



This project was funded by the European Union's Internal Security Fund — Police.

PATRIR



ibj
INSTITUTE FOR
POLICE RESEARCH

SYNYO

Budapest Centre
FOR MASS ATROCITIES PREVENTION



POLITICAL CAPITAL
POLICY RESEARCH & CONSULTING INSTITUTE



Hochschule Niederrhein
University of Applied Sciences



CHAMPIONS

COOPERATIVE HARMONISED ACTION MODEL TO STOP
POLARISATION IN OUR NATIONS

**D5.9 Collected Decisions and results of the Cooperation,
Communication and Online Joint Solution
Improvement Workshops**



This project has received funding from the European Union's Internal Security Fund — Police under Grant Agreement No. 823705.

Project Details

Acronym: **CHAMPIONS**

Title: Cooperative Harmonised Action Model to Stop Polarisation in Our Nations

Coordinator: **INSTITUTUL ROMAN PENTRU ACTIUNE, INSTRUIRE SI CERCETARE IN DOMENIUL PACII - PEACE ACTION, TRAINING & RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF ROMANIA (PATRIR)**, Romania

Reference: 823705

Type: ISFP-2017-AG-RAD

Program: Internal Security Fund — Police

Theme: Preventing and countering violent radicalisation

Start: 01 January 2019 – 30 June 2021

Duration: 30 months

Website: www.championsproject.eu

Consortium: **INSTITUTUL ROMAN PENTRU ACTIUNE, INSTRUIRE SI CERCETARE IN DOMENIUL PACII - PEACE ACTION, TRAINING & RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF ROMANIA (PATRIR)**, Romania
FUNDACJA INSTYTUT BEZPIECZENSTWA SPOLECZNEGO (IBS), Poland
ALAPITVANY A NEPIRTAS ES TOMEGES ATROCITASOK NEMZETKOZI MEGELOZESEERT (BCMAP), Hungary
POLITICAL CAPITAL SZOLGALTATO KFT (PolCap), Hungary
TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITAT DARMSTADT (TUDA), Germany
SYNYO GmbH (SYNYO), Austria
CULTURES INTERACTIVE E.V. - VEREIN ZUR INTERKULTURELLEN BILDUNG UND GEWALT PRAVENTION (CULTURES), Germany
HOCHSCHULE NIEDERRHEIN (HN), Germany

Deliverable Details

Number: **D5.9**

Title: **Collected Decisions and results of the Cooperation, Communication and Online Joint Solution Improvement Workshops**

Lead beneficiary: PATRIR

Work package: WP5

Dissemination level: Public (PU)

Nature: Report (RE)

Due date: October 30th, 2020

Submission date: June 30th, 2021

Authors: Sylvia Weiss, CULTURES

Contributors: All partners (HSNR, CULTURES, POLCAP, IBS, BCMAP, SYNYO, TUDA, PATRIR)

Reviewers: Dana Dolghin, PATRIR

<p>Acknowledgement: This project was funded by the European Union's Internal Security Fund – Police under Grant Agreement number: 823705.</p>	<p>Disclaimer: The content of this report represents the views of the author only and is his/her sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains</p>
--	---

Table of Contents

Contents

- 1. The Roundtable in Germany 6
 - 1.1 The date and location 6
 - 1.2 List of participants / people who filled out the survey..... 6
 - 1.3 Take-aways from the Workshop / the survey..... 6
 - 1.4 Summary 16
- 2. The Roundtable in Hungary 17
 - 2.1 The date and location 17
 - 2.2 List of participants / people who filled out the survey..... 17
 - 2.3 Take-aways from the Workshop / the survey..... 18
 - 2.4 Summary 19
- 3. The Roundtable in Poland..... 20
 - 3.1 The date and location 20
 - 3.2 List of participants/people who filled out the survey 20
 - 3.3 Take-aways from the Workshop/the survey..... 21
 - 3.4 Summary 23
- 4. The Roundtable in Romania..... 24
 - 4.6 The date and location 24
 - 4.7 List of participants / people who filled out the survey..... 24
 - 4.8 Take-aways from the Workshop 27
 - The survey..... 29
 - 4.9 Summary 29
- Conclusion 30

Executive Summary

This is a publishable report of the collected decisions and results of the Cooperation, Communication and Online Joint Solution Improvement specifically related to the cooperation on ALERT/ARENA and the usability of the platform. (D 5.9). These are results on the outcomes and recommendations of the Roundtable events, where participants themselves make joint decisions on future collaboration to counter polarisation / radicalisation in their relevant communities, as well as themselves develop innovative methods to jointly detect threats early that arise from polarisation. Specifically, we wanted to understand how FLPs engage with the platform, what improvement is needed and what further modifications need to be made to the platform. In this summary, partners of CHAMPIONS involved in the development of the roundtables convey the feedback received from FLPs (those engaged in the RTs) and from an extended network of relevant FLPs who, although not involved directly in the process, were interested in testing it out.

To upload on the platform, this document has been anonymized. For the participants involved, we have kept only their professional area/background.

The testing of the online platform has unfortunately been delayed by several months. Consequently, we have also pushed forward the deadline for the D5.9 deliverable to June 2021 (originally 2020), just like for 5.8, in order to have enough time to test it out and also collect input. The consortium has however included all expected elements in this deliverable. The deadline was not changed in the EC platform knowing that the delay was motivated by the process. The project officer of the CHAMPIONS project in the EC, Ana Maria Gila Rancano, was informed and made aware of the situation.

1. The Roundtable in Germany

This report is therefore divided into two parts. 1.) The workshop on online radicalisation and hate speech, which we used in June 2020 as a kick-off event for a more in-depth discussion on the topic of online collaboration, and 2.) The evaluation of the online survey, in which the participants specifically tested the ALERT/ARENA platform.

1.1 The date and location

- Workshop on Online Radicalisation: June 12th + 13th 2020 Training: 2 Days
- Online Survey / one on one consolidation on the ALERT / ARENA Platform with the Roundtable participants in May 2021 (no specific date)

1.2 List of participants / people who filled out the survey

- list of participants for online radicalisation Workshop
 1. University / counselling professional
 2. NGO worker
 3. NGO worker
 4. NGO worker
 5. NGO / youth worker
 6. youth worker
 7. youth worker
- 7 responses of the online Survey (anonymous) for the testing of the ALERT / ARENA-Platform.

1.3 Take-aways from the Workshop / the survey

Workshop on Online Radicalisation / Hate Speech:

Day 1:

Time	Method	Details
4pm	Introduction	Introduction of the workshop leaders & Agenda of the workshop

4.15p m	Exercise: Apps in our everyday life	<p>Which apps do you use?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each participant draws the apps (2-4 apps), shows them to the others and explains how they are used. • To get into the topic • Communicate how much we use online services and how important they are in our daily lives.
5.15p m	BREAK	
5.30p m	<p>Input: Media competence as a key concept</p> <p>subsequent discussion / exchange</p>	
6:30p m	BREAK	
6:45p m	<p>Expert interview with Harald Weilnböck (recorded video): How do young people radicalise? What does radicalisation mean?</p>	<p>Individual questions are presented and discussed in sequences</p> <p>First ask: What is your understanding of radicalisation?</p> <p>Afterwards: What have you noted down? Is there anything missing from Harald's definition? Would you disagree with certain points in Harald's definition?</p>

7.30p m	Feedback-Round	
------------	----------------	--

Day 2:

Time	Method	Details
9:30am	Arriving	
10:00a m	Morning-Round	How am I doing today?
10.30a m	Input: right-wing media strategies + Exchange	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. on which online portals / channels are right-wing actors active? 2. what content is disseminated by right-wing actors? And how? What effect does this have? 3. 'gamification of terror' (youth cultural perspective, references to the gaming scene)
12:00p m	BREAK	
12:15p m	Expert interview: Challenges of online radicalisation for youth work?	<p>Individual questions are presented and discussed in sequences</p> <p>First ask: What is your understanding of online radicalisation?</p> <p>Afterwards: What did you write down? What is missing from Harald's definition?</p>
1:00pm	LUNCH	

2:00pm	Input and exchange: youth cultural prevention work on the net	Present projects and practical examples + Do's and Don'ts
3:00pm	Teaching methods: Talkshow method/ Take picture	interactive methods with online media (mobile phone) that participants can carry out with young people
4:00pm	Input and exercise: Dealing with Hate Speech	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is hate speech? (If not already clear, or define very briefly) 2. Together with participants*: Collect possible strategies for dealing with hate speech (in plenary) (summary document already prepared) 3. Case work: Practise counter-speech with examples: Try it out yourself (small groups).
5:30pm	wishes / ideas for the next module + finding a date	
5:45pm	Feedback	<p>How am I doing?</p> <p>What am I taking with me?</p> <p>What am I leaving here?</p>

1. Comments, suggestions and questions raised

In the workshop on online radicalisation/ hate speech, the first task was to explain the problem area of radicalisation on the internet and the media strategies of right-wing

extremist actors. First, an outline of the problem was given, followed by a joint discussion on ways of dealing with hate speech and right-wing extremist agitation online. As usual for our workshops, we used interactive methods in alternation with knowledge transfer. In this roundtable, in addition to the topic of media strategies of far-right actors, we discussed the concept of media competence and youth-cultural online prevention work.

The participants commented that discussions can be shortened even more by the moderators if they become too long and deviate from the topic. The exchange between the group was really good and led to a lot of ideas for further thoughts on how to deal with online radicalisation and hate speech. The participants stated that already acquired knowledge has been further consolidated.

We also had an in-depth discussion on the terms 'radicalisation' and 'right-wing extremism'. As a result of the discussion it became clear to the participants how important it is especially for NGOs to have a clear definition of these terms. The participants really appreciated being given the space to talk about right-wing extremist media strategies and ways to deal with it. Some of the participants are directly affected by this. They already worked on some strategies to deal with it, so it was a very fruitful discussion in relation to this topic. With the knowledge of the participants, we also came to talk about possible ways to conduct the awareness raising event on hate speech.

2. Suggestions, recommendations for future roundtables.

How can we use resources of diverse teams the best? This can be one topic for the future. Two participants would like to know more about anti-feminism. The participants would like to get to know more methods or examples of methods with interactive exercises. The Inputs could be more practical with more examples etc. We can talk more about the international networking of the right-wing extremist scene.

Participants stressed the importance of standing up online as a strong civil society against any form of group hatred. Unfortunately, many feel insecure in dealing with this and instead remain silent. This is why it can be important to have an online platform where you can talk to experts about specific incidents (on the internet).

Online Survey to test the ALERT / ARENA-Platform

Usefulness of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

In order to keep the questionnaire about the online platform as low-threshold and clear as possible, there were three questions about the usefulness of the ALERT/ARENA platform: 1.) ALERT / ARENA are helpful for my work context. 2.) ALERT / ARENA are useful tools for case consultation. 3.) ALERT / ARENA enables inter-agency exchange.

57.1% of the participants agreed that ALERT/ARENA are helpful for their work context. 28.6% stated that ALERT/ARENA are moderately helpful for their work context. 14.3% stated that the platform is not helpful. For question 2, 42.9% agreed to a particularly high degree that ALERT/ ARENA are a useful tool for counselling. 28.6% said that it is a useful tool. 1 person moderately agreed and another person stated that ALERT/ARENA is not a useful tool. With regard to question 3, 42.9% stated that ALERT/ARENA promotes inter-agency exchange to a particularly high degree. 2 persons (28.6%) stated that inter-agency exchange is promoted. Again, 1 person (14.3%) was undecided (medium response) and 1 person (14.3%) indicated that ALERT/ARENA does not promote inter-agency exchange.

In addition to these quantitative statements, which were all in all positive, the participants also made additional comments, criticisms and suggestions for improvement, which are quoted below.

- *“When I submit a case to Alert, I may not want to be automatically registered as an expert in Arena. A choice would be nice.”*
- *“structured in a comprehensible way.”*
- *“It's hard for me to say from the description of a case without further processing. Sounds interesting at first, but the way to describe the case itself is too hurdling for me and some questions should only be asked afterwards (e.g. professional career). As a real person seeking support, I don't want to have to describe myself for 15-30 minutes first, but describe the case and then the rest. I often need support the day before yesterday rather than the day after tomorrow, especially in acute cases á la white pupil hit black pupil on the face because of his looks, that became a local topic,*

there was a demo, it was full of hate speech & co. and socio-pedagogue of the place writes.”

- *“At first glance, it seems both innovative and totally necessary and sustainable!!!”*

User-Friendliness of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

There were also three quantitative questions on this paragraph with a request for concluding comments. In relation to the first question "The concept of ALERT and ARENA is understandable", 3 people (42.9%) indicated that they strongly agreed with this statement. 28.6% stated that they agreed with this statement and one person (14.3%) stated that they moderately agreed with this statement. One person (14.3%) disagreed.

Regarding question 2 "The structure of ALERT and ARENA is clear", all participants agreed. 42.9% agreed to a particularly high degree.

Regarding question 3 "Submitting an ALERT was easy" there was again a mixed result. 1 person (14.3%) agreed to a high degree, 3 people 42.9% agreed. One person was undecided (14.3%) and 2 people (28.6%) said that submitting an ALERT was not easy.

In addition to these quantitative statements, the participants also made additional comments, which are quoted below.

- *“I don't find the categorisation of conspiracy theories appropriate for recruitment. It should be its own category. I would also argue for conspiracy narratives as a term. On the point about explaining the case in more detail, there is not a request for the type and manner of feedback. This should be included in the description or even be a separate field.”*
- *“Registration absolutely necessary?”*
- *“I was not able to submit a case. Maybe create a tutorial (video or illustrated) for this?”*
- *“I felt impatient to be able to describe the case and send it off, and didn't really know why my own profession had to be described first. Sometimes I found it a bit difficult when I was just looking for help. but i don't know whether it was intended for quick, low-hurdle support intervention or was conceived in a completely different way.*

Therefore: i would try to make the structure of the case description and the questions asked more intuitive to the issue. It sometimes distracted or confused me. Ultimately, however, I don't know whether this is only intended for a certain professional field, where the majority has studied and has a digital affinity, or whether a volunteer, committed person, educator, volunteer, etc. is also called upon to turn to it. for me, it would still be too full of hurdles / ambiguous in the roadmap.”

- *“... With a little more routine / getting used to it, I'm sure my rating will change from 4 to 5 ...”*

Suggestions for the sustainability of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

The feedback on sustainability was generally more consistent than the feedback on the previous thematic blocks. Even though most of the participants indicated that they were undecided - i.e. they did not tick either I agree or I disagree.

Thus, 57.1% of the participants indicated that they neither agree nor disagreed with the question "I will continue to use ALERT and ARENA to obtain expert assessments of specific cases". 2 participants (28.6%) indicated that they agree and 1 participant (14.3%) indicated that they strongly agree.

A similar result emerged for the question "I would permanently integrate ALERT/ARENA into my daily work routine. 3 people (50%) were undecided, 1 person (14.3%) agreed, 2 people (28.6%) agreed to a great extent.

Two people (28.6%) strongly agreed and 2 people (28.6%) agreed with the statement "I would recommend ALERT and ARENA to my colleagues". 3 people (42.9%) were undecided.

The following comments were made on the topic of sustainability:

- *“If the operation is clear, I would like to integrate it into the work and recommend it to colleagues.”*
- *“It's hard to say at the moment. It has potential and is a great idea, but it would have to be "easier" for users and in particular there would have to be an active community at the start. Sometimes tools on successful platforms are not the best, but the community is large (and the tools intuitive in the right/important places). Ultimately,*

it depends on whether people use it permanently. it's a difficult balancing act between catchy functionality and sustainable usability..."

- *"at first, some technical issues with the registration seem to be in need of mending"*

Comments and questions raised by the participants

One person seemed to have big problems with the platform and couldn't register. Accordingly, it can be concluded that technical problems also still occur.

- *"I filled in a little case story of an incident, I guess it may be found there somewhere. The print of the forms is relatively small. Attempts to register as "expert" or as "provider" somehow failed at various attempts: I received many messages of „Whoops, looks like something went wrong...." The "user" registration form is quite sensitive. I inadvertently left one letter space in the entry section of the registration code, this then blocked my registration without telling me where the problem was; also the web registration system will not tell you which information on which page you did not fill in, it just says something is missing. Moreover, some positive confirmation at the end of registration would be good. In the end, my "user" registration seemed to have failed. In any event I cannot log in with my password. My feeling is that the registration has cut the length of my password (I saw in passing, with my data, that there was only a five or six digit password, i.e. 6 stars ***** ... but my chosen password was longer . The "send new password" did not work either – since no password was then sent to me (also not in the spam)."*

Some participants expressed concern that there are too many hurdles for people who want to submit an alert easily and quickly, as they have to register additionally. One participant stated that the process can be complicated for people who are less tech-savvy. Furthermore, the question/comment came up that people can also get on the platform and submit false cases/ extremist statements. This point has already been discussed several times in the consortium, which is why we decided that all people who submit a case must also register. Registration, on the other hand, has the disadvantage that the offer may not be low-threshold enough. The participants also seem to have recognised this dilemma.

- *"The pitfall of being registered as an expert in an alert can tempt people to drop out because they don't want to be an expert."*

- *“Unclear operation for people who are not so technically gifted”*
- *“Without checking the information provided, any fool, misanthrope or whatever can comment here. Social help communities have great potential, but also great dangers, so quality management is very important.”*

The participants also emphasised the positive aspects of the platform. It was emphasised that the platform is good for an international and inter-professional exchange, as well as the possibility to exchange with experts on certain cases at eye level. The platform can be a great help, especially for people who may be inhibited from addressing problems in their immediate environment (boss, etc.).

- *“The possibility to network internationally.”*
- *“Better registration and also being able to collect statistical data.”*
- *“Inter-professional exchange on cases when things go wrong and new approaches are needed in practical work.”*
- *“Exchange, counselling, new perspectives, people don't have to go to their insecure bosses who don't have a clue either, can exchange with others at eye level, low-threshold potential for much social benefit!”*
- *“Different perspectives can be exchanged, i.e. a team that only consists of social workers, for example, can include other professional perspectives through such platforms, as well as get to know procedures from other countries and their structures, and also comparable cases from the database and how they were solved there; ergo, networking/exchanging results in a large pool of community knowledge, which in my opinion has incredible potential to shape prevention and intervention in a sustainable and effective way!”*

Recommendations for improvement of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

The participants gave various suggestions for improving the platform:

- *“FLP is not universally familiar and should not be used in this way.”*
- *“Tutorials on how to use it”*
- *“add group-focused enmity as a separate category at how would you categorize the case”*
- *“add street /demo as a own category on where the incident took place”*

- *“take the recommendations out if they are delivered by standard algorithms because they don't help for the specific case.”*
- *“I wouldn't ask so many questions independent of the case before I can submit the actual case, if then after and even if that means that there is less useful info for the community & admins around it. whereby I also don't know if my info about me, for example, is useful at all for the specific case. (except that, for example, it became clear that ahh he has dealt with the phenomenon of youth gangs and comes from the Erzgebirge. maybe he knows about youth gangs like hooligan nazi groups in the Erzgebirge. but maybe not, because I could also ignore the disgusting brew there and deal with youth gangs in the UK of the 60s, southern Italy of the 80s-2000s and the USA of the 2010s. (stupid example, but maybe it makes my thought visible)”*

1.4 Summary

All in all, the feedback on the ALERT/ARENA platform was mixed. Unfortunately, one participant was not able to register due to technical difficulties; these technical hurdles need to be cleared. All participants saw great potential in the platform, but it was also clear that the platform still needed more revision in order to be used by the participants in their daily work. One participant stated that he/she would like to have another questionnaire in several months after the platform has been revised. In general, the results on the online platform are satisfactory. However, many participants were still somewhat confused about the concept and structure of ALERT/ARENA.

A good basis for the online platform seems to have been laid, but there are still a number of areas where we can make improvements. Be it the question of the necessity of registration, the necessity of a detailed description of the FLPs themselves or the question of certain terms that should be added in a modified form. All participants showed interest in the further development of the online platform and saw in it the potential for international and inter-agency exchange.

2. The Roundtable in Hungary

2.1 The date and location

*Where did the roundtable take place?
Or specify if it was an online survey*

Political Capital and Budapest Centre for Mass Atrocities Prevention held a joint platform unveiling event on the 10th of June, 2021. We invited all sorts of FLP’s: experts, scientists, teachers, politicians, members of the advisory board in order to advertise the platforms as useful tools for any professional who in any capacity is likely to come across the phenomena of radicalization and polarization and might be interested a joint, multi-agent approach in solving cases.

After the event, we asked participants to try out the platform themselves to get a first-hand experience with and, and fill out a survey we prepared about the key elements and the usefulness of the platform in their work.

The survey contained both linear scale and open-end questions, where the former were mandatory, while the latter were optional.

Eight FLPs have registered on the ARENA platform in order to try out its functionality, and all of them sent in test incidents through the ALERT platform as well. All registered users filled out the survey.

2.2 List of participants / people who filled out the survey

*how many people participated / How many people filled out the survey:
List of test users*

Occupation:
<i>school teacher</i>
<i>psychologist</i>
<i>NGO worker/Youth worker</i>
<i>NGO worker</i>

<i>researcher</i>
<i>psychologist, UX researcher</i>
<i>researcher, NGO worker, Youth worker</i>
<i>School teacher, youth worker</i>

2.3 Take-aways from the Workshop / the survey

The survey questions were split into 3 segments, grouped into the following topics: Usefulness, User-friendliness and Sustainability. Across the questionnaire, we used 5 point likert scale, with 1 meaning “Totally disagree” and 5 meaning “Totally agree”. The questions were based on the form, which was developed by Cultures Interactive for the whole consortium, with some modifications in order to better fit the Hungarian context.

Linear scale question:

Usefulness

In terms of usefulness, the overall ratings were quite positive, with the answers averaging 4.25 points across four questions.

All participants “Totally Agreed” with the statements: “The ALERT/ARENA platforms could be a useful tool for experts to discuss cases” and to “ALERT and ARENA platforms can be useful in the Hungarian context”.

Overall the answers indicated that the users saw the potential of the platforms

User friendliness:

The average of the questions regarding user-friendliness were lower, with an average of 3.75 points across four questions. The lowest scoring question was: “The structure of the ALERT/ARENA platforms are easy to understand”.

Overall, the participants found the platforms less-user friendly than desirable, and mentioned a couple of problems and hardships they faced during the testing, which we will get into detail in the open-ended question part.

Sustainability

Answers to the questions regarding sustainability (“I’m likely to use the ALERT/ARENA systems to contact other organisations or experts” and “I’d recommend the ALERT/ARENA platforms to my colleagues”) had an average of 4,5 points. It’s safe to say, that amongst those FLPs who had taken the time to try and test the platforms, it became popular and showed that it has the potential to become a useful tool, if it could overcome some of its flaws and would become a bit more user-friendly

2.4 Summary

There were some really important insights by the participants contained in the open-end questions.

Overall, they shared their satisfaction with the tool, especially the possibility that it could provide a platform where experts could discuss and work together from a distance, which could become very important for experts working in rural areas of the country who would have a hard time getting help otherwise.

Multiple participants found the infographics very useful in understanding the process.

Some participants mentioned the necessity of a sort of online ethics codex, which could be built into the site and which all participants had to consent to at some point before joining case discussions in order to guarantee the high professional standard and serve as a basis of exclusion if someone would act inappropriately.

In terms of structure and user-experience, it was mentioned that it would be beneficial to visually separate the Alerts, which one has submitted and has been part of as an FLP, from those that one works on as an expert.

Multiple users mentioned that it is strange and counterintuitive for them that the email verification happened in the middle of the registration process and not at the end. Also, it slowed down the whole process significantly that the registration and the submission of Alerts have to be manually accepted by the National Moderator.

3. The Roundtable in Poland

3.1 The date and location

Where did the roundtable take place?

The Roundtable in which two sessions were devoted to presenting and testing Alert and Arena was held on-site on 25-26 May in Dąbrowa Górnicza, with the group of municipal workers and social organisations representatives that IBS has been working with since December 2019 - the local group responsible for the prevention and countering of radicalisation in Dąbrowa Górnicza, established thanks to the CHAMPIONS project.

3.2 List of participants/people who filled out the survey

How many people participated / How many people filled out the survey

Names (if possible)

Occupation

Organisation (if applicable)

18 participants attended two sessions on Alert and Arena and participated in the discussion about the usefulness and sustainability of these online tools.

1. representative Centre for Helping Education and Social Work Facilities
2. representative Centre for Helping Education and Social Work Facilities
3. representative Municipal Social Assistance Centre
4. representative Municipal Social Assistance Centre
5. representative Municipal Police (Guard)
6. representative Psychological and Teaching Counselling Centre
7. representative Police in Dąbrowa Górnicza (Criminal Department)
8. representative Culture, Sports and Leisure Department, Municipality of Dabrowa Gornicza
9. representative Culture, Sports and Leisure Department, Municipality of Dabrowa Gornicza
10. representative Education Department, Municipality of Dabrowa Gornicza
11. representative Education Department, Municipality of Dabrowa Gornicza
12. representative CIVITAS Association
13. representative Palace of Culture Zagłębie
14. representative Active Dąbrowa Association

15. representative Civil Society Organisations and Civic Activity Department, Municipality of Dabrowa Gornicza
16. representative Crisis Management Centre, Municipality of Dabrowa Gornicza
17. representative Crisis Management Centre, Municipality of Dabrowa Gornicza
18. representative, Police in Dąbrowa Górnicza (Prevention Department)

3.3 Take-aways from the Workshop/the survey

Usefulness of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

Several participants pointed to the purpose of Alert and Arena being a bit unclear to them. On the one hand, almost everybody can submit an alert, provided that they register and are accepted by the national moderator, and automatically become a member of Arena - an expert. On the other hand, Alert is not open to all people in the community who would just be interested in submitting an alert and receiving guidance on how to address a reported issue, without going through the complex and lengthy process of registration. For this reason, in their opinion, Alert and Arena would not be widely used as a community tool to report and address issues linked with radicalisation - as it was understood when the concept of the two tools was presented to them in 2019 and 2020. It would not be a tool dedicated entirely to the work of the local group either as everybody who submits an alert could have access to it.

As for Training Yard some participants declared the resources available there at the moment are fairly useful. However, they would be particularly interested in more specific resources - focused on specific issues that would relate to their local needs, e.g. how to work with Police on cases related to radicalisation etc.

User-Friendliness of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

Most of the participants in the sessions agreed that both tools were rather user-friendly - the instructions were clear, the actions to take in order to submit an alert were clearly presented and easy to follow, so were the processes of registration for Alert and Arena. As for the Training Yard about one third of the participants declared

that at first they were a bit confused about how to use it - there were many filters and possible options and there weren't that many visual cues which would make it user-friendly. They agreed, however, that perhaps it required more focused attention and time to find the resources they needed there.

Suggestions for the sustainability of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

One of the suggestions put forward by the participants was that the database in Training Yard should be regularly updated and include recent resources worth learning about. This issue is directly linked with the sustainability of the tools and indicates that in order to be useful Training Yard, Alert and Arena would need to be maintained and updated (both in terms of technology and knowledge, useful information) after the project ends and possibly further developed to respond to evolving needs of their users.

Comments and questions raised by the participants

One of the major elements of feedback provided by the participants was that in its present shape Alert and Arena were rather not that much useful for the purpose of the local group in Dąbrowa Górnicza. The participants raised the following issue: almost everybody can submit an alert, provided that they are accepted by the national moderator, and automatically become a member of Arena - an expert. However, Alert is not open to all people in the community who would just be interested in submitting an alert and receiving guidance on how to address a reported issue, without going through the complex and lengthy process of registration. For this reason, Alert and Arena could not be widely used as a community tool to report and address issues linked with radicalisation. It would not be a tool dedicated entirely to the work of the local group as everybody who submits an alert could have access to it and automatically become an expert.

Recommendations for improvement of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

Following the above-mentioned concerns and questions, several participants said that the following solution might be helpful in tailoring Alert and Arena more to the needs of the local group: skipping the registration in order to submit an alert (open the tool to a wider local community) and collecting just an email address instead to send the

recommendations. In this way access to Arena would be controlled and rather limited to the members of the local group, whereas the local community members would have a useful tool to report any situations linked to radicalisation.

3.4 Summary

Overall summary of the evaluation / take-aways from the Workshops

Focus on the transferability of the online platform into the respective working field of the participants / Focus on Usefulness of the Platform

- In its present shape Alert and Arena are not fully useful to the FLPs in Dąbrowa Górnicza.
- It is recommended that all the three tools, particularly Alert and Arena, are more tailored to the needs of the local group in Dąbrowa Górnicza as part of the sustainability of the project, e.g. further development and adjustments to the online tools could be part of a new project and funding.
- Alert, Arena and Training Yard should be maintained and regularly updated (further developed) after the project ends in order to be sustainable and viable. Arrangements should be made and further funding should be sought to make this possible.
- Once the above-mentioned issues are addressed and solved and the local group can work with the online tools on a regular basis and collect further feedback, plans to offer Alert, Arena and Training Yard as tools to help prevent and counter radicalisation to other towns and cities in Poland could be developed.

4. The Roundtable in Romania

4.6 The date and location

In Romania, due to the pandemic situation and to mitigate the delays in developing the platform, we separated the feedback on the online cooperation into three parts 1) RT on online cooperation where the platform in its updated form was presented (April 3rd, 2021) 2) Alert/Arena training ((April 21st, 2021) 3) Online survey distributed on the 9th of June 2021.

The local FLPs had been involved in the process of development along the way, so the process was extended in order to allow for an accurate assessment of the current stage of the platform.

4.7 List of participants / people who filled out the survey

Overall, we had 20 participants in these rounds, in all three events

1. RT April 3rd- Participants:

representative, Central Cultural Clujean
representative - Șef Birou Relații Externe și Investitori pentru Primăria Cluj
representative Duke of Edinburgh Award Foundation
representative - Botnar Foundation
representative Asociația CARE
representative -Simplon
representative, EduMapping
representative, Cluj County School Inspectorate
representative, Centrul pentru Combaterea discriminării și a violenței de gen
representative, Inocenti Foundation
representative Romanian Police
representative Scoala Floresti
representative Fundatia Inocenti
representative Noi Orizonturi Foundation
representative UBB Cluj

Opinions and feedback

Firstly, the FLPs were familiar with Alert/Arena already, in this RT we wanted to showcase it as a tool in a specific case of segregation in the educational system ai. how can the A/A help in cases of emergency. Consequently, we designed a case study, with a relatable situation for Cluj: an event where a person notices the racist and derogatory comments of another, and a situation to solve. What do you do with the instruments that are at your disposal: emergency 112 number, personal intervention etc? Slowly, we built up to the notion that Alert/Arena can be an instrument of online cooperation in this case, either with the person asking for recommendations, after s/he had taken other courses of action on the spot or directly with the person using the victim using the platform.

“the idea of an online cooperation, in this case, would really work if the platform had an app function - so that the person reports it on the spot and those involved can answer immediately”

-“very useful if/when the police units and departments are logged in. If not, it would not serve the urgency”

“good instrument to localize criminal behaviour. I’m not sure it would work as a tool for intervention, but localization and flagging certain areas where these happen locally could definitely be achieved through this platform”.

2. Training Alert/Arena, April 21st, 10 am- 12 am.

representative - trainer QT Hub

representative - Centrul de Prevenire Antidrog

representative - Scoala Floresti&

representative - Serviciul de Probatiune Cluj

representative - Simplon

Agenda:

1. Bun venit, prezentări și clarificări

2. Exercițiu prin studiu de caz 1:

Participant 1: Sunteți profesor la un liceu. Observați un caz în care o elevă hărțuită de un elev mai mare în vârstă. Agresorul are o situație materială mai bună ca victima. Sunt suspiciuni că agresorul este implicat în consum și trafic de droguri, deși acestea nu au fost dovedite. Considerați de asemenea că există posibilitatea ca victima să fie forțată să consume sau să participe la distribuția drogurilor în școală. Agresorul este un tânăr cu rezultate bune la învățătură și are o familie influentă în oraș. Victima este un caz social, cu părinți plecați din țară pentru muncă sezonieră. Victima face eforturi să se țină departe de agresor, dar nu reușește într-o comunitate mică și de multe ori nu reușește.

Participant 1: Introduceți o Alertă pe Alert/Arena. Doriți să aflați cum să răspunde acestei situații, fără a agrava tensiunea dintre cei doi. Doriți să identificați o legătură cu specialiști relevanți din domeniu din orașul dvs.

Participant 2 – sunteți consilier specializat pe consumul de droguri în rândul adolescenților

Participant 3 – lucrați în Poliție

Participant 4 – sunteți reprezentant al unui ONG local care sprijină adolescenții rămași singuri temporar

Participant 5 – sunteți profesor la alt liceu

Participant 6 – sunteți director de școală/liceu

Participant 2-6 Răspundeți la Alertă

3. Pentru a răspunde, va trebui să vă înregistrați pe Alert/Arena.

Pentru aceasta, puteți folosi orice adresă de **email** vă este mai la îndemână

3. Caz 2 (opțional): din activitatea dvs, curentă

4. Feedback, întrebări, observații

5. Pașii următori

3. Survey

4.8 Take-aways from the Workshop

Usefulness of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

All participants found the platform very useful as a process and a needed innovation in the field. They responded positively to the initiative and were happy to provide input and suggestions. Since the partners had been involved in the process earlier, many provided some technical improvements are made in terms of the database.

User-Friendliness of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

Most comments had to do with user-friendliness which was not up to par, to many participants.

- *“in order for people to use it, report an ALERT, it is important that they grasp the idea of the platform, what it can do for them and what it can bring, quickly. In this form, the text seems to overpower the platform.*
- *the registration on ARENA in order to finalize the ALERT is a bit confusing, because people do not understand what the process it at first glance.*

- *“There are concerns with the GDPR in the case of ALERT. because not every case can be checked when submitted. You cannot really figure out which is a false request/submission and which one is a real case. Perhaps more mechanisms of flagging this are needed”*
- *,”The submission messages are still a bit confusing, this might deter somebody from continuing”*
- *“ I understand that the ARENA registration provides a level of security, but perhaps less information should be asked of those trying to submit an ALERT”*
- *“The idea of a network of FLPs on which you can fall back is very important, so I would channel this to make it more usable as a connection platform”*

Suggestions for the sustainability of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

- *“making sure that the Police, prevention or action units, are involved and active on ARENA*
- *: making sure that all have clear instructions about what the end goal of the platform is; why would they submit an ALERT, to what end?”*

Comments and questions raised by the participants

- *the first page needs to be more attractive and also include visual elements, so that people can grasp it fast.*
-

Recommendations for improvement of Alert/Arena/Training Yard

- *“it would be useful to have a drop down menu where you can select which experts you invite to the case, with a short bio for each”*
- *“add an app version to the website, people will use it more and actually take it as a valuable tool in their daily lives”*

The survey

We distributed the survey again, among our usual RT community, which amounts to approximately 70 institutions, with 15 people filling it in. Some of the answers were anonymous, some shared their identity.

Feedback:

- *“The process of submitting an ALERT should not condition an FLP to register on Arena. It is not clear as to why one has to do it”*
- *“Separate between ALERT and ARENA, having them together is rather confusing for the user”*
- *“The specifications for the GDPR are not always enough, more needs to be explained to the user on the usage of their data”*

4.9 Summary

Overall, FLPs were positively impressed by Alert/Arena/Training YARD and look forward to using it and populate it with case studies and their own professional bios. They find it to be a useful tool in PVE/CVE in this context and essential to flagging areas of interest. There are still areas of development where FLPs have observations or feel the platform is not up to par with the initial sketches: primarily the flexibility of the platform, its potential to connect partners and how individuals outside the process of CHAMPIONS can use it.

Conclusion

Overall, the events focused on online collaboration and solution development were successful in that they brought in valuable feedback, which, where time permitted, has been implemented or saved for the further work the members of the consortium intend to do on Alert/Arena. They also solidified the engagement of the partners to work towards a joint solution and shared tools. The general feedback shows a divergence of opinions about how the platform should look like which did not reach a point of consensus during the project: for some partners it was crucial that Alert/Arena stayed as a "forum" for experts, for others, the desire was to make it into an open digital space for the localization of cases of extremism. Although this issue was discussed several times in the consortium, the decision was made difficult also by continuous conversations with local FLPs, and their changing perceptions about the work in progress. Although all found the new platform useful, they vary in their commitment to use it in its current form. We continue to work with these groups, and engage with them as a stable expert groups on PVE/CVE locally so that we can rely on their feedback for future modifications to the platform.