**ENAR’s Theory of change 2018 – 2020**

***From big picture to targeted actions***

***What is the problem and what is the impact of the problem?***

***Crisis mode.*** European politics and policies for the last decade has been characterised by firefighting multiple “crises”, the 2008 economic and financial crisis, austerity plans for Greece, the refugee reception and migration crises, security crises and Brexit. While some trends were already present when adopting our last strategic objectives in 2014, EU Institutions and its Member States have not managed to curb developments, which affect the most vulnerable groups.

In particular:

* Migration trends, due to ongoing conflicts and economic dire situations in several parts of the world as well as corresponding policies by EU States, are external factors with a strong influence on racial equality. The lack of solidarity within Europe and between Member States has resulted in even more restrictive policies towards refugees and migrants. The multiplication of different statuses to apply to migrants leads to discrimination between migrant populations, for instance between seasonal workers and beneficiaries of the single permit directive.
* Terrorism and the growing assertion that terrorist threats have increased in Europe has had a tremendous effect on groups at risk of racism. These groups are both victims of attacks inside and outside Europe, but also the disproportionate target of police, criminal, administrative repressive measures. With the multiplication of these measures at EU and national levels, less emphasis is placed on long-term prevention, including through social inclusion and equality policies.
* The way the EU and Member States have managed the economic and financial crisis also has an impact on racial equality, bringing the EU 2020 employment (75% of all aged 18-64 in employment) and poverty targets (reduce the number of people living in poverty by 20 millions) further and further away from reality. Social services and equality structures suffer from budget cuts, therefore impacting the most vulnerable parts of racial, ethnic and religious minorities, often women.

Policy responses to these crises seem to reinforce the perception of EU uselessness, democratic gap, disenfranchisement, discrimination and exclusion.

***What was old is new again****.* As in previous crises context, Europe develops a reaction to “outsiders”. There has been a rise in Antisemitism since 2014, in the term of physical attacks and threats to property. Islamophobia, Afrophobia and Antigypysism are also still present, building on historical abuses. “Cultural racism” from the 1980 introduced the idea that European and non-European cultures are not compatible and continue to feed current debates. Contemporary forms of racism increasingly impact individuals that combine several grounds of discrimination, such as religion, nationality, status, class, gender, gender identity, disability. These groups are redefined as “others”, in a racialisation process. Muslim women wearing the headscarf, undocumented migrants from certain parts of the world and migrant workers from Eastern Europe for instance.

***Less Europe or more Europe?*** Euroscepticism is not new in Europe. However, the consequence of the result of the Brexit referendum in the UK will have long lasting consequences on the European continent. Some parties in other countries are threatening to push for exiting the EU as well. There are risks of spin-off and further disintegration of the EU achievements. In terms of combatting racial discrimination, these achievements have been major and are constantly under threat.

Reactions in Brussels vary. Some argue that the EU response would entail a treaty change, arguing for more involvement of the EP and in order to strip out the various exemptions that allow countries to opt in and out opt out of EU rules, some advocate for much larger reform. Civil society is trying to keep up, and Brussels based CSOs look for appropriate reactions including more systemic reforms and connection to local level. A positive response has been in trying to look beyond silos how the EU should be leading in ensuring sustainable and inclusive development, advancing human rights, and allowing for dignified movements of people, where refugees are welcome and all people feel safe. A possible scenario would be to continue with business as usual. We can already see some complacency by the EU institutions not to change or question the way of dealing with arising issues.

***Far right spread: Blurred lines*.** The rise in far-right and xenophobic parties is a growing concern in the EU. Beyond, far-right and xenophobic ideologies, policies and practices have integrated mainstream political parties in the last decade. With an increased presence of populist parties in the European Parliament, xenophobes are hindering progressive efforts towards equality and use Brussels institutions as a platform for their own national political goals. Some mainstream politicians have embraced xenophobic ideas and pushed to the right to court voters from extremes, while pretending this is a good method to counter far-right. Other groups are targeted by surge in conservatism and populism that pretend to ‘protect European values from migrants and Muslims’: women, LGBTI people, persons with disabilities.

***State of denial*.** The real extent of racism and discrimination is difficult to establish because of the lack of reliable and comparable equality data across Europe. It is still possible in Europe to deny the existence of racism and discrimination or the impact it can have on minorities' exclusion. While data are not a goal per se, and should be part of proper equality planning and monitoring, they are crucial elements to document racism and establish trends, prove discrimination in court, support evidence-based decision making, assess impact of funding and promote diversity.

***Rise in hate crime and speech*.** Despite the lack of data and underreporting of racial discrimination and violence, there has been an increase in violent attacks. The rise in antisemitic and islamophobic crime across Europe and more recent post-referendum surge of hate crime in the UK confirm our findings that Muslims, migrants, people of African descent, Jews and Roma remain the main victims of racist crime in the EU and that States’ responses broadly fail to protect victims and stop impunity. This is made possible because people feel entitled and encouraged through political and media hate speech. Hateful comments are reinforced on social media where people are comforted within their system of beliefs. The failure of progressive counter narratives to dominate is sticking.

***Mobilising for social change*.** Social innovation and social media have shaped the way the anti-racism movement operates. Community-led, active movements and citizens' initiatives (Black Lives Matter, Refugees Welcome) operate next to more institutionalised CSOs. Sustainability of action is not always easy to conciliate with reactivity and flexibility. Mobilisation techniques should be explored to ensure one can use the full range of action for social change.

***What is ENAR aiming to achieve in response to the problem? What is the change we want to see? Outcomes (1. Change in law, policy and standards 2. Change in practices and accountability 3. Change in mobilisation  all of which to impact change in people’s lives)***

In the long-term, ENAR wants to achieve full equality, solidarity and well-being for all, citizens and residents.

This would mean that by 2020:

**There is a reduced employment gap for ethnic minority and migrants by changes in legislation and practices regarding discrimination trough multi-stakeholder dialogue**

* The European Commission explores a stricter system of race equality standards for employers further to Diversity charters
* A coalition of NGOs submit material for infringement proceedings on the basis of the Employment Directive regarding restrictions to wearing religious symbols
* At least xx sectorial trade unions and employer representatives have an increased understanding of issues of race discrimination including regarding migrant workers
* The Equal@work Platform has contributed to European standards on race and religious diversity at the workplace taking into account migrant workers specific situation and has developed knowledge and concepts in the field of diversity management and equal inclusion of ethnic and religious minorities and migrants at the work place through incentivizing measures, in dialogue with public & private employers, trade unions and institutions
* ENAR influences debates on diversity within EU institutions and EU CSOs by supporting changes in recruitment policies and affinity groups.
* ENAR’s work on employment is linked to advocacy for changes in EU migration policies to allow for broader access to the labour market by TCN without discrimination.

**Member States collect reliable and comparative equality data in line with fundamental rights and data protection standards**

* EC published recommendation or guidelines with the aim of improving Member States’ collection of data on various forms of inequality, disaggregated by race and ethnicity
* Equality data collection based on self-identification are being more widely collected (FRA, Member States, equality bodies, NGOs) including on evaluating equality policies
* More members of minority communities support equality data collection, challenge wrongful labels and data abuses and are empowered to advocate for data collection at their level
* The EP adopts a resolution calling Member States to collect equality data collection based on fundamental rights standards and supports the EC recommendation on equality data collection
* Specific modules are added to existing EU social surveys
* Equality data collection is included in policy planning and data populate indicators including on National Action Plans Against Racism or national strategies against different forms of racism

**European States duly respond to racist crime and speech, increase victims’ protection and access to effective remedies.**

* Comprehensive data collection based on victims and witness perceptions
* Timely and effective investigation by police of bias motivation including multiple biases
* Prosecution following up on bias motivation
* Victims have improved access to justice and feel safe and empowered to report racist crime or speech
* Civil society organisations and community-led organisations are consulted and have access to relevant information regarding crimes involving members of their community throughout criminal justice system
* Civil society organisations, community-led organisations and concerned users are empowered to report illegal content to IT companies, which act promptly and fairly.

**States implement trust building, efficient and inclusive security and policing policies grounded in human rights, equality and long term social inclusion.**

* New independent civilian oversight of law enforcement agencies are established and ensure full equality in practice in all their decisions, processes and actions.
* Police and security forces are trained and accountable of their role of interfaces between residents/citizens and the State. They act in a responsible manner, with restrain, aware of the structures of power they operate in and within the limits of rule of law and fundamental rights.
* Discriminatory practices such as ethnic profiling have decreased and are monitored. Victims get redress.
* Member States reinvest massively (up to 4% of state budgets) in law enforcement agencies in particular in the development of their human resources, to be able to develop and implement fully-fledged human rights based policies that would not disproportionately target ethnic & religious minorities (in particular Muslims and migrants);
* EU standards policy and legal standards on countering violent extremism and radicalisation leading to terrorism (VERLT) are reviewed according to human rights impact assessments and include FR and anti-bias training to law enforcement, respect of due process and rule of Law, systematic redress of institutional racism instances, etc.;

**Specific forms of racism are recognized and addressed through EU-wide strategies which take into account intersectionality and multiple forms of discrimination.**

* Increased number of MS have national strategies or specific objectives in their NAPR, which recognize specific forms of racism and demonstrate with use of indicators to progress they seek to make toward equality for these groups, with measurable objectives
* Increased calls for national strategies at EU level
* Move towards recognition of Afrophobia at the national and EU level
* Common sets of indicators and actions, with a supervision mechanism by the EU, to ensure that concrete changes are undertaken to improve the lives of ethnic & religious minorities and migrants in the EU
* Targeted demands and indicators, in close cooperation with minority led NGOs and NGOs working on the following specific forms of racism (Antisemitism, Afrophobia, Islamophobia, Antigypsyism and anti-migrant racism) are developed

**Communities including members of ethnic religious minorities and migrants mobilise coherently for social change.**

* reinforced self-awareness of a still nascent European civil rights movement;
* Larger reach-out of our network, reinforced internal coherence and the implication of its members;
* Strengthened capacities of our members and friendly NGOs in the area of community mobilization and community organizing, notably by disseminating and training to the techniques developed by US activists Saul Alinski
* Increased partnerships between organisations working in different sectors to reinforce cross-sectoral mobilisations, mainstreaming of intersectional approaches – from the local to European level
* Increased support Members to access funding for projects, while developing our own resource pool through the ENAR Foundation.
* Progressive voters mobilise to the detriment of far right electoral representation and narratives

**Member States guarantee equal rights to residents irrespective of status and nationality. There is no overall large exemption of access to rights based on nationality or status.**

* anti-discrimination principle is mainstreamed throughout the migration/integration policies
* EU institutions ensure that integration proposals guarantee equal access to basic social services for all residents irrespective of their residence status or their origin
* Framework Decision and Victims Rights Directive are implemented to ensure timely investigation, prosecution and sanction of violence irrespective of migrants’ residence status
* The Blue card Directive and other labour market proposals should promote access for low- and medium-skilled migrants and for migrants with an ethnic minority background
* Nation Action Plans for Integration/Discrimination or social inclusion cover TCN, asylum seekers and refugees including those belonging to ethnic and religious minorities
* Member States promote inclusion of migrants in compliance with the rule of law
* European Commission to promote of CSO’s good practices on labour market integration, civic or political participation, citizenship and education
* Member States use EU integration funds in a fundamental rights and inclusive way (especially on projects regarding discrimination and violence against migrants)

**Transversal outcomes:**

**The capacity of the network to jointly advocate for improved legislation and practices is strengthened through internal research capacities**

* an anti-racism database is operational and used by members to support their work
* at least xx research briefs are published and support local and EU advocacy and activism
* specific and dedicated research are produced to support our work
* thematic shadow reports are published

**Strategic priorities of the network are supported by informing and raising awareness of ENAR’s target audiences and increasing ENAR’s visibility in media and social media**

* more presence in media
* more interaction on social media
* more engagement of members and beneficiaries in media and on social media

***What are the main barriers to achieving the desired outcomes?*** Power analysis. What is your analysis of the key forces driving/blocking such a change? What economic or political interests are threatened/promoted by the change? Which groups are drivers/blockers/undecided? Is it visible (rules and force) or invisible (in people heads – norms and values) or hidden (behind the scenes influence). Who do the key players listen to (because that may help us decide on our alliance strategy).

ENAR need drivers to support our long term vision of realizing Full Equality. Therefore, we both

* + **Work inside the current EU institutional and ideological setting**. The aim is to improve what already exists with the view to reinforce the equality framework, to limit the damages and looks for “cracks” in the system to alleviate the pain of vulnerable communities;
	+ **Develop alternatives with like-minded movements** which have also understood that Full Equality is impossible within the current setting. It concerns reaching out, sharing analyses, building partnerships, learning from and influencing other progressive forces and movements in European societies and beyond to prepare alternatives and be ready in case massive shifts happen in our societies. ENAR is particularly focused on connecting with the feminist movements, migrants;’ rights organisations, the workers unions, progressive political parties, movements and foundations, the foundation sector, the environment sector and development sector, the anti-poverty and LGBTQI movements as well as progressive academics.

We nurture institutional advocacy with more radical approaches, while being strongly connected to the grass-roots in our and other movements, academic and political conversations.

Blockers include: those willing to keep the status quo, or having a patronizing way of doing anti-racism, far-right ideologues and politicians who use xenophobic and conservative ideas to promote their political interests, those who oppose ‘EU values’ to “other cultures” and attempt to pit groups against each other, as well as those who do fall in the trap of division.

Undecided/blockers: white marginalized or disfranchised middle class communities

Key decision makers at the EU level include VP Timmermans, who is keen to work on racism and mobilisation but reluctant to increase obligations for member States.

Brussels institutions are the sum of their member States and big States such as France, Germany or Italy are crucial to get any move at EU level.

***What are the change hypothesis/assumptions***? Opportunities? How is the change we are discussing likely to take place? What alliances (e.g. between sympathetic officials or politicians, private sector, media, faith leaders or civil society) could drive/block the change? What would strengthen the good guys and weaken the bad – e.g. research and evidence, pressure from people they listen to (who are they?) or mobilisation in the street? Can you foresee any likely ‘critical junctures’: new governments; changes of leadership; election timetables when change is more likely to occur?

1. We focus on employment because we know we can make a step change more quickly than by focusing on educational, housing or health issues: we have a strong body of expertise in that area as well as our members; there are European and national legislations that offer leverage to change the situation; working on increasing the income of All will contribute to increase access and level up the game of other stakeholders in other areas (education, health…) with the view to cater for the needs of new publics for them. In the current societal setting where jobs are the golden gate to social inclusion, ensuring that everybody has a quality job that pays well, will contribute to allow every person to develop a future for herself and her family, as well as offer access to quality education, quality housing, quality health and other services.

100% employment also caters for an encompassing narrative claiming the well-being of All, rather than a segmental struggle that could be distorted by opponents to racial equality as the claim of a minority at the expense of the majority.

1. We choose to work on different forms of racism because ENAR has quickly recognized the limitations of the “one-size fits all” universalist type of anti-racism. In every context, racism manifests differently towards different communities. Historical roots might differ and if some patterns are similar, their concretisations might differ widely.
2. We work on community mobilization because decision and policy makers are reassured that equality and diversity matter to people and are a strong demand. Strong communities will be able to bring change at the local and national levels and reinforce EU level advocacy. EU level expertise will strengthen local and national communities and their NGOs to claim their rights in a more professional manner.
3. We choose to focus on data because there can’t be any meaningful equality policy without a clear understanding of the issues at stake. We want to advocate for data collected and analysed within an equality and human rights framework for the sole purpose of promoting equality of outcomes. Equality data collection becomes part of States’ positive duty to combat discrimination and promote equality, as in the UK model. This implies that some form of positive action measures are required to ensure racial equality. When data are available, inequalities based on ethnic origin can’t be denied. Equality policies are being devised / improved.
4. We continue working on hate crime, hate speech and State violence because there can’t be any progress towards equality if ethnic and religious minorities don’t feel safe. Improved legislative standards in the EU would increase pressure on Member States. There is an established link between hate speech and physical violence and that better data collection on incidents would mean better response because more visibility.
5. We assume that the discriminatory impact of counter-terrorism measures would be counter-productive in the long-term and that more violent extremism could be happening without a proper prevention strategy which addresses exclusion and discrimination.

Critical junctures: national elections (FR, DE, NL, CZ, HU, SI in 2017), EU elections, Brexit negotiations, free trade agreement negotiations.

***How will we respond to achieve the desired outcomes?* Activities. Actions**

Our type of actions:

1. **Technical advocacy and lobbying**: direct meetings and message delivering to European, international and national decision makers (institutions and political leaders);
2. **Research**: we follow the trends and developments in the area of racism and related discrimination; we generate data that supports advocacy and substantiate the changes we are asking for; with the added value of shredding light on racism and discrimination trends and bringing the perspective of grassroot activists to the attention of decision-makers.
3. **Networking**: we are a voice, we represent a constituency gathering dozens of CSOs, small and big, active on ground, frontliners confronted to the dire reality of racism. We are their voice at institutional level; they are our voice at grass-roots level. We support each other to make a change, from the local to the European level and back. We equip our members with community mobilization techniques to help them make a change in the life of their constituencies, and to help us make their voice stronger in the European institution because they are a force “on the ground”.
4. **Communication**: we develop and implement communications and media strategies to support and reinforce our advocacy work. We attempt to debunk myths and provide Q&As to raise awareness of the reality and different forms of racism in Europe.