



# PRESERVERE

Preventing Racism and Discrimination -  
Enabling the Effective Implementation of the  
EU Anti-Racist Legal Framework

PROJECT 101049763 - CERV-2021-EQUAL

# PRESERVERE TRAINING IMPLEMENTATION: A Case-study Collection



Co-funded by the  
European Union



Partnership:



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers of the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

SUBSCRIBE TO OUR NEWSLETTER



preservere-eu-project



Co-funded by the European Union

**Authors (in alphabetical order)**

Athanasia Hadjigeorgiu

Bistra Ivanova

Gabriella Fabrizi

Georgios Vourlakis

Jeroen van Wijck

Johannes Gereons

Katerina Kalaitzaki

Martina Pierfederici

Vaggelis Gettos

Valentina Iacono Quarantino

Wai Feersma Hoekstra



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. CASE-STUDY OVERVIEW</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. CASE-STUDY ANALYSIS</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1 Trainers and Educators</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1.1 Educational inclusion of marginalised communities</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1.2 Rebalancing the general structure of training modules</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.1.3 Discrimination during Training</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.2 Legal Professionals</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.2.1 Safeguarding the rights and well-being of child victims</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.2.2 Practical scenario for application of the law</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.2.3 The usage and interpretation of the terms “race” and “racial” in legal language</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.2.4 Discrimination: the burden of cultural differences</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.2.5 The discrimination and the individual freedom</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3.2.6 Job Application</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3.2.7 Deployment of public funds for victims of criminal activities</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3.3 Frontline Workers</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.3.1 Anti-discrimination in the context of employment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.3.2 Emma: The intersectional discrimination case study</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3.3.3 The burden of proof in discrimination cases</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.3.4 The intersectional discrimination. How to deal with the problem</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.3.5 Health Service Policy</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.3.6 Health Service Policy</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.3.7 Job Application - Roma person</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.3.8 Discriminatory media articles</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4. CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>25</b>

# PRESERVERE TRAINING IMPLEMENTATION: A CASE-STUDY COLLECTION



## 1. INTRODUCTION

PRESERVERE is concerned with fighting intolerance, racism, xenophobia and discrimination against vulnerable ethnic and racial groups and, in particular, Roma, Jews, Muslims and people of African descent. Starting from the premise that any system tasked with protecting the vulnerable from discrimination must, first and foremost, rely on an effective legal framework, the project implements activities concerned with the better enforcement of the law. It undertakes **research** in 6 partner countries (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Malta, and the Netherlands) and develops **educational material** and **tools** to be used to **train legal professionals** (judges, lawyers, prosecutors) and **frontline workers** (legal officers in prisons, the police, social services, reception asylum centers and border control authorities etc.) on how to use the nationally transposed European framework on anti-racism. Relying on desktop and fieldwork research, the project produced a series of deliverables that meet this objective, including (a) an **e-Book** identifying any gaps in the law and legal practice in both the European level and national levels of the 6 partner countries; (b) a **Training Toolkit** used to educate legal professionals, frontline workers, and trainers/educators in the partner countries; and (c) a **Common Report** on the Implementation of Learning and Training Activities in Partners' countries recommending changes and good practices. A second e-Book offering key lessons learned from the project and training workshops in the different countries will be published at the end of the project (31<sup>st</sup> January 2024). A final Conference aimed to disseminate project's results and promote the debate on racism and victims' protection will be held in Cyprus.

This article is a collection of all the **case studies** presented during the implementation of the Training program in each partner's county. An exploration of the key insights, discussions, and consensus reached during the analysis of these case studies for each group is here presented.

## 2. CASE-STUDY OVERVIEW

The intention of the case studies was to **present the challenges and opportunities of the trainings** to the various target audiences of each local context. It was recommended for each partner to prepare one case study per target group (three in total) to get a broader view on the implementation of the trainings. At minimum, each partner was to prepare one (1) case study for either target group (frontline workers, legal professionals or trainers/educators) to be included in their respective national reports.

The case studies provided a discussion point for legal professionals, frontline workers, and trainers to engage in dynamic discussions on scenarios that encapsulated real-world challenges that shed light on the lived experiences of the vulnerable groups. Through **focused analysis and open dialogue**, participants explored for instance, issues related to child protection within the legal framework, discrimination in employment, and inclusive education for marginalised communities. These case studies not only prompted thoughtful consideration of legal and ethical implications but also spurred participants to reflect on **best practices** and the pivotal role each group plays in upholding justice, fairness, and inclusivity within their respective domains.

Below tables offer an overview of the case studies that were discussed during the trainings conducted for the target audiences in the respective countries.

### Trainers and Educators

TITLE OF THE CASE STUDY	COUNTRY	DATE	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	PARTICIPANTS' PROFILE
Educational inclusion of marginalised communities	Greece	11 July 2023	10	Judges and Prosecutors
Rebalancing the general structure of training modules	Italy	26 April 2023	11	Local Police, Civil Society Organisations, Legal Services, Local Municipality, NGOs
Discrimination during Training	Malta	18 July 2023	8	Academia (law faculty), NGO and CSO sector, Police

Table 1: Overview of case studies per country per target group.

### Legal Professionals

TITLE OF THE CASE STUDY	COUNTRY	DATE	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	PARTICIPANTS' PROFILE
Safeguarding the rights and well-being of child victims	Greece	13 June 2023	79	Lawyers, Judges, Trainee Lawyers and Trainee Judges
Practical scenario for application of the law	Cyprus	9 October 2023	140	Lawyers, Judges, Prosecutors, Trainee Lawyers, Master Students, Undergraduate Law Students
The usage and interpretation of the terms "race" and "racial" in legal language	Italy	28 September 2023	35	Lawyers, Legal advisors, Police officers, Employees in public and private organizations with legal experience

Discrimination: the burden of cultural differences	Italy	20 October 2023	11	Lawyers
The discrimination and the individual freedom	Italy	8 November 2023	24	Lawyers, Professors, Students from European University of Rome
Job Application	Malta	2 August 2023	9	Academia (scientific staff and students)
Deployment of public funds for victims of criminal activities	Netherlands	25 May 2023	8	Professionals from anti-discrimination organisations and a Lawyer

Table 2: Overview of case studies per country per target group.

### Frontline Workers

TITLE OF THE CASE STUDY	COUNTRY	DATE	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	PARTICIPANTS' PROFILE
Anti-discrimination in the context of employment	Greece	28 June 2023	27	Legal officers or Social workers in social services and NGOs
Emma: The intersectional discrimination case study	Cyprus	4 October 2023	40	Social workers, Educators, Representatives of frontline national authorities, a Lawyer from the UNHCR and a Police officer
The burden of proof in discrimination cases	Italy	26 June 2023	27	Front-Desk Operators for the Anti-Discrimination Service of the Municipality of Bologna
The intersectional discrimination. How to deal with the problem	Italy	19 June 2023	7	Educators; Social Operators; Caseworkers at the internal service "Casa Verde" (Green House), a home-shelter for women with children
Health Service Policy	Malta	2 August 2023	9	Police force, CSOs, and NGOs
Health Service Policy	Netherlands	2 October 2023	3	Anti-discrimination organisations and a Local municipality
Job Application - Roma person	Bulgaria	10 November 2023	6	Frontline Workers from various organizations across the country
Discriminatory media articles	Bulgaria	10 November 2023	8	Frontline Workers from various organizations across the country

Table 3: Overview of case studies per country per target group.

### 3. CASE-STUDY ANALYSIS

The case studies focus on:

Problem definition / Reasons that led to the analysis of the proposed case (which topic was being discussed? Did a discussion arise from the presentation? Did the participant(s) disagree? etc.)

Narrative of the actual case (how the discussion took place, what important elements emerged, whether a different perspective was put on the problem, a specific aspect was deepened, the participants presented some direct experiences, etc.)

Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions.

#### 3.1 Trainers and Educators

##### 3.1.1 Educational inclusion of marginalised communities

###### **Problem definition**

The case study for trainers delved into a complex scenario involving the educational inclusion of marginalized communities, namely Roma children and asylum seekers. The discussion revolved around the application of the Victims Directive and the Racial Equality Directive in addressing the challenges faced by these vulnerable groups.

The problem definition highlighted the systemic barriers faced by Roma children and asylum seekers in accessing education. Participants engaged in a thoughtful discussion, expressing their concerns about the discriminatory attitudes exhibited by the local population. Disagreements arose as some participants questioned the adequacy of existing legal frameworks in effectively protecting the rights of these children.

###### **Narrative of the actual case**

In the narrative of the actual case, participants identified critical elements that underscored the urgency of the issue. They emphasized the importance of combating xenophobia and racism, while also recognizing the need for proactive measures to ensure the safety and well-being of the affected children. The discussion provided a platform for participants to share their direct experiences and insights into similar challenges they may have encountered in their professional roles.

###### **Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions**

The exploration of different scenarios led to a consensus on the paramount importance of education as a fundamental right for all children, irrespective of their ethnic or social background. Participants recognized the need for targeted interventions and policy measures to dismantle the existing barriers to education.

Additionally, they emphasized the role of trainers in advocating for inclusive educational policies and fostering a supportive environment for marginalized children.

In sum, the case study served as a catalyst for a robust discussion on the critical issues surrounding the educational inclusion of Roma children and asylum seekers. Participants left with a heightened awareness of the challenges at hand and a commitment to advocating for policies that promote equal access to education for all children, regardless of their background.



## 3.1.2 Rebalancing the general structure of training modules

### Problem definition:

The current case study emerged during the training of trainers organised by Lai-momo Società Cooperativa Sociale for the presentation of the PRESERVE training toolkit.

After the speaker's presentation, a broad discussion took place on the **general structure of the training modules**. A key-point that emerged from this discourse pertained to achieving equilibrium within the modules, specifically concerning the distribution of theory, practical activities, and the exchange of ideas and experiences among participants.

Furthermore, it was suggested that the training program could greatly benefit from facilitating opportunities for **interaction between legal professionals and frontline workers**. This would enable the inclusion of diverse professional perspectives and the amalgamation of various skill sets, enhancing the overall training experience.

### Narrative of the actual case:

According to the proposed Training Program, the optimal structure for training modules should maintain a balance of 40% theory, 40% practical activities, and 20% dedicated to group discussions among participants. However, during the meeting, a significant debate emerged regarding the **allocation of time for discussions and exchange of topics**. Many participants stressed the paramount importance of these exchanges, considering the allotted 20% as insufficient.

Some participants emphasized the vital role of exchanges in mutual training and growth. For less experienced participants, listening to shared experiences can be extremely beneficial, often surpassing the value of predominantly theoretical training. Therefore, it was proposed that **the time designated for exchanges should be increased** and positioned more centrally within the training modules.

Moreover, the discussion highlighted the need to **create opportunities for legal professionals and frontline workers to meet**, promoting dialogue, exchanging experiences, and pooling expertise. This would be especially valuable in complex fields like mental health or migrant reception, where legal issues frequently arise.

In the context of legal professional training, it was agreed to reduce the emphasis on theoretical content, given participants' strong theoretical backgrounds. Similarly, for frontline worker training, the focus on theory can be diminished, directing participants toward self-directed learning with the provided materials.

In general, the allocated time could be more effectively utilized for interactive exchanges and hands-on laboratory exercises, known for their significant motivational and practical value.

### Scenarios and agreed solutions:

The discussion highlighted the need to appropriately balance theory, practical activities and group discussion in the training modules. It was agreed that favouring face-to-face meetings, where theory would constitute only 20% of the time, could be the ideal solution to ensure greater involvement of participants and encourage the exchange of experiences, thus contributing to more effective and meaningful learning. It was also agreed to try to encourage meetings between frontline workers and legal professionals, so as to ensure a mutual exchange of expertise.

### 3.1.3 Discrimination during Training

#### Problem definition

The case study followed the introduction and discussion of the EU Action Plan against Racism and the introduction and discussion of its implementation in Malta. The case was selected as an example from daily practices of trainers.

#### Narrative of the actual case

The case study was presented in the following form:

You are running a training on discrimination to a group of colleagues working at a retail company. One of the participants, who is a manager in the company, has passed some comments about how there is no discrimination in the company, and that this type of training is not necessary. You can see that some of the participants are uncomfortable.

The following questions were asked to engage participants in a discussion:

What do you do and why?

#### Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions

After an engaged discussion, the participants agreed on the following solution:

One key consideration when organising trainings is who is in the room and the types of hierarchies that would be present, so that before organising such a session we would need to consider having different training sessions for different levels within a company.

Ask questions about how and why the manager feels that there is no discrimination at the company – do they have policies that cover this, and how/whether they are followed? Who is responsible to make sure that there are safe ways to report any such behaviour within the company.

Using case studies for participants to discuss, in order to elicit experiences and understandings of discrimination that do not necessarily point fingers back at the company itself.

Splitting the group into smaller group discussions.

Ensuring that some of the feedback and discussion is anonymous (possibly avoiding whole-group presentation of working group discussions).

Providing space for anonymous feedback (whether on paper after the training or otherwise / online).

Encouraging critical thought into what might happen in the future (to reduce the focus on what is or isn't happening in the present).

## 3.2 Legal Professionals

### 3.2.1 Safeguarding the rights and well-being of child victims

#### Problem definition

The case study for legal professionals centred on a complex scenario involving child abuse allegations, highlighting the intricate dynamics and challenges faced during criminal proceedings. The discussion emerged from a presentation on child protection laws and the role of legal professionals in safeguarding the rights and well-being of child victims. Participants engaged in a robust discussion, sharing diverse perspectives and experiences related to similar cases they had encountered in their practice. There was broad agreement on the critical importance of prioritizing the child's well-being and ensuring their participation in proceedings in a manner that prioritizes their safety and comfort.

#### Narrative of the actual case

In the narrative of the actual case, several crucial elements emerged. Participants underscored the need for specialized support for the child, including access to mental health professionals and child advocacy services. They also emphasized the importance of creating a child-friendly environment during testimonies, which should be conducted in a sensitive and supportive manner. The potential trauma experienced by the child due to repeated testimonies was a key concern, leading to a consensus on the need for alternative methods of evidence gathering, such as video-recorded interviews conducted by trained professionals.

#### Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions

During the discussion, participants considered various scenarios and proposed solutions. They advocated for the child's right to legal representation and agreed that a qualified legal representative should be appointed to protect the child's interests. Additionally, participants emphasized the necessity of comprehensive training for legal professionals handling child abuse cases, ensuring they possess the requisite skills and sensitivity to address these complex situations effectively.

Overall, the case study prompted a thoughtful examination of the challenges and best practices in handling child abuse cases within the legal framework. Participants expressed a shared commitment to prioritizing the well-being and rights of child victims, reinforcing the importance of specialized training and support mechanisms for legal professionals engaged in these cases.

### 3.2.2 Practical scenario for application of the law

#### Problem definition

The participants to the workshop in Cyprus were given the following scenario:

“Jean, a Cameroonian national, has entered Rubinia, an EU Member State, irregularly and has applied for asylum. While waiting for his asylum application to be processed, he is told that asylum seekers are not allowed to work in any industry and therefore receive a monthly stipend. The stipend covers his accommodation but does not leave him with enough money to eat by the end of the month; it is, by law, 60% of the minimum salary guaranteed to Rubinian nationals. Two months later, his asylum application is approved, and he is granted refugee status. As a refugee, he is only allowed to work in the farming and agricultural sectors”.

He is told that this is a necessary governmental policy in order to ensure that the refugee application system is not abused and overwhelmed by economic migrants. When he does get a job, he realises that he is earning less than half of the salary that is earned by other employees that are Rubinian nationals. When he complains about this, he is told mockingly by the manager: “What are you going to do? Work as an IT consultant?” Jean complains to the authorities and is immediately fired from his job for “stirring up unnecessary trouble with other employees”. Due to staff shortages and budgetary cuts, the authorities end up investigating the complaint three years later, by which time all witnesses claim to have forgotten the exchange between Jean and his manager.

Kuda isa good friend of Jean. He is a national of Rubinia and although not a person of African descent, he has a darker complexion. The manager mistakenly thinks that he was also a refugee, getting paid a reduced salary and is also planning to complain to the authorities. Just to be on the safe side, he fires him too. Finally, Jean’s wife, Ayshe, is a Muslim and wears the burqa. She wants to get a job as a receptionist, but she is told that she must have a university degree and an excellent command of the Rubinian language. This had not been part of the job advertisement that she had seen when applying for the job; it was mentioned for the first time during the interview. When she attempts to go to university and to enroll in language classes, she is told that one cannot be a student if they are wearing the burqa. As a result, she is unable to attend University. When leave the University’s administration office, she spots a poster that says “This University supports ‘Radicals out of Rubinia’ ”. The poster prominently displays a picture of a woman wearing a burqa. Participants were asked to identify any potential instances in which EU anti-discrimination law was violated and explain why they think a violation took place. They were given 10 minutes to read the scenario and either think to themselves, or discuss with a partner, their answer. Then a 40-minute discussion followed. Participants debated between themselves a number of issues that arose from the scenario, including the following:

Whether a prohibition to wear the burqa was a violation of anti-discrimination law or not. We discussed the provisions of the Racial Equality Directive and how these can potentially contradict with case law from the European Court of Human Rights (in particular, *Leyla Sahin v. Turkey* (App. No. 44774/98, Grand Chamber decision of 10 November 2005); *Dogru v. France* (App. No. 27058/05, 4 December 2008); and *SAS v. France* (App. No. 43835/11, Grand Chamber decision of 26 June 2014)).

Whether Jean was discriminated as a result of his nationality, or his ethnicity. If he was discriminated as a result of his nationality, participants debated whether the Race Equality Directive could nevertheless be interpreted in a particular way to help him. In this debate, they relied on cases like Judgment of 6 April 2017, *Jyske Finans*, C-668/15, ECLI:EU:C:2017:278 and the Swedish Court of Appeal case: Göta Court of Appeal case no. T 1666-09 *The Equality Ombudsman v. Skarets Fastigheter Aktiebolag*, judgment of 25 February 2010. Whether the Race Equality Directive protects asylum seekers and, if not, whether there are any provisions of international law that can fill the gap.

### **Narrative of the actual case**

How the discussion took place: The discussion took place in hybrid format. Online participants wrote their answers in the chat function, which were then read out by the facilitator. In-person participants raised their hand and participated in the debate directly. In this way, there was interaction between the online and in-person participants, as a person from one group could ask a question that was then answered or complemented by a member of the other group. In case online participants had numerous follow-up questions, these were sometimes also answered in the chat by a second facilitator that was participating in the training.

Both facilitators have extensive experience in providing training in hybrid formats.

What important elements emerged: That EU law can be complemented by international law in order to yield even more protective results for vulnerable groups. Also, that EU law can be interpreted both broadly and narrowly, as the provisions of the different Directives are open-ended.

Whether a different perspective was put on the problem/a specific aspect was deepened: During the discussion, the scenario was used only as a starting point to illustrate the different ways in which EU law could be utilized. So, participants themselves often asked questions like “What if the facts of the scenario were different in X way?” This allowed facilitators to practically illustrate the limits of the legal provisions by showing how they would apply in one circumstance, but not necessarily in another.

Whether participants presented direct experiences: Participants were not only legal professionals and law students, but also, sometimes, members of the vulnerable groups themselves (mainly Muslims). Others were also nationals of EU Member States other than Cyprus, which allowed them to bring their different personal perspectives in the conversation.

### 3.2.3 The usage and interpretation of the terms “race” and “racial” in legal language

#### Problem definition

The case study pertains to a discussion that arose during the online training course for Legal Professionals titled “National and European Anti-Discrimination Legislation on the Grounds of ‘Racial’ and Ethnic Origin: Legal Safeguards and Other Forms of Protection”, organized by Lai-momo Società Cooperativa Sociale.

Specifically, the discussion centred on an intervention made by participants during a presentation by a lecturer who is a professor of European Union Law at the University of Bologna. The lecturer’s presentation focused on the analysis of the primary and secondary sources within the European legal framework against racism.

Based on the content presented by the lecturer, participants expressed their interest in gaining further explanations and insights into the **precise meanings and interpretations of terminologies used in European legislation regarding various forms of discrimination based on ethnic origin.**

The lecturer emphasized the significance of the issues raised and provided comprehensive and clarifying answers, illustrating relevant rulings of the Court of Justice of the European Union as examples.

The participants concurred with the explanations provided by the lecturer.

#### Narrative of the actual case

The case study began with participants seeking clarifications during the presentation of the secondary legal framework, particularly Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000, which implements the principle of equal treatment between individuals regardless of their racial or ethnic origin.

At the conclusion of the presentation, participants expressed perplexity regarding the terminology used in the legislative framework. They expressed a keen interest in gaining a deeper understanding of the terminological distinctions within the European legal framework, including discrimination based on “race”, discrimination based on “skin colour”, and discrimination based on “ethnic origin”. Participants also sought specific clarifications regarding how the term “race/racial” is interpreted at the legislative level, given its lack of scientific basis.

The lecturer, a professor of European Union Law at the University of Bologna, emphasized the significance of the issue raised and initially clarified that certain legal terms may, in practice, be considered outdated because they result from the consolidation of linguistic formulas that have become entrenched not only in European Union law but also in international law.

He proceeded to explain that the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the European Union suggests the necessity to develop a collective notion that is shared by all and takes into account various factors.

As an illustrative example, the lecturer analysed the Court's (First Chamber) judgment dated 6 April 2017 in the case of *Jyske Finans A/S v Ligebehandlingsnævnet*. This judgment pertained to a common practice among some European credit institutions, which involved requesting identity documents, such as a copy of a passport or residence permit, from applicants seeking loans for the purchase of motor vehicles and who were identified as third-country nationals (individuals from countries outside the European Union or the European Free Trade Association) by their driving license.

The judgment emphasized that ethnic origin cannot be determined solely on the basis of a single criterion. Instead, it must take into account several elements, including some that are objective (such as nationality, religious faith, language, culture, and living environment) and others that are subjective. Relying solely on the country of birth as a criterion is insufficient for establishing ethnicity. It cannot be assumed that there is only one ethnic origin within every sovereign state. Determining ethnic origin requires the consideration of a variety of factors, and country of birth alone cannot automatically presume belonging to a particular ethnic group.

The Court of Justice's ruling provides insight into the concept of "ethnic origin". Notably, the ruling avoids mentioning either "race" or "skin colour", which is deliberate, as EU law does not consider these terms suitable for legal qualification. Instead, the focus is on addressing discrimination based on ethnic origin.

### Scenarios and agreed solutions

Efforts to combat racial discrimination primarily target discrimination based on ethnic origin. Ethnic origin encompasses a range of objective and subjective factors shared among individuals.

The terms "race" and "skin colour" are essentially regarded as synonymous with the term "ethnic origin".

Efforts are underway to remove obsolete terminology from legal language, as evidenced by the Court of Justice of the European Union's decision not to ascribe legal significance to the term "race".

## 3.2.4 Discrimination: the burden of cultural differences

### Problem definition

The case study looked at the difficulty in dealing with religious and anti-Roma discrimination. In Italy these represent the most widespread forms of discrimination especially in the areas of employment, housing and education. Muslims are often discriminated against because they are identified as a fundamentalist people whose religion implies the denial of women rights as well as a very strong profession of faith with participation in mosques. People of Roma origin are often subject to cultural biases that portray them as people of poor hygiene and with a tendency to steal. This makes the Roma community very gated. Roma women rarely work at public facilities or with private individuals, and even more rarely do Roma rent apartments because landlords fear squatting.

Roma children are also frowned upon in schools.

This has raised the debate between discrimination and integration of the Muslim and Roma communities.

It has been noted how on the one hand both communities tend to remain very rigid and closed in on themselves and how poorly they integrate with the general population. Emblematic have been in recent years the cases of Muslim women who, for wanting to live “Western-style”, have been barbarically slaughtered by their own family. (Saman’s case is famous).

Equally emblematic are the cases of train captains alerting passengers over the microphone to the presence of Roma on the carriages and urging them to be careful with their belongings. Many participants noted how these extremely closed cultures are themselves at the root of discrimination not so much as cultural bias but as the absence of points of contact with “host countries”. Many employers refuse to hire Muslims fearing “dangers” from their religious faith.

Many landlords refuse to rent apartments to Roma people fearing squatting. In schools and sports or play activities, Roma children are often excluded, and girls wearing headscarves are often singled out by their classmates. Some participants also raised a “problem within the problem” that is, how Muslim women even more than men experience discrimination both because they are Muslims and because they are women. So, on the one hand, lack of integration creates discrimination and in turn discrimination prevents integration.

### **Scenarios and agreed solutions**

The “solution” shared by all is that of a path that is neither simple nor short that must on the one hand not homologate the Islamic community to generic stereotypes and on the other hand be based on respect for cultures. This path that must involve society at different levels. Obviously, legislators and legal practitioners must be aware and properly prepared.

## **3.2.5 The discrimination and the individual freedom**

### **Problem definition**

A strong issue raised during the in-presence workshop at the European University of Rome was the motivation for discrimination. Apart from the case of “discriminatory speech” (“dirty nigger”, or “ugly Muslim”, or “Roma thief”), which, however, is punished in Italy only if it represents defamation (if the insults are uttered in front of third parties) because insult was decriminalized in 2016, the rest of discrimination takes place “in the mind” of the discriminator. That is, can the employer be punished because he chooses not to want to hire Muslims, Roma, people with tattoos, or adherents of a political or football faith other than his own? It is basically the motivation that is discriminatory.

But the motivation “belongs” to the mind of the author. Can the legislature, therefore, require an employer or owner to conduct business or employment relations with persons for whom he or she has no “sympathy”?

When does the motivation for discrimination become relevant and thus require intervention of the legislature, and when must the individual’s freedom to “choose” whom to hire, to whom to rent, etc., be protected?

### Narrative of the actual case

Obviously the “answer” to the question is delicate, often political. Certainly, two aspects must always be kept in consideration: the first is respect for the fundamental rights of man: whoever he may be: so the hospital, the school cannot “refuse” their services to someone just because he is Roma or Muslim or black. The same is said for public exercises that must serve everyone (bars, restaurants, hotels). The second is the harm the discriminated suffers that must be quantifiable and protectable in court. Basically, if A decides to sell his car to B (white Italian) and not to C (Muslim) probably the legislator cannot intervene because although there is discrimination it remains at the level of “cultural motivation” and “free choice” of the private individual. That is, discrimination represents a choice: precisely a discrimen that everyone makes or can make at various times in life without being able to be “punished” for it.

### Scenarios and agreed solutions

Apart from the fact that some norms should be revised (such as the decriminalization of injury), one cannot think that the solution lies in handing over to the judges all the behaviours and opinions of people. It would run the risk of infringing freedom of opinion.

The “solution” to the problem of discrimination must therefore certainly be combated in the public sector and in all private sectors (where possible) to protect fundamental human rights; secondly culturally through schools and social media to prevent or limit the formation of cultural, racial and social prejudices that harm the dignity of the person and belittle the entire community.

## 3.2.6 Job Application

### Problem definition

The case study followed the introduction and discussion of the EU Action Plan against Racism and the introduction and discussion of its implementation in Malta. The case was selected as an example from daily experiences of migrants in Malta.

### Narrative of the actual case

The case study was presented in the following form:

A and B applied for a job. A is a migrant in the country, with the right to work. A is also of mixed ethnic origins. B is a Maltese national. The job advert highlighted the need for experience. A and B have similar qualifications and whilst A has more experience, B has completed an additional online course in the subject matter. At the interview, A is asked a question about the location of his family and his commitments to remaining in Malta, a question he is happy to answer. B is offered the job.

The following questions were asked to engage participants in a discussion:

Is this a case of discrimination?

What might be some of the challenges that A faces in knowing whether this is discrimination?

Where do they need to report this?

Who has the burden of proof in this case?

What are the other relevant issues to consider?



## Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions

After an engaged discussion, the participants agreed on the following solution:

- The job advert highlighted the need for experience, as well as the fact that he was asked for location of family members indicates discrimination.
- Some people highlighted the difference / appropriateness around asking these types of questions, and whether there is a reason to ask these questions as a matter of courtesy or friendliness. However, this is inappropriate in the particular setting.
- B has an additional online course, but the advert emphasized the need for experience rather than training.
- This indicates that even if the course is the reason for selecting B rather than A, then there is discrimination since the advert criteria were not the actual criteria used to make selection
- In the Maltese context, this would need to be reported to DIER, which is the equality body on labour issues.
- However, there are challenges – A has no way of knowing what experience B has, or what the employers know about B’s experience. Interviewees most often do not know each other, have no access to documentation and discussions held in the interview.
- A has the burden of proof prima facie, but once a claim of discrimination is made the burden of proof would fall onto B.
- This means that A would require a significant amount of resources (knowledge, access to documentation) to even make the complaint, followed by an understanding of the legal framework, knowledge of where to complain, and the skills to complete a complaint; and that therefore this is a very unlikely situation in which a person would be able to make a complaint.

## 3.2.7 Deployment of public funds for victims of criminal activities

### Problem definition

The case study involving legal professionals in Netherlands was an insightful exploration into the deployment of public funds for victims of criminal activities, guided by the framework established by “Donner”. The discussion primarily revolved around the critical evaluation of the justifications required for government expenditure in supporting victims of criminal offenses. A meticulous examination of “Donner’s” rationale revealed that victims of severe crimes undoubtedly deserve assistance to facilitate their recovery process and return to a sense of normalcy. Furthermore, victims of criminal acts should receive adequate support to secure compensation from the offenders successfully.

### Narrative of the actual case

The discourse unravelled a multifaceted viewpoint that emphasized the necessity of governmental assistance in helping victims reclaim their damages from the perpetrators. However, it also illuminated the boundaries of governmental responsibilities, questioning the extent of its involvement in ensuring the compensation of victims. “Donner” introduced an essential perspective that cautioned against unrestricted governmental guarantees for the payment of compensation in cases where the offender is financially incapable. Such an approach requires rigorous justification to ascertain its fairness towards victims of various criminal activities and those affected by other adversities.

## Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions

The conversation unfolded a nuanced understanding of the governmental role, advocating for a balance that avoids the provision of a blank cheque in compensation guarantees. The approach suggested by “Donner” encouraged a recalibration of the advance payment arrangements, limiting them to amounts that, based on past experiences, are realistically recoverable. This concept echoes a resonating emphasis on the necessity of a practical and justifiable approach, where the government’s financial assistance is meticulously aligned with the actual potential for recovering the compensation, ensuring a fair and balanced support system for all victims. This thorough analysis prompted a reflective evaluation of the strategies and policies essential for optimizing the effectiveness and fairness of legal support to the victims of criminal activities.

## 3.3 Frontline Workers

### 3.3.1 Anti-discrimination in the context of employment

#### Problem definition

The case study for frontline workers presented by CECL examined a discriminatory incident in the context of employment, shedding light on the nuances of direct and indirect discrimination. This case prompted a focused discussion on anti-discrimination laws and the role of frontline workers in addressing such situations. The participants engaged in a lively conversation, drawing from their professional experiences and knowledge gained in the previous training modules.

#### Narrative of the actual case

In the narrative of the actual case, several crucial elements emerged. Participants recognized the blatant act of discrimination against Mr. G based on his race, highlighting the employer’s prejudiced decision. They explored the legal definitions of direct and indirect discrimination and collectively determined that this case constituted a clear instance of direct discrimination, as Mr. G was directly denied employment due to his skin colour.

The discussion deepened as participants considered the appropriate actions Mr. G should have taken. There was consensus that he should have filed a complaint with relevant authorities, seeking legal recourse for the discriminatory treatment he experienced. Additionally, participants emphasized the importance of Mr. G documenting the incident and collecting any evidence that could support his case.

## Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions

Regarding the role of professionals in such a situation, participants shared their perspectives on providing support and guidance to individuals facing discrimination. They discussed the importance of referring affected individuals to legal resources and advocacy organizations, offering them practical advice on how to navigate the legal process.

Throughout the analysis, participants explored various scenarios and proposed solutions, reinforcing the critical role of frontline workers in identifying and addressing discrimination. They emphasized the need for continued education and awareness-building on anti-discrimination laws and practices, equipping frontline workers with the tools to effectively advocate for the rights of individuals facing discrimination in various contexts.

### 3.3.2 Emma: The intersectional discrimination case study

#### Problem definition

The topic that was being discussed focused on the various types of discrimination. Cypriot participants seemed quite familiar with the definitions of direct and indirect discrimination but were quite reluctant to define what intersectional discrimination means. Above all, they found it quite difficult to distinguish it from multiple discrimination.

The video that was included in the PRESERVE training material and which was projected in the training sessions, was proven to be the best way to introduce participants to this term. Participants were quite surprised by the way intersectional discrimination functions. They asked several questions in order to better understand it and some of them brought additional examples to the table to explore if situations that they had encountered in their job would fall under the definition of intersectional discrimination.

#### Narrative of the actual case

Participants watched a TEDx talk (included as an option in the training material created by PRESERVE project partnership) by Kimberlé Crenshaw who coined the term “intersectional discrimination” in 1989 while being a professor at Columbia Law School and at UCLA School of Law, after her chance encounter with Emma DeGraffenreid. Emma, along with other black women, sued General Motors in 1976 for discrimination, claiming that the company did not hire them because of a combination of their race and gender. The judge dismissed the lawsuit because General Motors employed both black persons and women. However, the issue that Emma was raising was that black workers at the company, who usually performed industrial jobs, were men. Equally, women employees at General Motors, who generally did secretarial work, were white. The judge refused to allow Emma to combine her race and gender claims because he believed that would give her preferential treatment. However, neither black men nor white women experienced simultaneous oppression on both fronts. At that time, the problem did not have a name, and it was difficult for individuals to incorporate new facts into their way of thinking. Kimberlé came up with the analogy of an intersection that might allow judges to see Emma’s dilemma. The roads to the intersectional discrimination were the way that the workforce was structured by race and gender. Given Emma was black and female, she was positioned where those roads overlapped and experienced more than one type of social injustice.

#### Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions.

The scenarios that were discussed were based on a “what if” convention, meaning that participants were invited to think what would happen if Emma tried to fight against the obviously discriminatory decision of her exclusion from the factory solely on the basis of one out of the two following scenarios:

- a) as a woman who is denied work because she is a woman
- b) as a black person who is denied work because of her race.

This method was chosen in order to show that the mainstream, traditional discriminations theory (for example direct VS indirect) would not be able to resolve and interpret the interconnected (intersectional) layers of discrimination that this person experienced.

### 3.3.3 The burden of proof in discrimination cases

#### Problem definition

This case study refers to a discussion that emerged during the training for frontline workers organised by Laimomo Società Cooperativa Sociale.

It refers to the insights requested by participants during a presentation by a lecturer, a lawyer and member of the Association for Legal Studies on Immigration (ASGI), on the **basic principles of the burden of proof in anti-discrimination law**.

Through the analysis of case studies, exchange of experiences and discussions, the topics of interest were explored in depth and questions posed by participants were clarified.

#### Narrative of the actual case

The discussion took place following the relator's citation of Article 2697(I) of the Italian Civil Code on "the burden of proof", which states that "whoever wants to assert a right in court must prove the facts on which it is based". This reference aroused the interest of the participants, who sought further clarification as to who is required to present evidence, what kind of evidence is required in the case of alleged discrimination, and whether the use of covertly made environmental recordings is legitimate as a means of proof in a court case in which one is a party to protect one's right.

The in-depth study of the relevant legal framework, the analysis of real cases and the contribution of participants' personal experiences stimulated a highly participative discussion that was much appreciated by all participants.

#### Scenarios and solutions

The following emerged from the discussion.

In cases of alleged discrimination, the need to provide valid evidence in a legal context is of paramount importance. Different approaches can be followed to find useful evidence.

Witnesses play a key role; whenever possible, it is advisable to be accompanied by a third person, so that they can then act as a witness.

Keeping a written record of interactions is equally important, reasoned responses in writing are particularly valuable and can be requested by PEC or registered mail. Failure to reply in writing may also constitute evidence of discrimination.

In the event of a lack of evidence, "situational tests" can be used, which allow one to replicate the situation in which discrimination is alleged to have occurred by replacing the victim with a similar person, except for the discriminating factor. The test result can be used as evidence to support proof of discrimination.

A further approach may be to collect evidence of similar discriminatory conduct from several individuals, demonstrating a discriminatory practice.

With regard to audio or video recordings, they can be used as valid evidence, allowing for the recording of interviews or events where one is present, if these recordings are used to protect one's rights in a legal context.

### 3.3.4 The intersectional discrimination. How to deal with the problem

#### Problem definition

This case study refers to a discussion that emerged during the training for frontline workers organised by Cooperativa Sociale San Saturnino onlus (in-presence session).

After the presentation, the participants asked numerous questions, linking the content addressed with the problems and needs of the women received in their service. In fact, this session took place at an internal service of the cooperative: a community that welcomes single women with children to accompany them towards autonomy. Most of these women are migrants from Africa. Many are Muslims. They present many difficulties in their path of inclusion. The most interesting topic was **intersectional discrimination**.

#### Narrative of the actual case

This case study refers to a discussion that emerged during the online training for Legal Professionals. Participants asked for more in-depth study of the topic and brought examples of women who suffer from such discrimination. With the help of trainers, they sought to better understand the **difference** between intersectional discrimination, multiple discrimination and additive discrimination. The distinction seems very subtle but interesting for the work.

Trainers used the now famous example of the crossroads developed by Kimberlé Crenshaw, later taken up by numerous authors, including Italian experts such as Sabrina Marchetti, Barbara Giovanna Bello, etc.

In a paper uploaded on Academia.edu, B. G. Bello (Discriminazioni multiple e intersezionalità: queste sconosciute!) proposes three observations:

- 1) Depending on how the discrimination manifests itself, a person may also suffer all these forms of multiple, additive and intersectional discrimination;
- 2) Traditionally we speak of these discriminations mainly with reference to the factors “gender” and “race”, but they may concern the most varied combinations of discriminatory factors (e.g. sexual orientation of migrants or refugees; disabled foreigners, etc.);
- 3) Discrimination based on two or more factors (whether additive or intersectional), just like discrimination based on a single factor, takes the typical forms of direct or indirect discrimination, harassment, orders to discriminate and retaliation.

#### Scenarios and agreed solutions

The question participants asked themselves was: “*Once intersectional discrimination has been identified in case management, how can this help frontline workers in their advocacy work?*”

Bringing examples from other projects developed, the trainers emphasised that intersectionality allows marginalised groups and their experiences to be given a voice. Adopting an intersectional approach therefore means recognising the uniqueness of each person’s experience, including the possible discrimination and exclusion they experience.

Putting the person at the centre of the intervention is the cooperative’s usual approach. However, intersectionality gives added value as it recognises the simultaneous and simultaneous importance of the different mechanisms of discrimination that the person experiences.

The need to be considered in one's entirety was expressed very effectively by Dianne Pothier (1954-2017), a Canadian law professor and activist with a visual impairment due to albinism, when she wrote: "I can never experience gender discrimination except as a person with a disability; I can never experience disability discrimination except as a woman. I cannot disaggregate myself nor can anyone who can discriminate against me. I do not fit into separate boxes of grounds for discrimination. **Even when only one ground of discrimination seems to be relevant, its effects affect my whole person**". Pothier highlighted one of the major difficulties still faced by people subjected to multiple discrimination today, that of being "dismembered" and put into "separate boxes of grounds for discrimination".<sup>1</sup>

### 3.3.5 Health Service Policy

#### Problem definition

The case study followed the introduction and discussion of the EU Action Plan against Racism and the introduction and discussion of its implementation in Malta. The case was selected as an example from daily practices in health care, however, the specific policy was fictional and does not exist.

#### Narrative of the actual case

The case study was presented in the following form:

The country's policy is that only nationals get access to the range of health services on offer whilst migrants (irrespective of the particular status) only receive access to urgent care.

The following question was asked to engage participants in a discussion:

Is this form of differentiated treatment unjustified discrimination for the purposes of the law?

After discussing the first case, a second, adjusted case was presented.

The case study was presented in the following form:

The country has reversed its policy and now migrants are entitled to healthcare. However, in the first months since the reversal of the policy, and informed by public concern, some health centres have continued to avoid treatment for non-urgent matters to some groups of migrants and instead referred them to NGOs that offer services specifically to migrant populations.

The following question was asked to engage participants in a discussion:

Is this form of differentiated treatment unjustified discrimination for the purposes of the law?

#### Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions

After an engaged discussion, the participants agreed on the following solution: Whilst this kind of policy can fall within the exclusion criteria of the directive (given that it is a policy based on nationality), there are various grounds to consider not least the fact that national insurance payments are collected from such migrants.

On the adjusted scenario, the solution was that this was clearly a case of discrimination however, it reflects the need for awareness of changes of policy and the risks associated with discriminatory policies in the first place.

<sup>1</sup> Dianne Pothier, *Connecting Grounds of Discrimination to Real People's Real Experiences*, in Canadian Journal of Women and the Law, vol. 13(1), 2001, pp. 37-73. <https://www.informareunh.it/intersezionalita-e-disabilita/>

### 3.3.6 Health service policy

#### Problem definition

In this case - presented in the Netherlands - involving a coordinating staff member from the blood department of a hospital, the dialectics of religious belief and professional requirements were explored. The staff member, due to her religious beliefs, preferred to keep her arms fully covered while at work. Contrarily, the hospital's policy mandated keeping forearms uncovered due to hygiene considerations, illuminating a case of indirect discrimination.

#### Narrative of the actual case

A lively and thoughtful discussion ensued, where participants deliberated on the concept of "indirect discrimination" They examined the hospital's policy juxtaposed against the employee's religious beliefs, seeking a balance between upholding hygiene standards and respecting individual religious practices. The dialogue deepened, exploring whether existing policies inadvertently affected certain groups, particularly those with specific religious attire requirements.

#### Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions

Participants shared diverse perspectives, discussing the possibility of revisiting and modifying organizational policies that inadvertently perpetuate discrimination. They also reflected on practical aspects such as how an employee can be reintegrated into the work environment following a conflict, underscoring the importance of fostering a supportive and respectful workplace atmosphere.

### 3.3.7 Job Application - Roma person

#### Problem definition

The case study was brought up by a social worker who works with the Roma community in Bulgaria. It is a typical case when Roma people are seeking a job and face discrimination and racism there.

#### Narrative of the actual case

A Roma person reads the job offers online on the most popular website. He is qualified for the position and sends his documents (CV, motivation letter). Then he receives a phone call for an interview. When he arrives at the office for the interview, the employer is not interested any more to interview him but quickly says that the position is already taken.

Then the questions were:

- Is there a case of discrimination?
- Is it possible to report it and where?
- Is it possible to influence the employer that the Roma person is qualified and should be at least given the equal chance as the other candidates?
- Would it be helpful to involve some media attention?

### Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions

There were many ideas discussed and different participants chose different scenarios for their work:

- A social worker needs to present the possibilities for the Roma person so he can take his own decision.
- A social worker can accompany the applicant at the interview and advocate to the employer that he is a good worker and can do the job
- The State Agency against Discrimination can be alerted for discrimination based on ethnicity.
- An emotional social media post can be published on how Roma people want to work and are qualified for the job, but nobody gives them the opportunity.
- An emotional post on the social media about some successfully working Roma to change the narratives.

### 3.3.8 Discriminatory media articles

#### Problem definition

The case study was brought up by a participant who has witnessed some racist media articles in the local media against Roma

#### Narrative of the actual case

Some online media in Bulgaria do not respect human rights and publish openly racist and discriminatory articles, many of which are fake. This often happens around national and local elections. Not only that they are unethical and misinformative as such, but they are harmful, they spread hate and strengthen negative stereotypes against Roma people.

Then the questions were:

- Is there a case of racism?
- What is our power as organizations and people to stand against it?
- Is it possible to report it and where?

#### Description of the different scenarios that were discussed and any agreed solutions

There were many ideas discussed:

- The State Agency against Discrimination can be alerted for hate speech based on ethnicity.
- The owner of the website can receive letters, or a petition to remove the content.
- The posts on the social media (FB) can be reported and taken down.
- Citizens can comment on the social media and expose that this racist and should not be tolerated



## 4. CONCLUSIONS

Cases presented by each country show specificities but also similarities.

The two case studies Bulgaria had executed provided concrete recommendations and conclusions. In the “Job Application - Roma Person” case study, agreed-upon solutions included a social worker presenting options to empower the individual’s decision-making, advocating for them during interviews, reporting discrimination to the State Agency, and using emotional social media posts to highlight the qualifications and desire of Roma people for employment opportunities. In the case study addressing “Discriminatory Media Articles”, participants reached a consensus on actionable solutions. These involved alerting the State Agency against Discrimination in cases of hate speech based on ethnicity, urging website owners through letters or petitions to remove offensive content, and reporting and removing discriminatory social media posts. Additionally, citizens were encouraged to voice their opinions, denouncing racism, and advocating against its tolerance on social media platforms. Further, proposing emotionally resonant posts showcasing successful Roma individuals aimed to shift prevailing narratives.

In one case study, Cyprus has focused on the problem of Intersectional discrimination which refers to the overlapping or intersecting forms of discrimination that individuals may face due to multiple aspects of their identity, such as race, gender, sexuality, or socioeconomic status. This concept emphasises the need to consider the interconnected nature of these various social categories when addressing issues of discrimination and inequality. This case study subject was chosen in order to show that the mainstream, traditional discriminations theory (for example direct VS indirect) would not be able to resolve and interpret the interconnected (intersectional) layers of discrimination that this person experienced.

For Greece, legal professionals, frontline workers, and trainers engaged in comprehensive discussions, delving into complex case studies and evaluating their practical implications. For example, in the case study entitled “Safeguarding the Rights and Well-being of Child Victims”, participants expressed a shared commitment to prioritising the well-being and rights of child victims, reinforcing the importance of specialised training and support mechanisms for legal professionals engaged in these cases. In another case study entitled “Anti-discrimination in the Context of Employment”, participants emphasised the need for continued education and awareness-building on anti-discrimination laws and practises, equipping frontline workers with the tools to effectively advocate for the rights of individuals facing discrimination in various contexts.

Italy implemented six case studies. Most of them were focused on practical problems one may encounter during cases of discrimination and anti-racism, for instance cultural differences. Also, like Cyprus, one case study focused on intersectional discrimination. In one of the case studies implemented, entitled “The Discrimination and the Individual Freedom” participants came up with the following recommendation: addressing discrimination demands a dual approach. Initially, it requires active combat in both the public and, where feasible, private sectors to safeguard fundamental human rights. Secondly, a cultural intervention is crucial, aiming to mitigate the emergence of cultural, racial, and social prejudices that undermine individual dignity and devalue entire communities. This entails efforts within educational institutions and social media platforms to curtail such biases.

Another case study entitled “Rebalancing the General Structure of Training Modules”, participants agreed to try to encourage meetings between frontline workers and legal professionals so as to ensure a mutual exchange of expertise.

Malta presented the scenario of a job application. A very common and realistic scenario presented to the participants with questions like “Is this a case of discrimination?”, “Where do they (the job applicants) need to report this?” and “Who has the burden of proof in this case?”. The discussion in the case study evolved around amongst others, the appropriateness of type of questions that were asked during the interview and the difficulty of the burden of proof.

In the Netherlands, one case study regarded the policies in Health Services organisations. Participants shared diverse perspectives, discussing the possibility of revisiting and modifying organisational policies that inadvertently perpetuate discrimination. The second case study focused on the deployment of public funds for victims of criminal activities around discrimination and racism. The thorough analysis during the case study discussion prompted a reflective evaluation of the strategies and policies essential for optimising the effectiveness and fairness of legal support to the victims of criminal activities.

Overall, it was evident that the similarities, in the type of cases discussed, the approach to discussion and the solutions, outweigh the differences after comparing the outcomes of the case studies implemented by the countries involved. The case studies revealed interchangeable topics, suggesting a recommendation for future case studies: employing identical case study setups with consistent themes. Distinctions arise in the implementation of legal frameworks across participating countries and the varying independence and funding structures of frontline worker organisations, whether governmental or non-governmental. Most importantly, all the scenarios discussed as well as the solutions proposed during the case studies can be used in a yet to be established knowledge base. Establishing this centralised hub can function as a perpetual resource for professionals and advocates, fostering continuous learning and facilitating the effective implementation of the directives.