## OSIFE-Justice Initiative Portfolio Review – Ethnic Profiling in Europe

***Parameters of the portfolio*:**

The portfolio covers the collaboration between the Fund to Counter Xenophobia (Xen Fund) and the Justice Initiative (JI) from the end of 2011, when the Open Society Initiative For Europe (OSIFE), through the Xen Fund, first started grant-making, to the present day. Over this period OSIFE has made $1,792,283 of grants and consultancies listed in the elements of the portfolio document to organizations addressing ethnic profiling in France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and the UK. The Justice Initiative provided extensive technical support both for grantees and a wider array of groups engaging on the issue. The portfolio does not include the Justice Initiative’s litigation in France and Spain, nor Justice Initiative’s additional direct engagement in advocacy and police good practice promotion, although there is no “bright line” that separates Justice Initiative technical support for building an “ethnic profiling field in Europe” as described in this review, and the wider project framework that includes Justice Initiative’s operational activities.

This field is situated within the larger field of anti-racism or non-discrimination work in Europe that was a raison d’être for the 2011 creation of the Xen Fund, and a historic concern of the Open Society Foundations writ large. When Xen Fund started grant-making on ethnic profiling, Justice Initiative was five years into a project that had focused on documenting and defining the nature of the problem, urging stronger European regional action to recognize and address ethnic profiling, and engaging with police to identify and test good practices. Important advances had been achieved, but the project also confronted the limits of a European regional approach. In 2010-2011, the profiling project was starting to build national strategies to address patterns of profiling in selected countries, and develop the basis at member-state level for possible future regional interventions. Xen Fund’s engagement came at a pivotal moment, and the introduction of grant-making has had an important influence on Justice Initiative’s understanding of its options and role going forward.

***Our ambition and our collaboration***

The portfolio describes the evolution of our now-joint ambitions; an evolution that was, to large degree, spurred by the advent of Xen Fund grant-making on ethnic profiling issues. From an initial focus by both Xen Fund and Justice Initiative on achieving specific campaigning and advocacy goals, our collaboration now aims to create a sustainable field of work on ethnic profiling.

Xen Fund grant-making complements JI’s strategy with an emphasis on the engagement of human rights and minority-led NGOs in communication and advocacy efforts. At the outset, Justice Initiative had clear leadership in issue analysis and strategy development, nonetheless, decision making has not followed an explicit “leadership model” per se. Close staff relationships, joint country visits and partner meetings, brainstorming on priorities and approaches and regular, if informal, communication have underpinned this collaboration and a collegial decision-making style has functioned well.

Given the limited human resource capacity of the Xen Fund in the first couple of years, partnership with other, better resourced OSF programs was sought for as a strategic way to leverage impact. At the time of the Xen Fund’s creation, the Justice Initiative Ethnic Profiling team had a well-established presence in Europe and the ethnic profiling project had a healthy complement of staff based in Amsterdam, London, New York and Washington DC, a consultant in Paris, and – from 2012-2014 – a fellow in Madrid. Justice Initiative staff had active networks with key stakeholders and actors in civil society and with selected police agencies. The Xen Fund started with a single program officer, joined by a part time assistant in mid-2012 and a part time consultant for the Netherlands in January 2013. Justice Initiative’s in-country presence proved invaluable to the Xen Fund, providing rapid access and advice on potential projects and grantees, and sharing analysis of challenges and opportunities.

A collaboration with Justice Initiative offered the Xen Fund an opportunity to see how profiling might be monitored and challenged (and examine how the criminalization of migration contributes to profiling practices), and bring new actors into debates about law enforcement. The Xen Fund’s approach focused on supporting campaigning and advocacy on ethnic profiling to accompany Justice Initiative’s strategic litigation with an aim to strengthen the civil society sector in the longer run.[[1]](#footnote-1)The advent of Xen Fund grant-making enabled more ambitious engagement with profiling in key countries, and while the main initial focus was on advocacy, the collaboration spurred deeper reflection on the appropriate trajectory for an OSF operational entity, and how to transition to field-building as an explicit joint undertaking, with a gradual sun-setting of Justice Initiative’s role. The Xen Fund has contributed greater sophistication to the Justice Initiative’s understanding of field-building, although this understanding – of what the field should look like, and how to get to that place and sun-set Justice Initiative’s role – remains a work in progress and one that we hope will be advanced through this portfolio review.

***Our place: How do we think about building a “field of ethnic profiling”?***

In 2005, ethnic profiling was barely recognized and was absent from policy debates in Europe and most member states despite extensive, if partial and unscientific, evidence of widespread profiling practices. Today, profiling is a recognized problem with increasing independent monitoring and documentation across much of Western Europe. Ten years into the project, Justice Initiative and the Xen Fund see our role as nurturing national voices and leadership, to build expertise and resilience, and a durable “ethnic profiling field”. But we also understand the ethnic profiling field as defined beyond its civil society components – be they individual leadership, organizational architecture, engaged donors, or grassroots movements and campaigning – to reflect larger recognition and insertion of the issue into public and political discourse, of ongoing academic studies, legal actions, and police recognition (albeit often begrudging) and engagement. It is hard to separate out cleanly our contributions in the distinct spheres as, particularly when we worked under an operational and advocacy logic, we used multiple spheres in combination to advance our goals. But we have tried here to reflect on how and where can grant-making and technical assistance can make the greatest difference.

Starting with civil society, a core dynamic in building the ethnic profiling field has been the dual need to identify and enable the affected communities and minority leadership to become protagonists in their own cause despite deeply fragile organizations, and, at the same time, buttress minority voices with broader rights discourse and public awareness. Our work has taken varied approaches to these challenges, reflecting our learnings and the needs and limits of specific settings.

Maison pour un Développement Solidaire (MDS), a group anchored in youth work in minority neighborhoods of Paris, illustrates some of the difficulties both of taking on a controversial issue and that OSF funding rules can present to small organizations that are largely dependent on official funding sources. This is true of many community-based groups in Europe that commonly receive funding for service provision. MDS had a 15-year track record, but engaged on profiling starting in 2010. In 2014 it had to shut down due to funding cuts. Many French “associations” have closed since 2012 due to such cuts, but officials told MDS that their work on profiling contributed to their cuts. Indeed, very few private foundations were ready to support work on ethnic profiling in Europe and virtually none in France. Omer Mas Capitolin, the Director, and his main staff person, Issa Coulibaly, have continued their work on profiling on a volunteer basis for the last six months, and have been crucial to winning support from Paris City Hall for an exhibit on the impacts of identity checks in Place de la République, as well as in national advocacy with a platform of other organizations. They are also documenting and planning legal challenges to profiling practices in their area of Paris. They created a new association, Pazapas, but this group had no budget in 2014, and consists of Omer and Issa, whose administrative skills are limited, but who are dynamic and important leaders, voices, and network generators. We face the question of how to enable their work, whilst not creating dependence on OSF support.

Part of the challenge is that, many well-staffed and administratively and financially sound NGOs do not include minorities in leadership or senior staff positions and have weak links to affected communities and grassroots. Many, but not all, of these organizations are also dependent on government funding and hesitant to jeopardizing this, and some do not recognize the issue or shy away from the complexities of addressing debates that include polemics about minority offending, terror threats and alienated Muslim youth. These polemics pose significant hurdles to the entry of many grassroots groups as well; and, at times, the different groups profiled by police (such as Roma, Afro-descendants, and Muslims) do not see common cause amongst themselves, limiting campaigning possibilities, an obstacle we are discussing with a current grantee and other partners in Sweden.

In one case, we found this to be a significant hurdle for academic engagement as well. While not reflected in the elements document because it was a consultancy to produce data for a Justice Initiative report on the impact of ethnic profiling in the Netherlands, work produced by the University of Leiden was profoundly skewed by the researchers reluctance to seriously challenge a dominant discourse about any evidence of profiling being entirely justified by rates of offending in minority communities. Indeed, the University went so far as to issue a public denunciation of AINL’s use of some sections of their work as misrepresenting their views. The school is highly dependent on Ministry of the Interior funds for research, which we believe is the likely grounds for their stance. Since that time, Dutch police are increasingly recognizing that they have a profiling problem and we hope this will create a more propitious space for rigorous research. Other academics have welcomed and in some cases, built their profiles on collaborations with this work, in research and surveys conducted in France and Spain. However, our funding has not generally targeted academic research except where needed to provide empirical analysis to support advocacy and litigation as it is expensive and should have alternative resource options. Justice Initiative has sponsored panels at academic conferences in an effort to build visibility and recognition and thus attract new scholars to the field.

Returning to the civil society focus, we have sought to win mainstream public recognition that profiling is taking place and that this is discriminatory and wrong in order to buttress the message and voice of minority communities, and to increase political pressure and shift political calculations about the necessity of action. In spite of some similarities, the discourse and understandings of race varies across each country demanding country-specific interventions while trying to build comparative experiences. In France, an academic report by the Justice Initiative released in 2009 remains the cornerstone evidence cited on profiling, even as the evidentiary foundation was not advanced by academic work in The Netherlands. Since that report, the Justice Initiative has maintained a strong operational role in France, with a report on impacts of profiling, and civil litigation on behalf of 13 clients that have garnered extensive media attention. We have faced more challenges in building broader coalitions, a topic discussed further in the next section, and continue to shape bottom-up efforts to consolidate the field in France. In The Netherlands, the joint release of Amnesty International Netherlands reports and a [video](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LvHXrfYiRGk) by Doetank that “went viral” (116,000 views) in December 2013 marked a shift in the debate and recognition of the issue. In the UK, the 2011 Tottenham riots and a subsequent OSF-funded study “Reading the Riots” galvanized political action by the government which was already facing more strenuous resistance to their “reforms” reducing police obligations to report stops, and the StopWatch coalition was positioned to have major influence on the issues and specific reform proposals based on Justice Initiative and Xen Fund supported research and campaigning.

Some of the relatively easy advocacy targets for new civil society actors have been human rights or non-discrimination bodies and regional and international human rights agencies. We have encouraged grantees, other partners and coalitions to target these bodies as this hones their skills in assembling and presenting evidence, and in shaping messaging and recommendations; it also provides them with profile and pressures national political actors to respond to demands amplified by the echo chamber of international attention, however toothless that may be in requiring implementation of international obligations. The Defensor del Pueblo in Spain issued its own report, based on complaints received (which Justice Initiative helped to generate), and wrote a formal letter of inquiry to the Ministry of the Interior. In France, Germany, and Sweden, ombuds offices have each held day-long events on profiling with invited speakers, and Justice Initiative has attended all three, and spoken and identified police speakers in France and Sweden. After a change in leadership, the current French ombudsman has become more outspoken, and submitted an amicus curiae detailing the state’s positive obligations to curtail profiling in the Justice Initiative’s civil cases. Justice Initiative has supported partners, where needed (some are already expert) from Spain, France, the Netherlands, the UK, which have targeted the UN CERD and UPR reviews, as well as the Working Group on People of African Descent and the Rapporteur on Racism who will issue a thematic report on ethnic profiling in June of this year. At the European level, they have targeted the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) and meet with them on their country visits when preparing the four-yearly country reports.

Through this combination of minority action buttressed by a broader rights discourse and public awareness, ethnic profiling has achieved considerable political resonance despite the limited political weight of minority communities. In some instances, electoral dynamics have helped get political attention. In France, Francois Hollande’s 2012 presidential campaign made a grab for minority votes with a commitment to tackle profiling, and a surprise announcement between the two rounds of voting that his government would introduce stop forms, in a bid to nail down the *banlieue* vote. (This provoked a police backlash that then set back possibilities for good practice implementation for some time.) Targeted advocacy by the Plataforma por la Gestion Policial de la Diversidad (PGPD) also produced improved prohibitions of police discrimination in identity checks in an otherwise troubling Law on Citizen Security. In France, a draft bill has been proposed and will most probably not pass, but at least is being discussed. In the Netherlands, the Ministry for Social Affairs Lodewijk Asscher and the Human Rights Institute seem to be increasingly interested and may open new avenues for political and police discussion. In the UK, in addition to the impact of the riots and rigorous analysis and advocacy, StopWatch has targeted ongoing advocacy around electoral districts where minority voters may tip the vote which may underlie the surprisingly enthusiastic uptake of their recommendations by the Conservative party.

Some ripple effects can be seen in broader civil society movements. Ethnic Profiling is increasingly becoming an issue of the wider equality movement including within the European Network Against Racism (ENAR) or the nascent European movement of Black Europeans (ENPAD). In the EU as in the US, we think that a consolidated ethnic profiling field requires not only able leadership from minority communities, but must be reflected into the consciousness and work of mainstream human rights and anti-discrimination NGOs and ensure broader public resonance of the issue.

What other key challenges remain? We close this section with two final concerns. First, is the next leap required to actually move from changing discourse to changing law, policy and practice. At this point, discussions of profiling are increasingly informed by a commonly-held set of recommendations, although the generation of ethnic statistics remains a major cultural stumbling block for European police outside the UK. We believe there are grounds for cautious optimism about the possibilities of advancing good practice experiments and new policies given the shift in discourse in Europe. The sudden prominence of US debates post-Ferguson may also help, as European police can no longer dismiss such scandals as reflecting barbarous Americans alone. Despite very real challenges in Europe around xenophobic attitudes about migrants, Muslims, and Roma, we may be at a tipping point to obtain more police engagement. Justice Initiative is working to broaden its police contacts and support specific discussions on profiling across countries as well as within them. In Spain, the successor to STEPSS led by the PGPD continues and we hope to support its expansion over time from local to regional agencies. It is frequently cited as an example of good practice in a range of UN and EU reports, and even by the Spanish government, and has garnered some interest from the Council of Europe. In The Netherlands a group of ten senior officers has been created to take forward a national framework that proposes pilots in all police regions; several regional units are already starting to experiment and introduce new trainings, local ambassadors’ networks, and videos (Rotterdam, Amsterdam and Utrecht).

The other concern as we consider remaining challenges is the continued paucity of independent donors willing to fund ethnic profiling. The Xen Fund had tested the issue with other donors back in 2012 finding very cautious reactions. More recently a session was proposed for the March 2015 Ariadne meeting and rejected (but we will try again). British donors are now supporting StopWatch (Paul Hamlyn Foundation and the Esmee Fairbairn Foundation) but are only funding nationally. One question we need to consider further is how much we can open up funding opportunities through less rights-based and adversarial approaches that focus on good practice. We plan further donor outreach, but to date only OSF is willing to fund controversial documentation and advocacy that accuses European police of discriminatory practices.

Possibly, based on experience to date, we could have a more delineated strategy targeting those engagements that are less controversial and possibly easier to fund. For instance, street law approaches in the Netherlands have successfully triggered the support of some initial local public funding in Amsterdam. In Spain, the PGPD has obtained a verbal commitment to project funding from the Council of Europe. Additional good practice engagement may also present other “fundable” projects emerging from the My City Real World and critical encounters approach (an OSIFE – JI – YE collaboration discussed at a March 10th portfolio review). This effort is now being replicated with some local authority and non-OSF funding. Yet, we are also wary of over-endorsing such feel-good responses as they frequently fail to address ongoing practices, and do not generate the police and ethnic statistics needed to track and hold police accountable for patterns of profiling. So even as new options may emerge, ongoing monitoring and hard data are needed to continue an informed and productive discussion on this topic.

OSIFE might consider a bifurcated strategy, focusing its ongoing grant-making in the more sensitive areas (monitoring, reporting, litigation, advocacy, and campaigning) while trying to trigger the interest of other human rights donors in good practice engagements that may be less sensitive for other donors. Street law approaches, positive policing initiatives, trainings for policemen might more easily obtain EU funding and the implicit endorsement that accompanies such official support. Beyond private and public donors’ engagement, to ensure the sustainability of the field we need to keep on systematically link up also with human rights NGOs (like we did in France, Spain, Sweden, the Netherlands and UK) to make this a normal issue for them to look after also in the long run.

***Our work: What would we do differently?***

This section illustrates the organic development of a model of Justice Initiative-Xen Fund collaboration based on very close engagement with the field in each country that enables targeted strategic training sessions alongside funding. In the early days (2011, 2012 and 2013) Justice Initiative trainings focused more on issues ranging from advocacy strategies, media work and messaging, use of social media and apps in documentation and campaigning, and strategic litigation, good practices in policing and recommendations for reform. Over time, and reflecting the needs created by collaborative grant-making and OSIFE’s emphasis on both mobilizing grassroots and minority groups while also engaging mainstream human rights actors, the strategy sessions have increasingly discussed organizational positioning, coalition-building, structuring good proposals, leadership development, and organizational governance issues.

In preparing for this portfolio review, we reflected on the implications of the shift in ambition from advancing specific advocacy aims to building a field, including the civil society architecture to sustain ongoing, independent work on profiling. One question we asked was: if we had started with this explicit aim, might we have scanned the field more systematically or structured the collaboration of grant-making differently? Considering our starting point in 2011, particularly our value proposition that our work should attempt to empower affected communities to be protagonists in addressing profiling, it is unlikely that scanning would have produced a very different list of grantees as few groups were working in this areas, as Justice Initiative knew most of those groups working in the Xen Fund priority countries.

In practice, we see a progression of field creation at different velocities in different countries, with a common factor in the need for recognition of the issue and the start of some public debate as a necessary precondition for wider engagement. Thus, in the UK, where disproportionate stop and search (as profiling is termed) has been discussed since the 1980s, it was relatively quicker to galvanize a new campaign, despite the challenges posed by the collapse of a number of key black-led organizations in the early 2000s. In the Netherlands, a wider array of organizations, including grass-roots and minority-led groups, have only become interested in working on ethnic profiling after the issue became more visible in the wake of the AINL reports and DoeTank video mentioned earlier. In Spain, awareness was generated through the confluence of local movements protesting police stops and deportations of undocumented migrants with the most successful of the pilot sites of the Justice Initiative’s Strategies for Effective Police Stop and Search (STEPSS) project, and subsequently reinforced through findings of survey funded by Xen Fund. Although Spain is not anymore a priority country for the Xen Fund, grants have been given to the Plataforma as a unique example of a civil society-police coalition, but the funding asks the Plataforma to extend their engagement more widely in Europe. In Sweden and Germany, national scandals have generated interest, but no systematic documentation or common positioning or campaigning has yet emerged. In France, where the 2005 riots were a factor for the inception of Justice Initiative’s work, we continue to maneuver through a fractious civil society and political landscape towards a broader strategic vision among domestic actors. What a more systematic scanning might have supported would have been a more planned entry by the Xen Fund into the field, allowing for a more reflexive attitude and the possibility to think in the longer-term, and incorporate earlier the possibility of offering grantees the opportunity to conduct self-assessments of organizational needs and include these in their funding proposals.

Considering the challenges we’ve faced, we would probably have changed some aspects of grant-making and technical assistance. Particularly for Justice Initiative staff who are not experienced grant-makers, it would have been useful to have had training and more explicit discussions internally, but also with the grantees, about organizational governance, financial health, and lessons from movement-building and community organizing efforts elsewhere. Given the fragility of some the groups we worked with, particularly those rooted in minority communities, the possibility of a wider array of grant-making tools or options, including individual or organizational leadership support as well as core or organizational development grants would have had value and might have supported greater organizational strengthening at a quicker pace alongside the advocacy advances that have been achieved. On the technical assistance side, we would have built in a greater emphasis from the start on organizational governance, strategic planning, and models of collaboration among local partners. These issues are increasingly central to the assistance now being provided by Justice Initiative and built-into the grant-making approach of OSIFE, in contrast to our earlier training that was heavily focused on the substantive issues involved in profiling and skills such as media messaging and advocacy planning. Yet, as we emphasize organizational health, we face the dearth of independent funding that groups appear to require to sustain this work without becoming dependent on OSF support.

The evolution of Graines de France (GdF) and its director, Reda Didi, illustrates both successes and limits of our cooperation. Between 2010 and 2014, JI and the Xen Fund worked closely with GdF; Reda took part in trainings and collaborated on a series of town hall meetings in French suburbs discussing experiences of profiling and developing a ten point policy platform that continues to inform advocacy asks in France. GdF continues to participate in a platform with other organizations on ethnic profiling, and has received a series of grants from the Xen Fund, including for trainings based on US community organization models that was to include an important focus on ethnic profiling. In the end, the multiplier effect of the work in knowledge transfer to local organizations, and support for local mobilization and campaigning on profiling has been weaker than we had hoped. In part, this appears to reflect a lack of additional funding for training that led GdF to limit this part of their planned engagement, and in part to their adoption of a “closed network” approach that did not encourage their partners to share expertise and knowledge in more open campaigning. Although Xen Fund identified and flagged the main areas of development of GdF in their second grant such as improving their on-line presence, communication and reporting skills, the emphasis remained on the project’s objectives. So, a couple of years later GdF is still struggling to get funding and hiring permanent staff that would allow for a stable organization, and we think we could have focused more resources on organizational development needs, with a greater concentration on fewer activities in order to develop the organization. The last grant was of a reduced amount also to stress that message, but even without getting to the point of exerting conditionality, we could have been even more proactive in suggesting and encouraging potential approaches and remedies. Despite these issues, both Reda and GdF did gain visibility and credibility through the work, and expanded to other non-discrimination work. In late 2014, Reda was offered a position as adjunct Director of an Inter-Ministerial committee focused on fighting against racism and anti-Semitism. While a welcome recognition of Reda’s increasing prominence, this also appears to follow a common pattern in France of coopting leaders from minority communities into official positions as soon as they begin to gain profile and legitimacy, and weakening their new and fragile organizations in the process. It is too soon to say whether Graines de France will successfully transfer leadership and continue its independent non-discrimination work, including ethnic profiling.

France is a particularly challenging country in which to develop broad-based campaigns on non-discrimination or civil rights. The more established NGOs, especially those on the left, hold tightly to the French universalistic Republican model’s deeply ambivalent attitude toward ethnic or racial identities and even those groups working on discrimination are rarely minority-led or staffed. More broadly, groups commonly have weak governance, compete for visibility and funding, argue with each other about strategy and substance, and rarely unite in common campaigns. Justice Initiative, the Xen Fund and the European Civil Liberties Project are now testing a “resource based” approach, building on Justice Initiative’s documentation and messaging materials to mobilize and improve the cooperation of local actors beyond Paris in a bottom-up approach.

In Spain, where civil society groups collaborate more easily, Xen Fund grants have supported a unique coalition of civil society and police organizations: the Plataforma por la Gestión Policial de la Diversidad (PGPD). Justice Initiative is an “observing member” of the Platform, which was the brain-child of the police chief of Fuenlabrada, the most successful site of “Strategies for Effective Police Stop and Search” (STEPSS), who was then also head of the Spanish association of local chiefs of police (UNIJEPOL). The Plataforma was created with a Xen Fund grant (to UNIJEPOL) in 2011, and since then the Justice Initiative and the Xen Fund have worked with the Plataforma to assist them in developing a strategic plan and adapt their approach and ambitions in the face of some financial management and organizational capacity challenges. Justice Initiative also provides technical assistance and advice on select platform activities, and the Plataforma is an incubator for testing good practice tools that we hope to promote with other European police in the future. One other Xen Fund grant financed a survey of experiences of police encounters conducted by University of Valencia and Oxford University that documented profiling practices, both engaging academics in legitimacy theory research, while providing fodder for public debate and evidence for fact-pattern arguments in Justice Initiative litigation.

In the UK also, Xen Fund grants were critical to the creation and consolidation of the StopWatch coalition, and Justice Initiative strategy sessions (we’d like to recognize the advocacy unit and Russell Pickard’s great assistance) helped to identify the coalition’s resources and shape a structure that drew explicitly on skill sets and interests of researchers and advocates, layers, and young people in three distinct committees under the StopWatch umbrella. This model, which worked extremely well in the UK, informed some initial efforts to encourage such alliances in other countries, although Xen Fund never conditioned grants on coalition-creation as a requirement. In practice, such tightly-structured coalitions have not emerged in other settings. In France, a campaign group, Stop les contrôles aux faciès, created by the Justice Initiative to assist in client identification for our civil litigation, adopted a non-transparent and closed-coalition model. The group has continued and has had resonance and weight in discussions, but prefers tight control and autonomy over wider engagement.

In subsequent efforts, we have encouraged, but do not press for structured coalitions as, when these work, they marshal resources far more effectively and offer possibility of significant impacts, but they have to arise from local will and ability. This shift also reflects our own shift away from an advocacy focus that encouraged an emphasis on strategies most likely to achieve short-term success, towards a field-building approach. Thus, in The Netherlands, as the space created by the work of AINL and DoeTank started to generate broader interest, Justice Initiative worked with Xen Fund and AINL to design and lead a two-day strategic planning session attended by some 15 different groups. That session spurred more visible actions on profiling from a number of the participants, who are increasingly initiating joint activities and formulating a joint strategy. In addition to greater visibility, and a local scandal involving one participating organization from The Hague, our ongoing discussions with the participants made clear their needs for support in thinking about messaging and organizational positioning, and for specific minority and youth leadership formation. We are now planning follow-up on each of these fronts.

In Sweden, and now in Germany, we are following this emerging model of strategy development assistance from the Justice Initiative combined with Xen Fund grant-making. In Sweden, the Xen Fund gave a grant to Civil Rights Defenders (CRD) to conduct outreach to a range of minority groups to develop a shared analysis of the issue and propose how specifically to document patterns of profiling so as to support further advocacy by a range of affected groups. Justice Initiative supported the organization of a strategy session and visited Sweden, taking two British police officers, to speak at an all-day event of the Swedish ombudsman’s non-discrimination bureau. We are now working with CRD to shape the research proposal and see if we can assist them in facilitating dialogue between various minority groups who have yet to identify clear-common cause between the profiling of Roma, migrants and Swedes of color. In Germany also, we propose to follow this model and will conduct an initial mapping of groups starting to work on profiling, and then organize a strategy session to generate a vision of needs in Germany and solid funding proposals in 2016.

Currently, OSIFE (including the ECLP) under the 2015 anti-discrimination work plan offers support for civil society organizations (grassroots, minority led ad mainstream human rights NGOs) with a particular emphasis on their coalitions; mobilization and campaigning for awareness raising and advocacy through monitoring and reporting; and seed support to good practices in policing developed in collaboration with Justice Initiative. Justice Initiative’s strategy for 2017 to 2019 is premised on ending our operational work at country level, to focus our efforts on field-building, we hope with ongoing OSIFE grant-making for civil society. Justice Initiative does plan to continue and deepen engagement with police to test whether a real tipping point has been achieved and develop a strategy for building a European police debate on profiling and networks that can build and share good practices. Together, we are grappling with the question of how we build a field, and about how we conceive the necessary civil society and good practice landscape to populate this field.

1. This is based on the very first strategy of March 2012 and the updated version of October 2012 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)