4
As an alternative sentence	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
In prison	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Separate from the justice system	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Other							

C8. Who provides the restorative justice programs in case of hate crimes in your country?

N=7	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
Public administration (*)	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
Civil society organization (**)	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Mixed institution (public/private) (***)	0	1	0	0	1	0	2

C9. Are there any specific restorative justice programs for anti-LGBT hate crimes in your country?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
I don't Know	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
Yes	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
No	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

C.10 Could you mention any specific restorative justice program for anti-LGBT hate crimes put in place in your country?

BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
0	1	0	0	0	0	1

C11. Do you know what restorative justice techniques are put in place to deal with anti-LGBT hate crimes in your country?

N=2	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
Victim/Offender Mediation or Dialogue	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Conferencing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peace making circles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other							

C12. At what stage of the criminal procedure are being applied the restorative justice programs for anti-LGBT hate crimes in your country?

N=2	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
Before the trial	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
During the trial	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After court sentence	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
As an alternative sentence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In prison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Separate from the justice system	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

C13. Who provides the restorative justice programs in case of anti-LGBT hate crimes in your country?

N=2	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
Public administration (*)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Civil society organization (**)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Mixed institution (public/private)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part D. Training needs

D1. In your opinion, how relevant for your organization are the following topics to be covered in a training on LGBT issues? From 1 = not at all, to 10 = totally

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
LGBT concepts and terminology, inclusive language	6,88 (3,181)	7,90 (2,269)	8,05 (2,681)	9,22 (1,228)	9,44 (1,014)	7,29 (3,407)	8,08 (2,599)
Social prejudices against LGBT people	7,18 (2,877)	8,36 (2,345)	8,00 (2,862)	9,16 (1,236)	9,44 (1,014)	7,62 (3,321)	8,27 (2,548)
LGBT people and vulnerable intersections (age, race, ethnicity, disability)	7,47 (2,718)	8,85 (1,565)	8,05 (2,104)	9,08 (1,278)	9,44 (1,014)	8,18 (2,468)	8,54 (1,989)

Legal assistance to victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes	7,24 (2,728)	8,03 (2,032)	7,91 (2,635)	7,69 (2,528)	6,00 (3,279)	7,88 (2,837)	7,70 (2,571)
Social, emotional and psychological assistance to victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes	6,00 (3,500)	8,10 (2,447)	7,64 (2,718)	8,00 (2,121)	6,89 (2,934)	8,61 (2,549)	7,82 (2,664)
Identification of anti-LGBT hate crimes	6,88 (3,039)	8,21 (2,195)	7,77 (2,671)	8,24 (2,362)	7,11 (2,934)	8,03 (2,767)	7,91 (2,569)
First contact with victims of LGBT hate crimes	6,00 (3,446)	8,13 (2,262)	7,64 (2,536)	7,62 (2,842)	6,11 (3,060)	8,09 (2,626)	7,59 (2,760)
Strategies to avoid secondary victimization of LGBT victims	6,12 (3,389)	7,82 (2,327)	8,09 (2,348)	7,89 (2,505)	7,56 (2,506)	8,73 (2,050)	7,87 (2,525)
Barriers to access to restorative justice by victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes	6,94 (3,344)	7,77 (2,032)	7,32 (2,514)	7,81 (2,364)	7,44 (1,810)	7,64 (2,881)	7,58 (2,499)
Strategies and techniques for applying restorative justice in anti-LGBT hate crimes	6,41 (3,280)	7,62 (2,243)	7,71 (2,552)	7,84 (2,489)	7,22 (2,048)	7,97 (2,651)	7,60 (2,549)
Specific needs of LGBT victims	6,41 (3,083)	8,53 (1,704)	8,14 (2,356)	7,86 (2,406)	8,44 (2,186)	8,30 (2,616)	8,03 (2,411)

Part E. Organization positioning about restorative justice

E1. Has the issue of restorative justice been discussed in your organization?

	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total	%
No	11	24	19	29	6	26	115	78,2
Yes	5	12	3	5	3	4	32	21,8
Total							147	100%

E3. In your opinion, how useful are the following topics regarding restorative justice for your organization? From 1=Extremely useless to 5= Extremely useful

N=31	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
The utility of restorative justice in general	4,00 (1,732)	4,36 (,674)	4,33 (,577)	4,80 (,447)	5,00 (,000)	3,50 (1,732)	4,32 (1,045)
The utility of restorative justice in the specific anti-discrimination field of your organization	4,20 (1,789)	4,60 (,516)	4,67 (,577)	4,60 (,548)	5,00 (,000)	3,50 (1,732)	4,43 (1,040)
The utility of restorative justice in hate crimes	4,20 (1,789)	4,73 (,467)	4,67 (,577)	4,40 (,548)	4,33 (,577)	3,50 (1,732)	4,39 (1,022)
The utility of restorative justice in anti-LGBT hate crimes	4,20 (1,789)	3,91 (,944)	4,67 (,577)	4,60 (,548)	4,33 (,577)	3,25 (1,708)	4,10 (1,136)

E4. Which actor do you think benefits the most from restorative justice?

N=153	BG	ES	IT	NL	BE	PL	Total
Offender	10	9	13	11	5	12	60
Victim	13	25	11	32	8	14	103
Other: Both	2	5	1	2	1	2	13
Other: Community. society	2	0	1	1	1	4	9
Other: the people they live with	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Other: I do not know	0	2	0	0	0	2	4

Annex 3. Main strategies/activities/programmes that could be relevant to the workshop- and training activities

Country	Type (e.g. Program, Strategy)	Title	Organiser (NGO, Government...)	Target group	Description
Belgium	Programme	Trajectory mediation	Mediators	Offenders	Mediators designs a long-term trajectory for the perpetrators, with the avoidance of recidivism as the goal. Some possible activities are cultural visits, sensitivity training, etc.
Belgium	Technique	Flag system	NGOs and professionals	Professionals	The flag system is used by practitioners to talk with children and parents, by discussing situations where different flags can be used in order to talk about uncomfortable or unknown topics. It is a communication technique.
Belgium	Technique	Police checklist	Police departments	Police departments	The checklist reflects cooperation among the Belgian Equality Body Against Discrimination (UNIA), diversity department of the Antwerp police force (PZA), and the judicial follow-up service of PZA. Police officers are able to take more effective notes of the incident and conduct a constructive dialogue with the victim, instead of the classic method (question-answer) where victims have less agency.
Bulgaria	Training	Tulip Foundation training	Tulip Foundation	Schools	The Bulgaria-wide foundation trains local organisations how to perform family group conferences. The

					organizations' key partner are teachers and schools. They establish connections with schools – with the principal or with a particular teacher who are informed well about FGC – and when the school staff sees that a certain child has a problematic behaviour, they contact the local organization and puts them in contact with the family in order to organize the conference.
Italy	Activity	What does Restorative Justice Means?	University/Professional order	Lawyers	Educational events targeting lawyers, aimed at raising awareness about RJ
Italy	Strategy	Restorative Practices	Universities	Law Students	University degree courses following pilot cases existing in other Italian Universities (e.g. Sassari, Milan Catholic University and Insubria).
Italy	Strategy	Fundamentals about RJ	Experts of RJ	Students	Seminars to stimulate a cultural change starting from younger generations
Italy	Strategy	Justice and Restoration	Government	General Public	Awareness-raising initiative about RJ
Italy	Activity	Restorative Justice for anti-LGBT hate crimes	Experts of RJ	LGBT NGO	Introduce the theme of RJ in LGBT NGO
Italy	Activity	Restorative Justice for anti-LGBT hate crimes	Experts of RJ; LGBT NGO	Mediators and RJ professionals	Seminars aimed at connecting the theme of anti-LGBT hate crimes to the one of RJ to raise awareness in RJ professionals
Italy	Strategy	United for LGBT rights	RJ professionals and NGOs	RJ professionals and NGOs	Cooperation to establish mutual learning, sharing knowledge and expertise about LGBT issues and RJ concepts
The Netherlands	Thematic meetings		Perspective on victim-offender mediation (Perspectief	Perpetrators, professionals who work with them	These courses aim to increase the empathy and responsibility of

			Herstelbemiddeling) also together with Custodial Institutions Agencies		perpetrators and to give professionals the tools to talk with offenders about guilt and victims and to stimulate them in taking responsibility.
The Netherlands	Training/course	“Cleaning up” (Puin Ruimen)	Custodial Institutions Agencies (restorative advisor)	Convicted persons/perpetrators	Restoration/reintegration. In the course attention is paid to being a perpetrator and taking responsibility. Not only towards the victim, but also towards your loved ones and yourself
The Netherlands	Masterclasses and trainings		Restorative and victim-oriented work	Prison staff, mental health workers and probation workers	Working in a more restorative and victim-oriented way. Giving the interests and needs of victims, perpetrators and society a central place in practice
The Netherlands	Initiative	Restorative justice promotion tour (Herstelestafette)	Prison sector	Prisoners but also broader public (professionals, victims, family members of the victims)	Tour consisted of testimonies from inside and outside the prison of prison personnel, ex-inmates, victims and relatives of victims.
The Netherlands	Pilot program	Pilot Vreedzame Wijk (Peaceful Neighbourhood)	Police and professional mediators	Victims and offenders	There were two forms of restorative mediation offered: neighborhood mediation and community mediation. In this project mediation could be an alternative to criminal proceedings
The Netherlands	Initiative Amsterdam	Triangular meetings as a part of Safe city for everyone (representatives from police, policy officer from municipality (or mayor)/representative from Public Prosecution Office). Also representatives from interest	Municipality	Different groups	Discussing different issues related to safety, violence in public spaces (including towards LGBT community: LGBTI+ and Safety)

		organizations			
The Netherlands	Program/initiative	Rainbow Cities Network	Movisie (commissioned by Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science)	LGBTI policies	The network is based on a Dutch cities network with an LGBTI policy, in which 43 Dutch cities now participate. The Rainbow Cities aim to exchange their experiences with LGBTI policies and share their do's and don't's, so that they can learn from each other and don't have to start from scratch.
The Netherlands	Initiative Rotterdam	Rotterdam Alliance Natural Together (Rotterdamse Alliantie Natuurlijk Samen)	Alliance partners: The Hang-out 010, Transcafé Rotterdam, Rainbow City, COC Rotterdam, Rotterdam Pride, IDEM Rotterdam, Police Unit Rotterdam, GayRotterdam Foundation, RADAR for Equal treatment against discrimination, Municipality of Rotterdam and the national Gay Straight Alliance for Safe neighborhoods	LGBTI+ community	Increasing the sense of safety and increasing the willingness of LGBT people to report incidents. Sharing knowledge, creating insights and an overview of the safety situation
Poland	Program	Conflict Management and Peer Mediation – Zarządzanie Konfliktem i Mediacje Rówieśnicze	House of Peace Foundation	Schools and other educational institutions	The program (based on educational methods and didactic materials developed by the Netherlands organization Stichting (MdL)) aims at preventing peer violence by teaching children, teachers, and parents to cope with crises and conflicts in peer groups. Students learn to resolve conflicts in a peaceful manner (e.g. to communicate without aggression, to listen attentively) and to take responsibility for their own, school community. The program is adjusted

					to the Polish core curriculum.
Poland	Task	The Work for Local Community – Praca dla Lokalnej Społeczności	Wroclaw Center for Restorative Justice – Wrocławskie Centrum Sprawiedliwości Naprawczej	Residents of Wroclaw and persons sentenced to the penalty of restriction of liberty	The organization has developed a system for reporting vandalism, property damage and hate speech in public space of Wroclaw via an online form, which is then made available to the municipal police and the police. The convicts perform community service as the penalty of restriction of liberty in a frame of cascade model, and in line with “problem-solving justice” and “community justice, ” which is organized by the WCRJ. The community service comprises, alongside others, removing hateful inscription from the walls, many of which are anti-LGBT. The convicts are referred to the WCRJ by the district courts for Wroclaw, while the enforcement of penalties is supervised by probation officers.
Poland	Project	The Emergency Mediation Service – Pogotowie Mediacyjne	House of Peace Foundation – Fundacja Dom Pokoju in cooperation with the Wroclaw Center for Social Development – Wrocławskie Centrum Rozwoju Społecznego	Residents of Wroclaw	The residents of Wroclaw can contact the emergency service to ask for free of charge assistance in conflict resolution by the use of mediation. All parties to the conflict need to agree to participate in this process. The assistance is provided by professional mediators of the House of Peace Foundation, while the municipality covers costs of the services. All participants can apply for a change of mediator without justification. The emergency service provides also education and leads an information

					campaign about amicable methods in conflict resolution.
Poland	Project	The Green Room	Polish Mediation Center, branch in Slupsk in cooperation with the District Court for Slupsk	Clients of the District Court and residents of Slupsk	Free of charge consultation with professional court mediators at the premises of the District Court for Slupsk, addressed both to “people in the street” and clients of the district court. Judges are supposed to send both parties for 15 minutes long consultation before a trial.
Poland	Project	Coalition: Prejudice-based Crimes – Koalicja: Przystępstwa Motywowane Uprzedzeniami	Lambda Warsaw Association (Warsaw), Dialog Foundation (Bialystok), Campaign Against Homophobia (Warsaw), the Polish Society of Anti-Discrimination Law (Warsaw), Homo Faber Association (Lublin), The Association for Legal Intervention (Warsaw), Never Again Association (Warsaw), Association for Multicultural Society Integration Nomada (Wroclaw), Diversity Laboratory Association (Torun), Crisis Intervention Society (Cracow)	People experiencing prejudice-based crimes on the ground of ethnicity/nationality and sexual orientation, and general public	The Coalition offered support to victims (legal advice, monitoring of court trials); provided trainings for NGOs involved in preventing prejudice-based crimes; and organized joint activities within the Coalition to conduct advocacy activities (e.g. to influence and shape public policies in this area). Within this framework they developed standards for the provision of support to victims of prejudice-based crimes, questionnaire for the monitoring of court hearings in cases of prejudice-based crimes, and “Equality Dictionary” (<i>Słownik równościowy</i>) used by the Coalition in all external communication. They published the manual “Prejudice-Based Crimes: Dilemmas, Challenges, Strategies” (<i>Przystępstwa motywowane uprzedzeniami: dylematy, wyzwania, strategie</i>). Within the Coalition LGBT and

					migrant organizations worked together, even though this was not supported by their respective communities.
Poland	Platform	The Team for Restorative Justice – Zespół ds. Sprawiedliwości Naprawczej	The Mayor of Wrocław – Prezydent Wrocławia	Institutions working with RJ and the residents of Wrocław	The team gathers representatives of municipality units (the Social Advisor of the Mayor of Wrocław on Tolerance and Combating Xenophobia, Wrocław Integration Center, Wrocław Center for Social Development), a district court probation officer, a district court mediator, a public prosecutor of the municipal police, and representatives of the NGO sector (the House of Peace Foundation, the Lower Silesian Association of Probation Officers Frontis). Its purpose is to promote and strengthen RJ methods in the city, to support Wrocław in its attempts to join European network of Restorative Cities, and to enable cooperation among institutions involved in (or willing to be involved in) RJ initiatives. The major LGBT organization in Wrocław, the Culture of Equality Association, is engaged in team's activities.
Poland	Platform	The Lower Silesian Center for Dialog – Dolnośląski Ośrodek Dialogu	House of Peace Foundation	Residents of the Lower Silesia, Lubusz, and Opole provinces	The center is conceived as a platform for organizations and people outside big cities (e.g. NGOs, local authorities, cultural and educational institutions, local activists) interested in resolving conflicts in their local environments, in transforming them into dialog, and in

					various forms of advocacy; in sharing problems, experiences and good practices; and in creating support, collaboration and training networks. Providing workshops, trainings and other forms of assistance comprise the main contribution of the House of Peace Foundation.
Spain	Training	Sensitivity and diversity training	Hate crimes prosecutor and Generalitat de Catalunya	Offenders	Mandatory sensitivity and diversity training for those offenders who want to receive mitigation, under the Spanish Penal Code. The contents are jointly managed with the Autonomic government.
Spain	Programme	Intrajudicial mediation	Intrajudicial Mediation Service of the Universidad Carlos III de Madrid (UC3M)	Courthouses	Agreement between a public university's mediation and RJ service with local courthouses in order to have inhouse mediation and RJ services available for judges, prosecutors, and the parties.
Spain	Programme	Penitentiary RJ services	Sociedad científica de justicia restaurativa (Restorative Justice Scientific Society) Service of the Universidad Carlos III de Madrid (UC3M)	Convicted offenders	RJ services with inmates in specific prisons who have agreed to it with the organiser. Direct and indirect mediation and other RJ procedures with willing inmates.
Spain	Programme	Territorial RJ service	Generalitat de Catalunya or Basque Government	Offenders, victims	Public territory-based RJ services, who act under administrative and/or penal laws, and who are available for all parties. They are also referred by other government services. They have territorial distribution via referrals and offices.
Spain	Programme	Territorial victim support network	Generalitat Valenciana	Victims	Network of connected victim-support offices,

					throughout a region. Connected to other public services and to NGOs for further support.
Spain	Training	Restorative measures outside mediation	RJ professionals and scholars	NGO professionals	Training about how other already conducted practices are also restorative measures (sensitivity and diversity training, mitigation and compensation, community work).