



The International Institute for  
Justice and the Rule of Law

## **IJJ TRAINING CURRICULUM FACILITATOR'S GUIDE**

# **Developing Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programmes – Implementing a Whole-of-Society, 'Do No Harm' Approach**

*A publication under the IJJ Multi-Actor  
P/CVE Interventions Workstream*



**Funded by the  
European Union**



**Funded by  
the European Union**

## **The International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law**

Inspired by the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF), the IJ was established in 2014 as a neutral platform for training and capacity-building for lawmakers, judges, prosecutors, law enforcement, corrections officials, and other justice sector practitioners to share and promote the implementation of good practices and sustainable counter-terrorism approaches founded on the rule of law.

The IJ is an intergovernmental organisation based in Malta with an international Governing Board of Administrators (GBA) representing its 14 members: Algeria, France, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Malta, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the European Union. The IJ is staffed by a dynamic international team headed by an Executive Secretary, who are responsible for the day-to-day operations of the IJ.

### **Disclaimer**

This publication has been produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of the International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

For more information, please contact:

The International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law  
University of Malta - Valletta Campus  
Old University Building, St. Paul Street, Valletta, Malta

[info@theij.org](mailto:info@theij.org)

[@ijmalta](https://twitter.com/ijmalta)

[@ijmalta\\_fr](https://twitter.com/ijmalta_fr)

[theij.org](http://theij.org)

# Contents

<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Credits</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Glossary</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>List of Acronyms</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Foreword</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>About the Course</b>	<b>14</b>
A. Objectives	14
B. Theory of Change	14
C. Learning Outcomes	14
D. Intended Audience	15
E. Key Principles	15
F. Training Material	16
G. Course Overview	16
H. Facilitators	17
I. Overview of Modules	18
<b>Module 1: Partnership as a Foundation for Multi-Actor Interventions</b>	<b>21</b>
Activity 1: Paper Folding Exercise	23
Activity 2: Developing Collaborative Partnerships through Learning	23
Activities 3 and 4: Communication for Productive Collaboration	24
Appendix: Strategic Listening Handout	25
<b>Module 2: Levelling the Playing Field</b>	<b>26</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	27
Activity 2: Key Foundational Concepts and Terms	27
Activity 3: Application of Concepts and Terms	28
Activity 4: Conclusions	28
<b>Module 3: Common Features of a Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programme</b>	<b>30</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	31
Activity 2: Common Features	31
Activity 3: Different Models	32
Activity 4: Debrief and Conclusions	32

---

<b>Module 4: Mapping a Specific Context</b>	<b>34</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	35
Activity 2: Understanding the Threat and Drivers of Violent Extremism	36
Activity 3: Existing Legal/Policy Frameworks	38
Activity 4: Mapping of Existing Programmes	38
Activity 5: Debrief and Conclusions	39
<b>Module 5: Identifying and Understanding Stakeholders</b>	<b>41</b>
Activity 1: Mapping Primary and Secondary Stakeholders	43
Activities 2 and 3: Negotiating Roles/Responsibilities and Debrief	43
Appendix: Mapping Relationships Handout	45
<b>Module 6: Building a Multi-Actor Team</b>	<b>46</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	47
Activity 2: Key Elements for and Navigating Challenges to Team-Building	47
Activity 3: What Type of Multi-Actor Team and Challenges to Participation	48
Activity 4: Promoting Trust, Transparency and Consensus-Building	48
Activity 5: Leadership and Team-Building	49
Activity 6: Debrief and Conclusions	49
Appendix 1: Worksheet for Breakout Exercise #1	51
Appendix 2: Worksheet for Breakout Exercise #2	51
<b>Module 7: Identifying Needs, Resources and Capacities of the Multi-Actor Team</b>	<b>52</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	53
Activity 3: Intervention Programmes	54
Activity 4: Skills/Expertise	55
Activity 5: Training and Other Capacity-Building Needs	56
Activity 7: Debrief and Conclusions	56
<b>Module 8: Developing a Case Intake and Management System</b>	<b>58</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	60
Activity 2: Importance of Team-Oriented Case Management	60
Activity 3: Case Studies	61
Activity 4: Initial Assessment	62
Activity 5: Case Study Feedback and Discussion	62
Activity 6: Case Management/Disposal/Protocols	63
Activity 7: Debrief and Conclusions	64
Appendix: Case Studies for Initial Assessment: P/CVE Referrals?	65

---

<b>Module 9: Ensuring “Do No Harm” – Assessing Vulnerabilities, Needs and Strengths</b>	<b>66</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	67
Activity 2: Assessment – What Do We Need to Know? How to Assess? Who Should Assess?	67
Activity 3: Case Study – Identifying Strengths/Needs and Gathering Information	68
Appendix: Case Studies for Initial Assessment	70
<b>Module 10: Ensuring “Do No Harm” – Developing and Implementing Tailor-Made Individual Support Plans</b>	<b>71</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	72
Activity 2: Addressing Strengths, Needs and Risks – What Interventions and Who Intervenes?	72
Activity 3: Gender/Age Considerations and “Do No Harm”	73
Activity 4: Case Study (Continuation) – Focussing on Addressing Strengths, Needs and Risks	73
Appendix: Case Studies for Intervention	75
<b>Module 11: Monitoring and Evaluating (M&amp;E) a Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programme</b>	<b>76</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	77
Activity 2: How to Define M&E and M&E Purposes	77
Activity 3: Process Monitoring	78
Activity 4: Monitoring and Evaluating Programme Impact	78
Activity 5: M&E Planning Simulation Exercise	78
Activity 6: Debrief and Conclusions	79
<b>Module 12: Navigating Stigma</b>	<b>81</b>
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	82
Activity 2: Challenges – Stigma	82
Activity 3: Overcoming Challenges – Opportunities for Mitigating Stigma	82
Activity 4: Debrief and Conclusions	83
<b>Module 13: Review of Key Principles and Lessons Learned from Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programmes</b>	<b>85</b>
Learning Objective	85
Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives	86
Activity 2: Review and Discussion of Key Principles and Lessons Learned	86
<b>Module 14: Capstone, Break-Out Group Exercise</b>	<b>88</b>
Activity 1: Customising a Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programme Appropriate for the Local Context	89
Activity 2: Presentation and Discussion of Model Programmes	90

---

<b>List of Resources</b>	<b>92</b>
1. Core Resources	92
2. Assessments and Interventions	93
3. Building a Team and Case Management	94
4. Gender	95
5. Local Strategy Development	95
6. Monitoring and Evaluation	96
7. No One Size Fits All	96
8. Public Health Approach	97
9. Stigma and Mental Health	98
10. Terminology	98
11. Training	98

---

# Acknowledgments

The International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law (IJ) wishes to acknowledge the European Commission's Directorate-General for International Partnerships (DG INTPA) for its generous support of the IJ Multi-Actor Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism (P/CVE) Interventions Workstream and, in particular, this first-of-its-kind training curriculum to support the design and implementation of multi-actor intervention mechanisms for preventing and countering violent extremism.

Some 150 practitioners and other stakeholders from a diversity of professions with relevant experience and expertise have contributed to the content and structure of the training curriculum. The curriculum development process included an in-person expert meeting co-hosted in February 2020 by the Danish Centre on Prevention of Extremism, a series of virtual expert consultations and two online pilot workshops in Kenya and North Macedonia. The experts included representatives from Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Commonwealth Secretariat, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Hedayah, Indonesia, Institute for Strategic Dialogue (ISD), Lebanon, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Secretariat and the OSCE Mission to Skopje, the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), Sweden, Tony Blair Institute for Global Change, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT) and the United States.

---

## Credits

The IJ is grateful to the following experts who drafted one or more sections of the training curriculum:

- Mr. Eric Rosand, Senior Expert Adviser, IJ and President, PVE Solutions, LLC
- Mr. Braden Schrag, CEO, Polymath Solutions, LLC
- Mr. Eric Poinot, Coordinator for the Prevention of Radicalisation, City of Strasbourg, France
- Mr. Hadelin Feront, Former Head of Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism, Crime Prevention Agency, City of Brussels, Belgium
- Ms. Heidi Ellis, Associate Professor of Psychology, Harvard Medical School and Director, Boston Children's Hospital Refugee Trauma and Resilience Center
- Mr. John McCoy, Executive Director, Organization for the Prevention of Violence
- Ms. Nadia Gerspacher, Expert Adviser, IJ
- Mr. Paul Turner, Technical Co-Director, Peace and Stability, Management Systems International
- Mr. Simon Smith, Prevent Programme Manager, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, United Kingdom

A special thanks is owed to Mr. Rosand and Ms. Gerspacher, who designed and oversaw the development of the curriculum.

This publication and associated activities were organised, coordinated and implemented by the IJ under the direction of Mr. Thomas Wuchte, Executive Secretary, and Mr. Adrián Carbajo, Programme Manager, together with the logistical support of Ms. María Ladrón de Guevara, Programme Assistant.

In addition to the above, the following are acknowledged for their contributions to the project:

- Mr. Alush Doda, Focal Point on Countering Violent Extremism, OSCE Mission to Skopje
  - Mr. Christopher Hockey, Research Fellow, RUSI Nairobi
  - Mr. Eric Manton, P/CVE Expert, IJ
  - Ms. Katrina Gillman, Project Manager, Danish Centre for Prevention of Extremism
  - Mr. Mark Bang Kjeldgaard, Chief Consultant, Danish Centre for Prevention of Extremism
  - Ms. Martine Zeuthen, Associate Fellow, RUSI Nairobi
  - Mr. Omar Metwally, Independent Peacebuilding Practitioner
-



## Glossary

**Civil society** — a diverse body of non-governmental actors, communities and formal or informal associations with a wide range of roles, that engages in public life seeking to advance specific values and objectives.<sup>1</sup>

**Counter-terrorism** — policies, laws and strategies developed by state actors and implemented primarily by law enforcement and intelligence agencies, and sometimes by the military, aimed at killing or capturing terrorists, thwarting terrorist plots, and dismantling terrorist organisations.<sup>2</sup>

**‘Do No Harm’** — through an understanding of the local context, relationships, and dynamics more broadly, this involves mitigating or avoiding negative, unintended consequences for the potential beneficiaries of and implementers of P/CVE interventions that may result from such interventions and seeking to influence these dynamics in a positive way.<sup>3</sup>

**Enabling environment** — conditions within a society that offer world views that prescribe violence as a solution to existing grievances. These may include the presence of ‘radical’ mentors (including religious leaders, individuals from social networks, etc.), access to ‘radical’ online communities, social networks with violent extremism associations, access to weaponry or other relevant items, a comparative lack of state influence, an absence of familial support and so on.<sup>4</sup>

**Evaluation** — the assessment of whether project activities collectively achieved the objectives as intended or planned, and as articulated in a theory of change. Inherent to any effective evaluation effort is a clear understanding of the project objectives, the development of measurable and specific indicators and access to reliable and relevant data.<sup>5</sup>

**Foreign terrorist fighters** — individuals who travel to a state other than their state of residence or nationality for the purpose of the perpetration, planning or preparation of, or participation in, terrorist acts or the providing or receiving of terrorist training, including in connection with armed conflict.<sup>6</sup>

**Former violent extremists, “formers”** — individuals who have disengaged from a path to violent extremism and radicalisation that leads to terrorism and who can play a useful role in raising awareness and communicating credible counter-narratives.<sup>7</sup>

**Gender** — a term used to describe socially constructed roles for women and men. It is an acquired identity that is learned, changes over time and varies widely within and across cultures. In contrast, the term sex is used to indicate the biological differences between men and women.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (April 2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT). (2018). *Reference Guide - Developing National and Regional Action Plans to Prevent Violent Extremism*.

<sup>4</sup> Khalil J., and Zeuthen, M. (2016). *Countering Violent Extremism and Risk Reduction: A Guide to Programme Design and Evaluation*.

<sup>5</sup> Holmer, G., Bauman, P. and Aryaeinejad, K. (2018). *Taking Stock: Analytic Tools for Understanding and Designing Programs*.

<sup>6</sup> United Nations Security Council (UNSC). (2014). *Resolution 2178 (2014)*.

<sup>7</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (April 2019).

<sup>8</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (May 2019). *Understanding the Role of Gender in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Good Practices for Law Enforcement*.

**Gender perspective** — awareness and consideration of differential needs, experiences, and statuses of women and men based on socio-cultural context. In P/CVE this requires, *inter alia*, focus on (i) women and girls as victims of violent extremism; (ii) women as perpetrators, facilitators, and supporters of violent extremism; (iii) women as agents in P/CVE; and (iv) the differential impact of P/CVE strategies on women and women's rights.<sup>9</sup>

**Monitoring** — the task of ensuring that activities are completed on time and within a prescribed budget and plan. It is the assessment of progress toward project implementation – the completion of key activities for intended beneficiaries, implementers and partners – and the measurement of quantitative outputs such as the number of participants engaged in the activities.<sup>10</sup>

**Multi-actor approach** — an approach that embraces an interdependent view of P/CVE that integrates government (including the security sector), the private sector and civil society.<sup>11</sup>

**Multi-variable analysis** — a statistical technique that can be used to simultaneously explore whether multiple risk factors (referred to as independent variables) are related to a certain outcome.<sup>12</sup>

**Preventing and countering violent extremism (P/CVE)** — a broad range of non-coercive and preventative activities that are united by the objective of counteracting the drivers of violent extremism specific to the locations in which these initiatives occur. P/CVE includes activities that target individuals specifically identified as 'at risk' of being drawn into violence to the extent that this is feasible in each location.<sup>13</sup>

**Primary prevention** — P/CVE programmes focussed on the community level that seek to develop community resilience and social cohesion to resist the appeal of extremist violence. These initiatives target non-radicalised communities.<sup>14</sup>

**Protective factors** — resources, processes, capacities, and structures that enable individuals, groups, communities and institutions (local, national, formal and informal governance structures) to protect themselves from and prevent violence, including violent extremism. Rather than a series of traits, these protective factors are highly contextualised and dynamic and should be seen as an "interactive and reciprocal process".<sup>15</sup>

**Public health approach to violent extremism** — an approach that recognises violent extremism as a social phenomenon and the impact it can have on society and draws from the field of public health, which has traditionally been linked to preventing diseases and promoting healthy behaviours and environments. One of its features is the acknowledgement of the importance of identifying practical and protective interventions to manage potential threats that can have a positive impact on the daily lives of individuals.<sup>16</sup>

**Pull factors** — factors which make violent extremist ideas and groups appealing or more proximate factors of violence, including "access to material resources, social status and respect from peers; a sense of belonging, adventure and self-esteem or personal empowerment that individuals and groups that have long viewed themselves as victimised and marginalised can derive from the feeling that they are making history; and the prospect of achieving glory and fame".<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee (n.d.). *Gender*.

<sup>10</sup> Holmer, G., Bauman, P. and Aryaeinejad, K. (2018).

<sup>11</sup> Holmer, G. (2013). *Countering Violent Extremism: A Peacebuilding Perspective*.

<sup>12</sup> Wakkee, M., Hollestein, L. M., Nijsten, T. (2014). *Multivariable Analysis*.

<sup>13</sup> Khalil J., and Zeuthen, M. (2016).

<sup>14</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (April 2019).

<sup>15</sup> EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Protective and promotive factors building resilience against violent radicalisation*.

<sup>16</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (April 2019).

<sup>17</sup> United States Agency for International Development (USAID). (2011). *The Development Response to Violent Extremism and Insurgency - Putting Principles into Practice*.

**Push factors** — structural or environmental conditions that can create grievances prompting individuals to support violent extremism, including “high levels of social marginalisation and fragmentation, poorly governed or ungoverned areas; government repression and human rights violations; endemic corruption and elite impunity; and cultural threat perceptions”.<sup>18 19</sup>

**Radicalisation** — a phased and complex process in which an individual or a group embraces a radical ideology or belief that accepts, uses, or condones violence, including acts of terrorism, to reach a specific political or ideological purpose.<sup>20</sup>

**Rehabilitation programming** — programmes that target individuals radicalised to violence (including terrorist offenders), and possibly their families, at different stages of radicalisation. These types of programmes include prison-based disengagement and post-detention aftercare programmes focussing on the rehabilitation and reintegration of terrorist offenders and returning foreign terrorist fighters and their re-entry into society, as well as programmes for those individuals who may have had some association with violent extremism but cannot be prosecuted.<sup>21</sup>

**Referral mechanism** — a process of referring an individual to another organisation or service provider for the purpose of receiving a service or services that the referring entity or other actor does not provide, but that the individual requires.<sup>22</sup>

**Reintegration** — a safe transition back into a community, by which an individual proceeds to live a law-abiding life, often following a rehabilitation process or release from prison, and acquires attitudes and behaviours that generally lead to a productive functioning within society.<sup>23</sup>

**Risk assessment tool** — a framework for collecting data to assist with decision making that provides a non-discriminatory method for examining in a structured way an individual's propensity to cause harm as well as the nature and severity of that risk, based on available information from multiple sources.<sup>24</sup>

**Risk / vulnerability factors** — factors that form the basis of risk assessments and constitute variables associated with the increased likelihood of a negative outcome. They do not necessarily explain why an act has or might occur, but rather aim to interpret the risk of it taking place.<sup>25</sup>

**Safeguarding** — a term commonly used in child protection or broader social work domain. It involves protecting people's health, wellbeing, and human rights and enabling them to live free from harm, abuse, and neglect.

**Secondary prevention** — P/CVE intervention programmes that target individuals “at risk” of or on the path to radicalisation to extremist violent and seek to steer these individuals away from violence before a crime is committed. These interventions might include psychosocial support, mentoring, family counselling, cultural or recreational activities, theological debate, education and vocational training and/or support.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> In 2020, USAID updated its P/CVE policy, noting that “[a]n understanding of the drivers of violent extremism – such as the structural “push” factors and the highly personalized “pull” factors detailed in the 2011 Policy and associated research – is still fundamental to reducing risk, as they shape the form that radicalization and recruitment take with different communities in different contexts. Effectively reducing risk, however, requires a recognition that these factors do not exist in isolation; rather, they constitute part of a dynamic process that can be influenced or interrupted. By adopting a systems approach and focussing on the interaction among violent extremist organizations (VEOs), their target populations, and other stakeholders, USAID is better-positioned to affect the larger context in which VEOs operate” (USAID. (2020). *Policy for Countering Violent Extremism through Development Assistance*).

<sup>20</sup> EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (n.d.). *Prevention of radicalisation*.

<sup>21</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (April 2019).

<sup>22</sup> Catholic Relief Services. (2018). *Referral mechanisms for children orphaned or made vulnerable by HIV*.

<sup>23</sup> Veldhuis, T. (2012). *Designing Rehabilitation and Reintegration Programmes for Violent Extremism Offenders: A Realist Approach*.

<sup>24</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (April 2019).

<sup>25</sup> Copeland, S., and Marsden, S. (2020). *Extremist Risk Assessment*.

<sup>26</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (April 2019).

**Structural motivators** — broader conditions within society that catalyse the radicalisation process, e.g., repression, corruption, unemployment, inequality, discrimination, a history of hostility between identity groups, or external state interventions in the affairs of other nations.<sup>27</sup>

**Structured professional judgement** — an analytical method used to understand and mitigate the risk for interpersonal violence posed by individual people that is discretionary in essence but relies on evidence-based guidelines to systematise the exercise of discretion.<sup>28</sup>

**Terrorism** — involves the use of violence to coerce and intimidate governments and populations for some sort of political or ideological goal.

**Tertiary prevention** — all measures designed to support (violent) extremists in prison and in society in their efforts to leave their milieus, disengage from violence, decriminalise and reintegrate in society.<sup>29</sup>

**Violent extremism** — the beliefs and actions of people who support or use ideologically motivated violence to further social, economic, religiously-based or political objectives.<sup>30</sup>

**Vulnerability or “at risk”** — susceptible to radicalisation or recruitment to violent extremism or terrorism and involves identifying demographic criteria associated with radicalisation and recruitment to terrorism or violent extremism such as age, sex, education level, involvement in criminality, recent changes in religious or ideological orientation, place of residence and his/her social network.

**Whole-of-society approach** — an approach to P/CVE that includes a role for multiple sectors and civil society actors in prevention, intervention, disengagement and rehabilitation programmes.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> European Commission's Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development, CIVI.POL Conseil, and the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). (2017). *Operational Guidelines on the preparation and implementation of EU financed actions specific to countering terrorism and violent extremism in third countries*.

<sup>28</sup> Hart, S. D., Douglas, K. S., and Guy, L. S. (2017). *The structured professional judgement approach to violence risk assessment: Origins, nature and advances*.

<sup>29</sup> Koller, S. (2020). *Issue Paper: Good Practices in Risk Assessment for Terrorist Offenders*.

<sup>30</sup> Hedayah. *Introduction to Countering Violent Extremism: Resources on Key Concepts and Definitions*. This handbook is not yet published.

<sup>31</sup> Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (April 2019).

---

## List of Acronyms

CSO	Civil society organisation
EU	European Union
FTF	Foreign terrorist fighter
GCTF	Global Counterterrorism Forum
IJJ	International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
P/CVE	Preventing and countering violent extremism
RUSI	Royal United Services Institute
UK	United Kingdom
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
VE	Violent extremism

---

## Foreword

Despite recent military and intelligence successes against Da'esh and other terrorist groups, countries continue to face the multifaceted challenge of terrorism and mitigating the factors that lead to violent extremism, detecting and preventing “homegrown” attacks, as well as managing the return of “foreign terrorist fighters” (FTFs) and accompanying family members from conflict zones.

Policymakers and practitioners have increasingly recognised the importance of multi-sector and multi-level collaboration within each country to tackle this complex challenge. This collaboration is particularly important when it comes to the development of programmes to identify, intervene, redirect and support individuals who are assessed to be “vulnerable to”, “at-risk of” or already on the path to radicalisation to violent extremism and/or have expressed interest in engaging in terrorist activity, but have not committed crimes.

Multi-actor, often locally-led, interventions are among the most concrete measures aimed at preventing and countering violent extremism (P/CVE) and are reflected in recommendations, guidance and good practices developed by the United Nations, the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF), the European Union (EU) and other regional bodies such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation (OSCE). They can involve social, youth and health workers, as well as family counsellors, religious and other mentors, family members, peers, teachers and local civil society organisations (CSOs), as well as the police.

There are numerous practical, capacity, and other challenges that exist when it comes to designing, operationalising and sustaining P/CVE interventions – all of which depend on collaboration. These include information-sharing among different agencies, institutions, organisations and professionals which may lack the necessary experience working in multi-actor settings as well as technical expertise. Yet, there are few training or other capacity-building tools outside of the EU in this area.

Drawing on existing guidance, good practices, and recommendations, the International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law (IJ) has developed a training curriculum for relevant policymakers, professionals and practitioners from regions where there is growing interest in, and donor support for, the design and implementation of multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes. This is based on the expectation that providing the relevant, individual government and non-governmental actors the tools to make such contributions increases the likelihood that multi-actor programmes will not only be developed, but also operationalised in an effective and sustainable manner that abides by the “Do No Harm” precept.

Although this curriculum is focussed primarily on developing *secondary prevention* programmes (i.e., programmes centred around individuals on the path, vulnerable to or “at risk” of all forms of extremist violence) it is also relevant for *tertiary prevention* programmes (i.e., those that address rehabilitation and reintegration of former terrorist offenders and/or individuals who may have been associated with terrorism and violent extremism but who have not been convicted of or even charged with related offences).

---

This course aims to complement and build on existing P/CVE curricula, whether focussed on P/CVE in general or on specific themes (e.g., gender, youth, community engagement and national action plans) and is informed by a range of sources. These include recommendations, guidance and other relevant material developed by multilateral platforms (e.g., United Nations, GCTF, OSCE, Council of Europe and the EU's Radicalisation Awareness Network), national governments, think tanks and other non-governmental organisations. The curriculum was further shaped by two sets of consultations. The first was an IJ Curriculum Development Workshop convened in Copenhagen, Denmark between 26 and 27 February 2020, in cooperation with the Danish Centre for Prevention of Extremism. The workshop brought together 40 national and local government experts and researchers, alongside civil society actors from 19 countries and international organisations, in order to identify key elements of the framework and how best to transfer knowledge on multi-actor P/CVE interventions to policymakers and practitioners in different contexts. The second was a series of virtual consultations in June 2020, where 59 practitioners and professionals from around the globe had the opportunity to provide feedback on a draft of the framework.

Finally, the curriculum was piloted in Kenya and North Macedonia before being updated and finalised. Participants in these activities included government and non-governmental officials and experts operating at a national and or at a local level with an interest in increasing their knowledge and understanding on how to develop multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes.

Although developed by the IJ, with support from the EU, this course can be used by any government or non-governmental organisation that sees its added value for its own multi-actor or even broader P/CVE needs. Because the course is intended to have a broad applicability, those delivering in a specific context, whether regional, national, or local, will need to ensure it is appropriately tailored for that environment.

## About the Course

### A. Objectives

- To develop and build on participants' knowledge, skills, and tools to contribute to the development and implementation of multi-actor P/CVE interventions, while taking into account the relevant local context and needs.
- To demonstrate value of and grow knowledge around multi-actor P/CVE interventions.
- To enhance effectiveness of P/CVE intervention programmes to increase social cohesion and/or decrease terrorism.

### B. Theory of Change

- **if** governmental and formal and informal non-governmental actors create collaborative spaces to leverage each other's experience, networks, knowledge, and areas of responsibilities and
- **if** these stakeholders have the skills and tools to develop/implement inclusive, multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes,
- **then** the likelihood that these actors will have increased motivation and ability to develop such collaborative multi-actor programmes will increase.

### C. Learning Outcomes

After this course, participants will be able to:

- Explain the logic behind multi-actor P/CVE interventions;
  - Contribute to the development of multi-actor P/CVE interventions in their own communities/context;
  - Identify the relevant actors for any given P/CVE intervention and articulate the narratives and possible incentives needed to invite/include additional actors in the process;
  - Understand the added value of each actor and identify roles and responsibilities of each;
  - Analyse and consider the contextual factors which will underpin the P/CVE intervention;
  - Integrate intentionality, strategy and good practices in the process of designing and implementing multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes; and
  - Incorporate monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategies to understand the impact of a given intervention, and the multi-actor intervention programme as a whole and glean lessons learned for future activities.
-



## D. Intended Audience

Course participants should include multi-stakeholder representation from those who would contribute to the development of multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes and make decisions around and implement them. These include relevant officials from national and local governments, front-line practitioners, civil society organisations, and resource persons such as academics and other experts who are involved in programme development. Participants should include those who have had some involvement in or exposure to P/CVE efforts in their respective countries, or those with involvement in multi-actor approaches to address other issues, including anti-social behaviour, gang violence, gender-based violence or human trafficking, and have demonstrated an interest in developing or supporting the development of multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes.

## E. Key Principles

The course is guided by a number of cross-cutting principles that should underpin the design and implementation of multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes. In his/her introductory remarks, the moderator should introduce or otherwise mention some of these principles, which would then be discussed in more detail during Module 13. These principles include having multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes:

- Be part of a wider, comprehensive, “whole of society”, rule of law-based approach to violent extremism that incorporates a public health approach to P/CVE and promotes social cohesion and resilience.
  - Be cognisant of relevant national strategies and frameworks, even when they might not be consistent with these principles.
  - Avoid a “top-down” approach and follow an inclusive, consultative, and collaborative process that builds or strengthens trust among relevant stakeholders.
  - Be scoped/branded to best leverage existing resources and secure/sustain the support and involvement from communities/professionals.
  - Leverage or be integrated into existing programmes/platforms to avoid the creation of parallel structures where possible.
  - Include a transparent protocol/framework to facilitate information-sharing among different stakeholders while protecting privacy rights and ensuring consent.
  - Rely on non-discriminatory, human rights-based, gender- and age-sensitive plans to identify individuals “at risk” or “of concern” based on objectively observable behavioural signs.
  - Embody a “person-centred” approach, involving evidence-based interventions tailored to the unique needs/risks of participants and informed by local context.
  - Include a joint messaging and wider communication strategy that helps both communities and professionals understand the scope, nature, and objectives of the programme.
  - Rely on appropriately trained professionals to conduct gender- and age-sensitive assessments and design and deliver gender- and age-sensitive interventions.
  - Include a rigorous monitoring and evaluation framework to help understand what works and what does not, and to identify ways to improve the programme.
-

## F. Training Material

- Pre-training and post-training evaluation questionnaires.
- Practical scenarios.
- PowerPoints, with suggested talking points, and trainers' scripts for each module.

## G. Course Overview

The first component of the course focuses on collaboration and partnership building, the need to ensure that the diversity of actors involved in multi-actor intervention programmes share a common understanding of the relevant terminology and concepts and identifying the common features of these programmes, while recognising there can be no "one-size-fits-all" approach.

The second component identifies the different steps that policymakers and practitioners should consider taking when developing a multi-actor programme that is tailored for the local context. This includes ensuring it is aligned to the threat/s it is meant to address and the available capacities and resources. As such, the focus is on mapping the local context, ensuring a collaborative approach that is appropriately contextualised, team-building and identifying the capacities and resources necessary to operationalise the multi-actor team.

The third component of the course focuses on the more technical aspects of the programme. This includes how to develop a system for receiving information on individuals who might benefit from participating in a multi-actor programme, assessing their vulnerabilities, needs and strengths, designing and implementing tailor-made interventions and monitoring and evaluating both the wider programme and the individual interventions it delivers or facilitates. In addition to these technical issues, this part of the course will explore the different ways in which stigma can manifest itself, including among the intended beneficiaries of the programme or professionals whose involvement in them is critical to their success, as well as complicate efforts to make progress with these programmes and identify opportunities for stigma-mitigation.

At the conclusion of each component, the course features a breakout session in which participants can consider a number of questions in small groups that should allow them to apply and share back what they have learned during the course as they begin to develop model, multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes that are tailored to the local context.

Following a brief review of some of the key principles and lessons learned from previous efforts to develop these programmes in different contexts, the course concludes with a capstone exercise. At this stage, using the interactive "Pecha Kucha"<sup>32</sup> format, participants are given the opportunity to build on the discussions during the abovementioned breakout sessions and elaborate model programmes. The participants will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the various approaches as they work together to identify how best to develop and operationalise multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes for the local context/s.

---

<sup>32</sup> *Pecha kucha* ("chit chat" in Japanese) is a presentation style in which 20 slides are shown for 20 seconds each (6 minutes and 40 seconds in total). The format keeps presentations concise and fast-paced.

---

## H. Facilitators

This curriculum is designed to provide a package to individual and/or organisations, governmental or non-governmental that can be implemented in any particular context which faces the threat of radicalisation that would lead to extremist violence. This section aims to provide a few points of guidance to support the preparation and adoption of this course in any given programme of instruction, training or educational course.

### The Intent of the Curriculum

The curriculum is designed to support the development of a multi-actor team made up of various individuals/organisations which can contribute to the P/CVE space. It is developed to bring together a varied cohort of participants who will practice developing a team structure and identifying roles and responsibilities as well as respective contributions that each can make. The focus of the lessons is the identification of team stakeholders, bringing together individuals and for the team to provide a structure to handle a customised referral process for each case. To support the implementation of this course, scripts, presentations, handouts and exercises have been built into the course and included in this document.

### The Content

In addition to an agenda, which should be adapted for each iteration of a course, the scripts that are provided in this course package make up the structure of the course. The package includes guidance on content, methodology and proposed timing for each activity. The content included in these scripts provides the foundation and key messages, knowledge, skills and tools that make up this course. The course package is intended to be utilised in its integrity with the adaptation to a specific audience and context. Therefore, the content is provided and instructors for this course should prepare their sessions using the script as the structure of the session and add their own experience, illustration and contextual knowledge to ensure the course is adapted to the audience and their context.

### The Methodology

This course offers both opportunities for learning and for practicing the application of the knowledge, skills and tools of this course. Each session is intended to integrate each of the exercises outlined in the scripts. The exercises are intended to be a core part of the instruction and sufficient time for debrief of each small group is required to ensure that participants' work is validated and heard and feedback is provided to ensure the intended learning has taken place. The scripts provide general time management guidance to ensure that the interactive portion of each session is allotted the correct amount of time for application, participation and learning by doing.

### Credentials

Facilitators or instructors should have one or more of the following: a) front-line experience working with individuals on P/CVE cases; b) a good understanding of the local context in which the course is implemented, both in terms of the threats, past and current efforts and activities around P/CVE, as well as any initiatives aimed at working collaboratively across government and non-government actors; c) experience facilitating collaborative processes among a varied cohort of actors with different interests and objectives; d) familiarity with existing international and other good practices, guidance and recommendations relevant to the development and implementation of P/CVE interventions or other P/CVE programmes.

---

## I. Overview of Modules

### Module 1: Partnership as a Foundation for Multi-Actor Interventions

#### Learning Objectives

- Understand the promise of collaboration.
- Identify common objectives through effective communication.
- Create a safe space for the exchange of perspectives.

### Module 2: Levelling the Playing Field

#### Learning Objectives

- Get on the same page in relation to terminology and definitions.
- Consider the complexity of radicalisation to violence.
- Understand the merits of adopting a public health approach as a team.

### Module 3: Common Features of a Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programme

#### Learning Objectives

- Understand the common features of multi-actor P/CVE approaches which will bind the various actors together.
- Identify the context specificities to be addressed to create a multi-actor intervention team.
- Understand and compare different models and the actors involved in each.

### Module 4: Mapping a Specific Context

#### Learning Objectives

- Establish a common understanding of drivers and threats relevant to a particular context.
- Map and understand the relevant legal/policy framework(s) which will provide key parameters for the multi-actor team.
- Identify and evaluate how the multi-actor team can leverage existing P/CVE activities.

### Module 5: Identifying and Understanding Stakeholders

#### Learning Objectives

- Identify the institutions, organisations, professionals, programmes and other key actors to include.
  - Conduct an in-depth analysis of each stakeholder to understand the nature and scope of their contribution.
-

## **Module 6: Building a Multi-Actor Team**

### **Learning Objectives**

- Promote transparency, trust and consensus-building.
- Understand key approaches to establishing clear mandates, roles and responsibilities.
- Develop effective information-sharing among relevant actors.

## **Module 7: Identifying Needs, Resources and Capacities of the Multi-Actor Team**

### **Learning Objectives**

- Understand potential capacities, resources, gaps and needs.
- Understand how to mobilise adequate resources, so the team can meet its objectives.
- Identify resources and priorities necessary for the overall commonly-stated objectives of the team.

## **Module 8: Developing a Case Intake and Management System**

### **Learning Objectives**

- Identify and build upon participants' knowledge and understanding to be able to develop an effective shared case management system.
- Identify the appropriate referral mechanisms for the team.
- Understanding how to work together to conduct thorough initial multi-actor assessment.
- Develop a P/CVE case identification approach adequate for the local context.

## **Module 9: Ensuring “Do No Harm” – Assessing Vulnerabilities, Needs and Strengths**

### **Learning Objectives**

- Understand how to conduct a “Do No Harm” multi-actor P/CVE assessment.
- Leverage capacities of each actor to integrate safeguards to mitigate possible harm during the assessment process.
- Understand the potential harm that could come from assessments and the need to adopt reduction/avoidance strategies.

## **Module 10: Ensuring “Do No Harm” – Developing and Implementing Tailor-Made Individual Support Plans**

### **Learning Objectives**

- Identify the key domains and potential tools/approaches for intervention under a multi-actor approach.
  - Understand that available interventions must align with vulnerabilities and strengthen the protective factors identified during assessment.
-

- Describe special considerations by age and gender.
- Understand the potential harm that could come from interventions and the need to adopt reduction/avoidance strategies.

## **Module 11: Monitoring and Evaluating (M&E) a Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programme**

### **Learning Objectives**

- Understand M&E as a tool for strengthening an intervention and its impact.
- Identify indicators and plan M&E for the intervention.
- Leverage data for adaptation, efficiency and resource mobilisation.

## **Module 12: Navigating Stigma in Developing/Implementing a Multi-Actor Intervention**

### **Learning Objectives**

- Understand the impact of stigma (e.g., on the community/targets of the programmes and/or on the professionals involved in it) on the team's ability to develop/operationalise multi-actor P/CVE interventions.
- Identify opportunities for mitigating stigma within the team and by the team to increase community willingness to engage with and support intervention activities.

## **Module 13: Review of Key Principles of and Lessons Learned from Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programmes**

### **Learning Objectives**

- Identify key elements of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme for the local context.

## **Module 14: Capstone, Break-Out Group Exercise**

### **Learning Objectives**

- Apply the human rights-based principles that should underpin the development of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme in a context-specific and conflict-sensitive way.
  - Apply the lessons learned from existing multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes.
  - Design and present a model programme.
-

# Module 1: Partnership as a Foundation for Multi-Actor Interventions

## Learning Objectives

- Understand the promise of collaboration.
- Identify common objectives through effective communication.
- Create a safe space for the exchange of perspectives.

## Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Icebreaker	Paper folding exercise	5 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation	Developing collaborative partnerships through learning	15 mins	15 mins
3. Breakout exercise	Communication for productive collaboration	30 mins	30 mins
4. Debrief and conclusions	Outcomes of lessons from the module	20 mins	20 mins
Total		70 mins	70 mins

## Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

## Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

In preparation for the session, the facilitator should understand and be able to explain to the participants the rationale for the session. In short, the development of a team requires building partnerships at both the organisational and individual levels and for formal and informal collaboration approaches. These partnerships provide the fabric of the multi-actor team, which will together conduct risk and needs assessments and undertake interventions. Developing a working partnership requires the negotiation and establishment of roles in order for the team to be able to leverage the respective competencies and services each actor brings to the group. This module offers the foundational skillset that underpins every multi-actor team and allows it to be flexible and adapt to the different conditions of each P/CVE case. Communication – and especially listening and taking a learning stance to understand others – is key to the proper functioning of the team.

This module aims to show how strategic listening creates a space for effective collaboration as it prioritises understanding the caveats, challenges and opportunities that exist for each actor involved in the process. This module begins by explaining the benefits of working together effectively and the importance of a collaborative mindset and/or attitude. The facilitator should be in a position to provide examples of impacts of the creation of a collaborative relationship which resulted from investments in learning about each other's approach, resources, limitations, worldviews, objectives, assumptions and beliefs. These should be helpful to illustrate the promise of a collaborative approach to a multi-stakeholder P/CVE intervention process. Such an approach is different from mere attempts at coordination among different actors and the facilitator should clearly articulate this distinction. Collaboration is working together toward a common goal, leveraging the comparative advantages and respective resources of each member of the team, while coordination consists in making sure that each individual efforts are neither redundant nor counter-productive to others. There is no common work per se.

In addition, the module should be most successful when it is set in a context which is relatively familiar to participants and, therefore, attention should be paid to adapting the exercise to ensure that it feels realistic and likely to be encountered by participants. For example, if a given context already has an existing track record of collaboration, learning what works, what does not, and why, can help to guide the development of a team that is willing to work together. If that is not possible, a personal case which many can relate to may be a good alternative.

The facilitator should also become familiar with the strategic listening tools explained in the handout attached.

## Key Messages

Sharing worldviews, capacities and limitations, and adopting a learning stance in the development of collaborative relationships will allow multi-stakeholder P/CVE interventions to leverage the strengths that each actor in the process offers, to mitigate potential conflicts and disagreements and to understand what can be realistically accomplished by a given group of stakeholders.

“Win-win” and compromising are key aspects of collaborative work and empower the entire team to synchronise their approaches, strategies, and visions in order to become more than the sum of the parts.

Collaboration requires the intentional creation of a space in which information, ideas and approaches can be shared and those receiving these ideas seek to understand the proposal being offered in order to identify its merits and adequacy for a given process and objective.

---



## Activity 1: Paper Folding Exercise

*(5 mins)*

Participants should be given a blank piece of paper and asked to stand, close their eyes, hold their paper in front of them and follow the instructions of the facilitator. The facilitator should give instruction to 1) fold the paper in two, 2) fold the paper in two again, 3) tear the right corner and 4) tear the top left corner. The participants are then told to open their eyes, unfold their paper and look at each other's papers. The papers should all be very different and demonstrate clearly to all that the same words can be interpreted differently and lead to different outcomes. This lays the foundation for the need to learn about how to communicate effectively to collaborate and reach a similar desired outcome.

## Activity 2: Developing Collaborative Partnerships through Learning

*(15 mins)*

### **Slides 2 – 4 of the PowerPoint presentation**

This section should be a presentation of how to adopt a learning stance in a multi-stakeholder process to create a safe space for the sharing of information and ideas and the creation of a team which privileges leveraging the collective assets, processes, resources, relationships and reputation of each stakeholder. It should demonstrate how each stakeholder alone should be limited in achieving even their own organisation's objectives as interventions aiming to steer individuals on the path to extremist violence in a peaceful direction typically require a web of services and activities that no single actor or organisation can deliver. The module should include a brief facilitated discussion about the interdependence of various stakeholders.

The module should then focus on teaching strategic listening as a means of developing a safe collaborative relationship amongst the stakeholders. The emphasis on understanding each other should govern the development of skills around asking powerful questions and the strategic aim of ensuring each understands the position, objectives and respective views of roles and responsibilities which should either impede or promote collaboration in an intervention.

This section should conclude with a presentation of basic negotiation and mediation principles to promote the integration of strategic listening in an interest-based construct.

---

## Activities 3 and 4: Communication for Productive Collaboration

(30 + 20 mins)

### Slides 5 – 9 of the PowerPoint presentation

A typical/widely representative scenario which depicts a multi-stakeholder P/CVE intervention programme should be given to participants to read. The goal of the practicum should be to establish a common vision for the objective of undertaking such an intervention. Participants should be tasked to learn about the assumptions and views, specific objectives and caveats and limitations (legal and structural) of another participant; and then to identify a common vision which should lay out a shared set of objectives which should later be picked up to develop roles and responsibilities. Each participant should aim to initiate a discussion which acknowledges and validates the contributions of each, and every participant should be required to make slight adjustments to their respective approaches and visions in order to effectively contribute to the objective of the multi-stakeholder intervention. This should be done by practicing developing relationships by listening and learning as taught in Activity 2.

The debrief should include feedback on:

- The existence of a space for exchange that is free of judgement;
- Strategic learning and validation;
- The comfort level of those answering questions when they shared their views and realities;
- The general atmosphere of the discussion; and
- A visioning discussion of what would have failed in the intervention given the discussion that has taken place.

## Appendices

Strategic Listening Handout.

## Resources

- TED. (2016, February 16). *Celeste Headlee: 10 ways to have a better conversation*. [Video] Available at: [https://www.ted.com/talks/celeste\\_headlee\\_10\\_ways\\_to\\_have\\_a\\_better\\_conversation/transcript](https://www.ted.com/talks/celeste_headlee_10_ways_to_have_a_better_conversation/transcript).

## Bibliographic Resources

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2019). *Communicating Open-Government - A How-to Guide*. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/gov/Open-Government-Guide.pdf>.
-

## Appendix: Strategic Listening Handout

Technique	Purpose	How?	Examples
<b>Encouraging</b>	<p>Convey interest</p> <p>Keep the person talking</p>	<p>Avoid agreeing to disagree</p> <p>Use non-committal words in a positive tone</p>	<p>1. "I see..."</p> <p>2. "Uh-huh" / "Mmm"</p>
<b>Eliciting</b>	<p>Gather more relevant information</p> <p>Encourage others to reveal their needs and concerns</p> <p>Establish a climate of open communication</p>	<p>Ask open ended questions</p> <p>Don't agree or disagree</p> <p>Use non-committal words in a positive tone</p> <p>Use encouraging body language (nodding if culturally appropriate and if understood that it does not commit you to anything)</p>	<p>1. "What is important about this for you?"</p> <p>2. "Tell me more about..."</p> <p>3. "What does this mean to you?"</p>
<b>Clarifying</b>	<p>Understand ambiguous or unclear statements</p> <p>Test Interpretation</p>	<p>Ask about specific words or phrases</p> <p>Use focused open-ended questions</p> <p>Seek fuller explanations</p> <p>Avoid frequent interruptions</p>	<p>1. "I'm not sure that I am following. Can you tell me more about...?"</p>
<b>Restating</b>	<p>Verify you understand</p> <p>Let others know you are listening</p>	<p>Paraphrase</p> <p>Avoid value judgment or inserting your opinion</p> <p>Ask for confirmation</p>	<p>1. "What I'm hearing is... is that correct?"</p> <p>2. "Would it be correct to say?"</p>
<b>Reframing</b>	<p>Refocus discussion from past events to future goals</p> <p>Redirect negative or adversarial statements into more productive channels</p>	<p>Build on ideas</p> <p>Emphasise common ground</p> <p>Use neutral or positive rather than accusatory language</p>	<p>1. "Since we both value... would it make sense to ...?"</p> <p>2. "What would you like to see in the future that would be different?"</p>
<b>Empathizing</b>	<p>Understand events from the other's perspective</p> <p>Show that you respect their point of view and their feelings</p>	<p>Recognise the experiences of other as valid, without necessarily accepting their conclusions</p> <p>Give acknowledgement rather than agreement</p>	<p>1. "It sounds like you feel..."</p> <p>2. "That must have been... for you."</p>

## Module 2: Levelling the Playing Field

### Learning Objectives

- Get on the same page in relation to terminology and definitions.
- Consider the complexity of radicalisation to violence.
- Understand the merits of adopting a public health approach as a team.

### Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	5 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation	Key foundational concepts and terms: from "P/CVE" to "counter-terrorism" to "Do No Harm"	25 mins	25 mins
3. Breakout exercise	Application of concepts and terms	25 mins	35 mins
4. Conclusions	Outcome of lessons/findings	5 mins	10 mins
Total		60 mins	75 mins

### Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

### Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator should become familiar with the PowerPoint presentation and with the resources used to design this session. To make the session as interactive as possible, he or she should be prepared to draw on their own experience, introduce some facilitation questions informed by that experience and bring in the ideas and challenges of the participants.

## Key Messages

- Multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes should draw on different professional backgrounds/experiences, but benefit from shared terminology and understanding of foundational concepts.
- Radicalisation to violent extremism is a complex phenomenon with no single path, profile or factor.
- No single actor, agency, or organisation can address multiple factors/needs of an individual on its own.
- There are multiple benefits of multi-actor interventions that involve a range of professionals.
- Most suitable for secondary and/or tertiary prevention but depends on the context.

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

(5 mins)

### Slides 12 – 14 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should introduce the session, goal and learning objectives and provide justification for the messages and their relevance to creating collaborative spaces to leverage each other's experience, networks, knowledge and areas of responsibilities for the purpose of developing multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes.

## Activity 2: Key Foundational Concepts and Terms

(25 mins)

### Slides 15 – 26 of the PowerPoint presentation

Given the diversity of stakeholders that will likely be involved in developing and implementing multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes, it is critical that they share a common understanding of key foundational concepts and terms as well as their relevance to these programmes.

Typically, these programmes can involve those who have been working in the P/CVE field and those who may be new to it, e.g., some social, health, youth, and municipal workers, community leaders and teachers. These workers may be unfamiliar with the terminology and concepts around violent extremism and radicalisation to violence, let alone the tools and approaches for addressing them.

On the other hand, law enforcement and other security actors may lack familiarity with concepts such as *safeguarding*, *anti-social behaviour* and *Do No Harm*, as well as with a *public health* (as opposed to law enforcement) approach to addressing violent extremism and preventing radicalisation to violence.

Ensuring those involved in developing a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme have a common understanding of the concepts that underpin the programme is a prerequisite to then facilitating the necessary collaboration among professionals/practitioners from different disciplines with different priorities and cultures.

## Activity 3: Application of Concepts and Terms

(25 mins if online / 35 mins if in-person)

### Slide 27 of the PowerPoint presentation

Participants should be divided into their preassigned groups, asked to identify a locality in their country where violent extremism is a concern and then consider a series of questions which would allow them to apply some of the terms and concepts presented during this module. Each group should be asked questions that allow participants to begin to identify the drivers of violent extremism, the influencers, the scope and objective/s of P/CVE interventions in their community/ies.

## Activity 4: Conclusions

(5 mins)

### Slide 28 of the PowerPoint presentation

## Resources

- Bosley, C. (2020). *Violent Extremist Disengagement and Reconciliation: A Peacebuilding Approach* (Peaceworks, No. 163). Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace. Available at: <https://www.usip.org/publications/2020/07/violent-extremist-disengagement-and-reconciliation-peacebuilding-approach>.
  - Care Quality Commission, UK. *Safeguarding People*. Available at: <https://www.cqc.org.uk/what-we-do/how-we-do-our-job/safeguarding-people>.
  - Centre for the Prevention of Radicalization Leading to Violence. *Types of Radicalisation*. Available at: <https://info-radical.org/en/types-of-radicalization/>.
  - Challgren, J., et al. (2016). *Countering Violent Extremism: Applying the Public Health Model*. Washington, DC: Center for Security Studies. Georgetown University. Available at: <http://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/NSCITF-Report-on-Countering-Violent-Extremism.pdf>.
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2020). *Rehabilitation Manual: Rehabilitation of radicalised and terrorist offenders for first-line practitioners*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_rehab\\_manual\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_rehab_manual_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2016). *RAN Issue Paper - The Root Causes of Violent Extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/issue\\_paper\\_root-causes\\_jan2016\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/issue_paper_root-causes_jan2016_en.pdf).
  - European Commission's Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development, CIVI.POL Conseil, and the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). (2017). *Operational Guidelines on the preparation and implementation of EU financed actions specific to countering terrorism and violent extremism in third countries*. Available at: <http://kbb9z40cmb2apwafcho9v3j.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/EU-CT-CVE-guidelines.pdf>.
  - Glazzard, A., and Zeuthen, M. (2016). *Violent Extremism*. GSDRC. Available at: [https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Violent-extremism\\_RP.pdf](https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Violent-extremism_RP.pdf).
  - The Global Network for Community Safety. *Multiagency Early Risk Intervention Tables (MERIT) - Ottawa*. Available at: <http://globalcommunitysafety.com/resources/community/ottawa>.
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
-

- Rosand, E. (2020). *Countering Violent Extremism in the US: A Work in Progress*. Available at: [Countering Violent Extremism in the US: A Work in Progress | ORF \(orfonline.org\)](#).
- United Nations Development Programme. (2017). *Journey to Extremism*. New York, NY: UNDP. Available at: <http://journey-to-extremism.undp.org/content/downloads/UNDP-JourneyToExtremism-report-2017-english.pdf>.
- United Nations General Assembly. (2015). *Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism: Report of the Secretary-General (A/A/70/674)*. Available at: <https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/plan-of-action-to-prevent-violent-extremism>.
- United Nations Human Rights Council. (2021). *Countering Islamophobia/Anti-Muslim Hatred to Eliminate Discrimination and Intolerance Based on Religion or Belief: Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief (A/HRC/46/30)*. Available at: [https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/RegularSessions/Session46/Documents/A\\_HRC\\_46\\_30.docx](https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/RegularSessions/Session46/Documents/A_HRC_46_30.docx).
- Weine, S., and Eisenman, D. (2016, April 5). *How Public Health Can Improve Initiatives to Counter Violent Extremism*. University of Maryland National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism. Available at: <https://www.start.umd.edu/news/how-public-health-can-improve-initiatives-counter-violent-extremism>.

## Module 3: Common Features of a Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programme

### Learning Objectives

- Understand the common features of multi-actor P/CVE approaches that will bind the various actors together.
- Identify the context specificities to be addressed to create a multi-actor intervention team.
- Understand and compare different models and the actors involved in each.

### Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	5 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation and breakout exercise	Common features	25 mins	35 mins
3. Presentation and breakout exercise	Different models	25 mins	40 mins
4. Debrief and conclusions		5 mins	10 mins
Total		60 mins	90 mins

### Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

### Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator, including by reviewing the relevant materials in the resources section, should familiarise him- or herself with common features of multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes and how they are incorporated in different contexts. He or she should also be aware of the different programme models and their advantages/disadvantages, become familiar with the PowerPoint presentation and develop their own examples.

---



## Key Messages

- Many multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes share common features, but one size does not fit all, and any model must be adapted to the local context.
- There are a range of different programme models/approaches to draw from when considering the most appropriate one for any given context; understanding the advantages/disadvantages of these models/approaches is thus essential.

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

*(5 mins)*

### Slides 31 – 33 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should emphasise that multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes come in different shapes and sizes but have some common features. He or she should highlight some of these differences and how they are manifested in different contexts. For example:

- “Top-down” (i.e., imposed by the national government across the country, with limited input from local actors) vs. “bottom-up” (i.e., local perspectives, needs and capabilities drive action by the national government).
- Police-led vs. non-police-led approaches.
- National vs. regional vs. local.
- Scope and branding (e.g., adding P/CVE to existing programmes vs. P/CVE-focussed approach).

## Activity 2: Common Features

*(25 mins if online / 35 mins if in-person)*

### Slides 34 – 36 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should enumerate some common features found in many programmes:

- Voluntary – based on consent.
- Multiple municipal/government agencies, civil society organisations; different disciplines; includes, where appropriate, police.
- Referrals accepted from multiple sources.
- Rely on contextualised individualised assessment.
- Privacy-protecting information-sharing.
- Tailored intervention/support plans that address a wide set of factors that can make someone vulnerable to violent extremism.
- Basic levels of trust.

### Key messages include:

- Programmes come in different shapes/sizes.
  - They can be led by different actors, e.g., government (national or local), police or other security actors, NGOs, or combination thereof.
  - They can have different labels, e.g., “safety houses”, “panels”, “hubs”, “partner tables”.
  - They can focus narrowly on P/CVE or more broadly on crime/violence prevention or safeguarding.
  - Nevertheless, they often share some common features.
-

### **Slide 37 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The group should then consider the extent to which the local context can incorporate these features in multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes and barriers/challenges to such incorporation. To do so, participants should be divided into their preassigned groups and then report back to the plenary.

## **Activity 3: Different Models**

*(25 mins if online / 40 mins if in-person)*

### **Slides 38 – 44 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The aim of this activity is to share with participants some of the different existing models for developing multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes, which incorporate the features presented/discussed earlier in the session.

Key messages include:

- The role of different stakeholders, whether national or local government, police or non-law enforcement professionals, government or non-governmental actors varies depending on the model/approach.
- The specific roles of the different stakeholders are often informed by existing capacities, resources and political will.

The group should then address the questions below as they discussed the different approaches presented in the previous activity and consider which ones are most salient for the specific context:

- Is a “top-down” or a “bottom-up” approach more appropriate for this context?
- What actor(s) are best placed to lead the programme?
- What role should the police and civil society play in a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme in this context?
- Should the programme focus on P/CVE or on a broader set of issues?
- Should the programme focus on secondary and/or tertiary prevention?

## **Activity 4: Debrief and Conclusions**

*(5 mins if online / 10 mins if in-person)*

### **Slide 45 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The goal of this activity is to emphasise the key messages described above. The facilitator should explain how the remainder of the course will help participants better understand how the common features presented in this session can be incorporated into and determine which elements of the different models presented, if any, are most applicable for their local context. The facilitator can also underscore that, regardless of how the features are incorporated and which model – if any – is followed, the overarching programme objectives should include mobilising those stakeholders best placed to deliver an effective P/CVE intervention because they have the required expertise. Including them thus increases the likelihood that the needs and vulnerabilities of those most “at risk” of violent extremism can be addressed before they commit to violence.

---

## Resources

- Centre for the Prevention of Radicalization Leading to Violence. *Types of Radicalisation*. Available at: <https://info-radical.org/en/types-of-radicalization/>.
- Danish Centre for Prevention of Extremism. *Prevention of extremism in Denmark*. Available at: <https://stopekstremisme.dk/en/prevention>.
- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Ex Post Paper - Strasbourg's P/CVE approach and its multi-agency partners*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_study\\_visit\\_strasbourg\\_21-22052019\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_study_visit_strasbourg_21-22052019_en.pdf).
- The Global Network for Community Safety. *Multiagency Early Risk Intervention Tables (MERIT) - Ottawa*. Available at: <http://globalcommunitysafety.com/resources/community/ottawa>.
- Home Office, United Kingdom (2018, Dec 13). Factsheet: Prevent and Channel Statistics 2017/2018 [Factsheet]. Available at: <https://homeofficemedia.blog.gov.uk/2018/12/13/factsheet-prevent-and-channel-statistics-2017-2018/>.
- Interministerial Committee for the Prevention of Crime and Radicalisation (2018). *Prevent to Protect: National Plan to Prevent Radicalisation*. Paris, FR: Government of France. Available at: [https://www.cipdr.gouv.fr/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/PNPR\\_English\\_final\\_sansmediakit.pdf](https://www.cipdr.gouv.fr/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/PNPR_English_final_sansmediakit.pdf).
- Ministry of Justice and Security, The Netherlands (2016, Oct 7). *Safety Houses* [Video file]. Available at: [https://www.veiligheidshuizen.nl/nieuws/2016/120516\\_engelse-versie-animatiefilm-veiligheidshuizen#.W\\_1mZfZFW2x](https://www.veiligheidshuizen.nl/nieuws/2016/120516_engelse-versie-animatiefilm-veiligheidshuizen#.W_1mZfZFW2x).
- ReDirect. *Learn How We are Stopping Violence in Youth through the ReDirect Program*. Available at: <http://redirect.cpsevents.ca/>.
- Shift. *Supporting People for Safer Communities*. Available at: <https://shift.gov.bc.ca/>.

## Bibliographic Resources

- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). *Multi-agency approach*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/ran-creating\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/ran-creating_en).
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
  - Sivenbring, J., and Andersson Malmros, R. (2019). *Mixing logics: Multiagency approaches for countering violent extremism*. Göteborg: Segerstedtsinstitutet, Göteborgs Universitet.
-

## Module 4: Mapping a Specific Context

### Learning Objectives

- Establish a common understanding of drivers and threats relevant to a particular context.
- Map and understand the relevant legal/policy framework(s) which will provide key parameters for the multi-actor team.
- Identify and evaluate how the multi-actor team can leverage existing P/CVE activities.

### Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	5 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation and breakout exercise	Understanding the threat and drivers of violent extremism	45 mins	60 mins
3. Facilitated discussion	Existing legal/policy frameworks	15 mins	25 mins
4. Facilitated discussion	Mapping of existing programmes	20 mins	25 mins
5. Debrief and conclusions		5 mins	5 mins
Total		90 mins	120 mins

### Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

## Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

This module will focus on understanding the local context – in particular, the violent extremism threats and drivers as well as the existing current approaches and challenges in addressing them – in order to help ensure that a multi-actor intervention programme is appropriately tailored to the context.

The facilitator should also have a basic understanding of the local context (e.g., threat, legal/policy framework/s, resources, and relationships) and how it can have an impact on the design/implementation of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme. He or she should also be able to help participants understand how to map their local context, including what questions to ask and what issues to focus on. Where such a mapping has already been undertaken, the facilitator should help participants understand how to ensure it is updated periodically to take into account the evolving threat and the wider local context.

## Key Messages

- Understanding the extremist threat, the factors that lead to creating it, and the existing community-level awareness of these factors are critical initial steps to developing a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme.
- Such programmes should be underpinned by human rights-compliant, legal and policy frameworks and leverage existing P/CVE and other relevant programmes.

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

*(5 mins)*

### Slides 48 – 50 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should provide a brief introduction and his/her experience in mapping contexts. He or she should ask participants to raise their hand to indicate if they have been involved in mapping the context where they live or work in or have supported others in mapping a specific context in order to get a sense as to the depth of complexity that can be shared with the participants (in case they all have been involved in similar efforts, the facilitator can turn to some of them in order to draw on their experiences).

The facilitator should present Slide 48, noting that this is what is hoped to be covered in the session, allowing time for participants to read the slide. He or she should ask why understanding the context should be an essential first step of designing any multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme. Answers should suggest that this understanding should be the departure point for all design and implementation of multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes and if the problem and existing ecosystem are not sufficiently understood, then the programme is unlikely to be effective, let alone sustainable.

The facilitator should present Slide 49 and explain that it is hoped that the module is able to supplement the participants' own expertise and understanding of their local context with the ability to offer some framing devices to structure their insights.

The facilitator should then present Slide 50 by reading out each of the learning objectives, pausing briefly after each objective.

---

## Activity 2: Understanding the Threat and Drivers of Violent Extremism

*(45 mins if online / 60 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 51 – 55 of the PowerPoint presentation**

### **The most important step in solving a problem is identifying the problem you wish to solve**

The facilitator should provide a background for Slide 51. Too often, P/CVE programming tends to under-resourced expansive efforts with no clear objective(s). This generally occurs because of the inability to focus on a particular threat that is clearly defined and understood.

Understanding the extremist violence threat requires a nuanced appreciation of the factors that give rise to it. This includes recognising which communities and individuals within them are most affected by it, as well as the vulnerabilities and risks in those geographies and among those potential beneficiaries, which a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme should then focus on.

This multi-step process for the threat assessment involves: 1) identifying terrorist and violent extremist groups of concern; 2) understanding the intention and capabilities of each group and the local, national, regional and global issues which affect the political, economic, security and other issues relevant to the local context; and 3) evaluating the impact of the threat on various locations and the relevance of different groups as identified by age, gender, religion or ethnicity.

While leading the discussion about the threat, the facilitator should emphasise how understanding the threat and the grievances/issues that lead to violent extremism, the communities they affect and existing community-level awareness of the vulnerabilities and strengths, is critical to the design of an appropriately focussed and scoped multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme.

The facilitator should share Slide 51 with the group and briefly present the above-mentioned topics in one to two (1-2) minutes. He or she should advance to Slide 52 and ask participants to break into their preassigned groups. The facilitator should encourage the groups to use Slide 6 as a template for discussion and to populate it with their understanding of the threat in their local context.

### **Understanding the drivers of violent extremism**

The facilitator should provide background for Slides 53-54. Identifying the drivers of violent extremism in a particular context, at least some of which a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme would then aim to address, can be a complex endeavour. Drivers are a more nuanced look at root causes or underlying conditions. They are overlaid on to the individual's radicalisation process and impact individuals, families, neighbourhoods, communities and countries in a different manner.

There is no single approach to analysing the drivers of violent extremism and these approaches are not mutually exclusive. Perhaps the most commonly used one focuses on the "push" (the structural or environmental conditions that can generate grievances prompting individuals to support violent extremism) and "pull" (the factors or conditions which make violent extremist ideas/groups appealing or more proximate factors of violence) factors. This approach is reflected in the European Commission's Operational Guidelines on the Preparation and Implementation of EU Financed Actions Specific to Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism in Third Countries.

---

An additional framework for understanding the drivers of violent extremism focuses on structural motivations, enabling factors, groups and network dynamics, as well as individual incentives. With another lens to apply to the local context, one can seek to address the limitations of the binary system captured in the somewhat simplistic “push”/“pull” factors analysis.

A third framework involves the use of a systems-approach to understanding an environment that does not focus on a framework but tries to understand the complexities of an issue by looking at the connections and relationships within it, so it starts to be understood as more of an ecosystem.

When delivering a training to a cohort that is new to the P/CVE field, the facilitator may wish to work through the “push”/“pull” factors analysis. Those who have already received some P/CVE training will likely have some awareness of these factors.

While discussing the “push”/“pull” factors, the facilitator should also draw attention to different aspects of the enabling environment that can impact the significance of particular “pull” or “push” factors. These can include weak states, poor security/corruption, poorly governed areas, proactive religious agendas, inter and intra-religious divides and state sponsorship of violent groups. The factors that contribute to radicalisation to violence are wide-ranging and complex. A single framework is unable to capture this complexity.

The facilitator should move to Slide 53 and ask participants to raise their hands if they have heard of these terms. He or she should ask for a volunteer to share his/her understanding of “push” factors and offer some additional nuance if needed. The facilitator should then follow the same procedure to introduce the concept of “pull” factors. As noted above, it is important to explain that, in an effort to really capture the complexity of the entire system, many are beginning to think of drivers as being formed by more than “push” and “pull” factors, and that some are using a more evolved framework.

Whether more evolved or not, having an additional lens to challenge initial conclusions is always a good approach to take in understanding complex environments. Beyond the “push”/“pull” factors, Slide 53 also presents another framework that focuses on identifying another set of factors, giving participants a chance to approach the drivers through a different perspective.

The facilitator should shift to Slide 54 and give participants a brief moment to focus on the four factors captured on the slide. If the participants seem quite advanced in their thinking, the facilitator should ask them to share examples of each of the factors. The facilitator should then help build out the inputs with further examples, so the participants understand the breadth of each factor. If the facilitator senses that the participants are not quite as experienced, he or she could provide illustrative examples of each factor.

In concluding the slide, if there is time or the group is advanced, the facilitator should ask participants to share additional analytical frameworks or approaches they may have used in the past. The facilitator should ask if they have struggled with the limitations of frameworks and, if they have, how they overcame those limitations.

The facilitator should move to Slide 55. Maintaining the groups from the previous activities, he or she should ask them to consider their local context and populate the chart so that they have experience applying this framework and deconstructing their understanding. Groups should return to the plenary with 10-15 minutes remaining and the facilitator should ask if the framework highlighted any areas that participants were overlooking or whether it helped provide some additional nuance or insights.

## Activity 3: Existing Legal/Policy Frameworks

*(15 mins if online / 25 mins if in-person)*

**Slide 56 of the PowerPoint presentation**

### Identifying applicable legal/policy frameworks and what gaps might need to be addressed

The facilitator should provide a background for Slide 56. In any given context, a number of legal and policy frameworks may be relevant to the development of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme. These include national or local laws, strategies and/or action plans related to counter-terrorism, P/CVE, crime prevention, child protection, information sharing, data protection and privacy, as well as protocols/codes of conduct that might govern relevant practitioners, e.g., social workers or mental health professionals.

The facilitator should ask participants to identify the relevant frameworks for the local context and analyse whether they can support multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes or whether (and which) additions or adjustments might be required to do so.

At this stage, the facilitator should ask participants which frameworks are most relevant. It is important to inquire about the P/CVE or other relevant strategies/action plans and how they complement existing laws and what legal challenges exist in the relevant context. If participants are hesitant to speak, the following questions may spark a brief discussion:

- Does it allow a hotline for community or family members to seek help for those they believe are “at risk” or are in the process of radicalisation to violence?
- Is steering an individual away from violence or rehabilitation possible?
- Can information be shared between security and civilian actors or between government and civil society actors?
- Are there any areas that need to change?

## Activity 4: Mapping of Existing Programmes

*(20 mins if online / 25 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 57 – 58 of the PowerPoint presentation**

### Seeking synergy

The facilitator should provide background for Slides 57-58. He or she should emphasise that it is essential for those involved in developing a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme to gain a comprehensive understanding of the programmatic landscape, including which programmes have worked and which ones have not. When mapping programmes, it is important to explore the entire system. Although P/CVE interventions are likely the most relevant, child protection, gender-based violence, social cohesion, crime prevention and other types of programming are often indirectly relevant. Recognising that programmatic interventions may originate from a number of sources, it is key to engage with multilateral and bilateral donors, national, subnational and local governing structures, as well as civil society, that may be at the national or even grassroots level. All may have some responsibility for programming.

---



The facilitator should spend the majority of the time with Slide 57 on screen. He or she should ask participants to identify the best place/s to find information on the ongoing programmes and inquire as to how comprehensive the available information is for programming in the relevant country and if the level of detail is sufficient. If there is a notable gap in the discussion, the facilitator could explore with a question such as “how can we find out information around the programming initiated by civil society?”

The facilitator should shift to Slide 58 and inquire if there are parts of the country where it is difficult to learn what programming is taking place there. He or she should also ask why that is the case and what means participants have to learn about the effectiveness of ongoing programmes.

## Activity 5: Debrief and Conclusions

(5 mins)

### Slide 59 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should move to Slide 59 and ask for two volunteers to share what aspect of the module, if any, they believe will be most useful for them to apply to their work in the future.

This module focuses on understanding the threat and, once defined and the drivers understood, establishing a foundation for programmatic design. With insights into the threat, a response becomes grounded with the ability to evolve from an analysis of mapped out relevant programming, so that any new intervention can be used to complement their efforts. Throughout this module, emphasis has been placed on the importance of understanding the specific violent extremist threat, exploring the drivers of extremism including the structural, individual, group and enabling factors, and applying this framing to the country context.

In addition, the module has sought to promote an understanding of the existing legal and policy frameworks that either provide guidance or highlight the need for refinement and how discussing the breadth and depth of existing programming creates a framework for multi-actor programme design.

## Resources

- CVE Reference Guide for Local Organizations. (n.d.). *Assessment Process*. Available at: <https://www.cvereferenceguide.org/assess/assessment-process>.
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *Multi-agency Working and preventing violent extremism: Paper 2*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran\\_hsc\\_policy\\_mawr\\_report\\_sarma\\_26032019\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran_hsc_policy_mawr_report_sarma_26032019_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Collection of Approaches and Practices - Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism: Approaches and Practices*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran\\_collection-approaches\\_and\\_practices\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran_collection-approaches_and_practices_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Multi-agency working and preventing violent extremism I*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018_en.pdf).
  - European Commission's Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development, CIVI.POL Conseil, and the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). (2017). *Operational Guidelines on the preparation and implementation of EU financed actions specific to countering terrorism and violent extremism in third countries*. Available at: <http://kbb9z40cmb2apwafcho9v3j.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/EU-CT-CVE-guidelines.pdf>.
-

- European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO). (2016). *EPLO Briefing Paper 1/2016 - Overview of the EU's Policy and Programming on Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism (PVE/CVE)*. Brussels, BE: EPLO. Available at: <http://eplo.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/EPLO-Briefing-Paper-on-CVE-Sept-16.pdf>.
  - Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF). (2020). *Memorandum on Good Practices on Strengthening National-Local Cooperation in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism Conducive to Terrorism*. The Hague, NL: GCTF. Available at: <https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Framework%20Documents/2020/GCTF%20Memorandum%20on%20Good%20Practices%20on%20Strengthening%20NLC%20in%20PCVE.pdf?ver=2020-09-29-100315-357>.
  - Holmer, G. and Bauman, P. (2018). *Taking Stock: Analytic Tools for Understanding and Designing P/CVE Programs*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace. Available at: <https://www.usip.org/publications/2018/09/taking-stock-analytic-tools-understanding-and-designing-pcve-programs>.
  - Mattei, C. and Zeiger, S. (2018). *Evaluate Your CVE Results: Projecting Your Impact*. Abu Dhabi, AE: Hedayah. Available at: <https://hedayah-wp-offload.s3.eu-central-1.amazonaws.com/hedayah/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/17114010/File-16720189339.pdf>.
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2013). *Women and Terrorist Radicalization - Final Report*. Vienna, AT: OSCE. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/4/a/99919.pdf>.
  - United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT). (2018). *Reference Guide - Developing National and Regional Action Plans to Prevent Violent Extremism*. New York, NY: UNOCT. Available at: [https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/sites/www.un.org.counterterrorism/files/unoct\\_pverreferenceguide\\_final.pdf](https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/sites/www.un.org.counterterrorism/files/unoct_pverreferenceguide_final.pdf).
  - United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2009). *The Universal Legal Framework against Terrorism* [PowerPoint slides]. Available at: [https://www.unodc.org/documents/southeastasiaandpacific/2009/05/Universal-Legal-Framework-against-Terrorism-Workshop/1\\_General.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/southeastasiaandpacific/2009/05/Universal-Legal-Framework-against-Terrorism-Workshop/1_General.pdf).
  - United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (n.d.). *National approaches*. Available at: <https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/terrorism/module-14/key-issues/legal-framework/national-approaches.html>.
  - United States Agency for International Development (USAID). (2020). *Policy for Countering Violent Extremism through Development Assistance*. Available at: <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USAID-publication-Policy-for-Countering-Violent-Extremism-through-Development-Assistance-April2020.pdf>.
  - United States Agency for International Development (USAID). (2011). *The Development Response to Violent Extremism and Insurgency – Putting Principles into Practice*. Available at: [https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/Pdacs400.pdf](https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdacs400.pdf).
-

# Module 5: Identifying and Understanding Stakeholders

## Learning Objectives

- Identify the institutions, organisations, professionals, programmes and other key actors to include.
- Conduct an in-depth analysis of each stakeholder to understand the nature and scope of their contribution.

## Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Mapping primary and secondary stakeholders	20 mins	20 mins
2. Breakout exercise	Negotiating roles/responsibilities	30 mins	45 mins
3. Debrief and conclusions	Outcomes of lessons from practicum	10 mins	10 mins
Total		60 mins	75 mins

## Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

## Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

This highly interactive module relies on facilitation to take participants through a process of identifying the stakeholders present in their own context in order to create a space for building a web of collaborators who might contribute to a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme. For participants to buy in to the promise – and the compromises required – of such a coordinated and collaborative approach, the facilitator should focus the discussion on the nature and scope of existing structure, platforms, institutions and/or teams, if any, that already exist in the context of the participants.

Following this discussion, participants should look to identify the gaps that may exist and to reflect on how to fill them.

The facilitator should integrate insights on good practices of collaboration, including the development of a common vision and subsequent objectives for working effectively in a team as a way to create a comprehensive process. Several of these can be found in the resource section of this document.

Participants should be led through the various components of mapping stakeholders including the development of who has a stake and can contribute to a given process of intervention for P/CVE, undertaking a political analysis to identify interests and positions of each stakeholder, the attitudes of each including that of the institution/organisation, as well as the relationships among these stakeholders – current and potential ones. Once the analysis of their own context has taken place through a facilitated discussion in plenary, the facilitator should ask participants to break into their preassigned groups and ask them to develop an engagement strategy considering both positive and negative stakeholders. The product of the respective exercises should be presented in plenary and the facilitator should allow each group to comment and question on each presentation and fill in to ensure that all relevant issues have been considered.

By the end of this module, participants should have a basic map of their own context that identifies the gaps, needs and opportunities, as well as strengths and capacities. This will be a useful tool to build upon for the upcoming modules which will further refine the development of the team in terms of its dynamics and its resources.

In addition, the practicum should offer the participants the opportunity to work in small groups in an exercise which would allow them to practice negotiating roles and responsibilities given their specific context's resources, habits, structures, existing processes, and norms, etc.

The facilitator should understand the course materials and develop a few questions that should guide the debrief to ensure that small groups have customised their presentations and their approach in order to be effective in their given context.

## Key Messages

Working in teams made up of individuals representing different disciplines or areas of expertise is a more effective approach to addressing violent extremism-related vulnerabilities/risks than those same individuals working in isolation.

Win-win and compromising are key aspects of collaborative work and empower the entire team to synchronise their approaches, strategies and visions in order to become more than the sum of the parts.

Collaboration requires the intentional creation of a space in which information, ideas and approaches can be shared and those receiving these ideas seek to understand the proposal being offered in order to identify its merits and adequacy for a given process and objective.

---

## Activity 1: Mapping Primary and Secondary Stakeholders

*(20 mins)*

### Slides 62 – 65 of the PowerPoint presentation

This section focuses on how to identify the relevant actors in a given context and to create a mechanism for coordination and/or collaboration.

The presentation should demonstrate how to develop an engagement strategy for various stakeholders, informed by an assessment of their power and influence as well as their interests. This section includes insights on how to conduct and incorporate a political analysis in an engagement strategy.

This section then presents a simple relationship mapping tool which should allow participants to perform a stakeholder analysis. This tool helps to create an understanding not only about which individuals and institutions/organisations should be integrated in the multi-stakeholder process, but also to consider the nature and scope of the relationships between stakeholders as these need to be understood as collaboration mechanisms are undertaken, mainly (but not only) to mitigate possible spoilers of the process. A mapping of the context should be introduced to participants in a way which is superimposed on the stakeholder analysis according to a “who/why/what/how” framework allowing participants to create a picture of their specific context, including opportunities and threats.

The module should then present a concrete stakeholder analysis template which should be used in the practicum. This section should include an explanation of the template and answer questions from the participants to ensure that the template is well understood and can be used as a tool. This tool should include the mapping of the attitudes of stakeholders around multi-stakeholder processes and P/CVE as an approach.

## Activities 2 and 3: Negotiating Roles/Responsibilities and Debrief

*(30 + 10 mins if online / 45 + 10 mins if in-person)*

### Slides 66 – 68 of the PowerPoint presentation

Participants should be split into their preassigned groups to conduct a stakeholder analysis of their own context. The template shared with them in the section above should serve as a guide for the analysis. Each group should run the same exercise and prepare a presentation to share in plenary after 30-45 minutes. The presentation should include a template which is filled out, a list of challenges encountered when filling out the template and any area of disagreement which the exercise surfaced as well as areas of consensus. The presentation should include a graphic of the context that was mapped out.

The debrief should include feedback on:

- The ability to identify the key actors which exist in a given context;
  - The nature and scope of the challenges discovered in the stakeholder analysis;
  - The consideration of interests and influence into the analysis;
  - An inclusive approach to the development of a process; and
  - The manifestation of the ability of looking for opportunities for common vision and objectives.
-

## Appendices

Mapping relationships handout

## Resources

- Hovland, I. (2007). *Successful communication: A Toolkit for Researchers and Civil Society Organisations*. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute (UNI). Available at: <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/192.pdf>.
  - Mabrouk, M., Sperandio, S., and Girard, P. (2014). Stakeholder Mapping in a Collaborative Project for a Sustainable Development. In B. Grabot et al (Eds.), *Advances in Production Management Systems: Innovative and Knowledge-Based Production Management in a Global-Local World* (pp. 518-525). Heidelberg, DE: Springer.
  - USAID (2018). Collaboration Mapping: A Facilitation Guide [Factsheet]. Available at: [https://usaidthroughlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/collaboration\\_mapping\\_facilitation\\_guide\\_formatted\\_201806\\_508.pdf](https://usaidthroughlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/collaboration_mapping_facilitation_guide_formatted_201806_508.pdf).
-

## Appendix: Mapping Relationships Handout

Stakeholder	Contribution	Legitimacy	Willingness to engage	Influence	Necessity of involvement
S1: individual or group sharing interest and identity	High: valuable, in-depth knowledge in issue or process at stake	High: directly involved or affected by change under consideration	Low: believe(s) planned change will result in loss for self/group	High: make or break influence over the process	High: engage as a priority to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>concerns are factored in</li> <li>buy-in and support</li> </ul>
S2	Medium:	Medium:	High: proactive group already engaging	Medium:	Low: maintain level of engagement with minimal effort
S3	Low:	Low:	Medium:	Low:	Low:

## Module 6: Building a Multi-Actor Team

### Learning Objectives

- Promote transparency, trust, and consensus-building.
- Understand key approaches to establishing clear mandates, roles and responsibilities.
- Develop effective information-sharing among relevant actors.

### Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	3 mins	3 mins
2. Presentation	Key elements for and navigating challenges to team-building	7 mins	7 mins
3. Breakout exercise	What type of multi-actor team and challenges to participation	20 mins	30 mins
4. Presentation	Promoting trust, transparency and consensus-building	10 mins	10 mins
5. Breakout exercise	Leadership and team-building	20 mins	30 mins
6. Debrief and conclusions		10 mins	10 mins
Total		70 mins	90 mins

### Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

### Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator should become familiar with the various concepts that are presented in this module and efforts to develop team-oriented approaches to P/CVE in the particular context as well as the challenges that may have arisen. In addition, the facilitator should develop and/or draw on examples based on the local contexts that can be used throughout the sessions.



## Key Messages

- Given the complexity of the process of radicalisation to violence, P/CVE requires a diversity of disciplines, resources, and capacity – no agency, entity or individual can do it alone.
- A team-oriented approach is likely to be more effective than any single actor working alone.
- However, the “team” concept can be operationalised in a variety of ways, depending on the local context.
- Key elements to setting up an effective team include promoting transparency, developing trust, building consensus, clarifying roles and responsibilities and facilitating information-sharing among team members. There are a variety of ways to incorporate these elements in a particular team.

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

*(3 mins)*

### **Slides 71 – 74 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should highlight the learning objectives and main messages for this session. He or she should introduce some of the key ingredients for building a team that can work together on P/CVE cases and some challenges to doing so.

## Activity 2: Key Elements for and Navigating Challenges to Team-Building

*(7 mins)*

### **Slides 75 – 77 of the PowerPoint presentation**

#### **Why work as a team? (Slide 75)**

The facilitator should read from Slide 75 the listed benefits of working as a team.

#### **Range of practitioners/professionals that could be considered for the team (Slide 76)**

This includes youth, health and social workers; religious or other “mentors”; family, drug and/or alcohol, or other counsellors; sports, life, or other coaches; former violent extremists; teachers; and local CSOs.

The facilitator should have a basic understanding of the role that each is currently playing, if any, in P/CVE efforts in the local context and the most relevant ones for the development and viability of a multi-actor programme in that context.

#### **A “team” in the context of P/CVE interventions comes in different shapes/sizes (Slide 77)**

The facilitator should provide an overview of the different forms a “team” can take, including specific examples of existing programmes. They can be formal structures or ad hoc, relying on a loose network of practitioners. They can be led by an NGO or local or national government. They can work together on an ongoing basis in the same office or can gather – either in person or virtually – on a periodic or “as needed” basis.

The facilitator should then present and discuss the different factors that typically influence the form in a particular context: e.g., levels of trust, capacities/resources, existing programmes and demand.

---

## Activity 3: What Type of Multi-Actor Team and Challenges to Participation

*(20 mins if online / 30 mins if in-person)*

### Slide 78 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should break the participants into their preassigned groups. Each group should consider the following questions:

- Who should be part of the team?
- What might be some of the challenges to getting them to participate and how can they be overcome?
- What type of multi-actor team might work best for your community?

## Activity 4: Promoting Trust, Transparency and Consensus-Building

*(10 mins)*

### Slides 79 – 82 of the PowerPoint presentation

#### Clarifying roles, responsibilities, and mandates (Slide 79)

The facilitator should facilitate a discussion of the different roles, responsibilities and mandates of team members and the key elements surrounding the team. He or she should emphasise the importance of the diverse stakeholders sharing a common understanding of these elements, how such an understanding could be realised through a series of consultations with them and how these elements can be memorialised (e.g., in a founding charter).

Key elements include:

- The purpose and focus of the programme;
- The practitioners/organisations involved and the role of each;
- Who leads? (emphasising the importance of identifying a lead actor);
- What sort of oversight, if any, is there? and
- Trust, transparency and consensus building (**Slide 80**).

#### Possible activities for building trust and consensus and ensuring transparency (Slide 81)

The facilitator could briefly outline some steps that could be taken to build trust / consensus and provide transparency, such as:

- Guiding framework;
- Engaging community members (e.g., via community forums);
- Leadership selection; and
- Joint messaging.

#### Information-sharing foundation (Slide 82)

The facilitator should emphasise how the effectiveness of a multi-actor team depends heavily on the extent to which information on those deemed to be at risk of violent extremism can be shared among team members, while protecting data and privacy.

---

The facilitator should encourage participants to reframe their thoughts and efforts on information sharing to include a mindset which asks, “How can we share?” and “What can we share?”. There is often information that can be shared quite easily. Existing mechanisms, standards, norms or ad hoc arrangements may already exist.

He or she should enumerate some of the challenges in facilitating information-sharing among different actors who might have relevant information on a single individual, which will need to be reviewed as part of an assessment and included when designing an intervention or support plan. In this context, the facilitator should emphasise the critical importance of balancing the privacy or data protection rights of the concerned individual with the need for the team to have access to the necessary information to allow it to undertake a comprehensive assessment and design an appropriate intervention or support plan.

The facilitator should underscore the need to put in place a set of transparent information-sharing guidelines, which can come in different forms and facilitate a discussion around what issues should be addressed in such guidelines. Particular emphasis should be placed on ensuring transparency as to when information on an individual case can be shared with the police or other security actors.

## Activity 5: Leadership and Team-Building

*(20 mins if online / 30 mins if in-person)*

### Slide 83 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should break the participants into their preassigned groups. Each group should consider the following questions:

- Who should lead the team?
- What steps could be taken to build trust and consensus among team members and ensure transparency?
- What are the barriers to facilitating information-sharing among team members and how can they be overcome?

## Activity 6: Debrief and Conclusions

*(10 mins)*

### Slide 84 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should ask the rapporteurs to brief the plenary on the key findings / conclusions from their respective sessions and then highlight any common themes/challenges.

## Appendices

Worksheets for breakout exercises.

## Resources

- The Global Network for Community Safety. *Multiagency Early Risk Intervention Tables (MERIT) - Ottawa*. Available at: <http://globalcommunitysafety.com/resources/community/ottawa>.
  - International Observatory of Mayors. *Protocol for the Prevention of Radicalization*. Available at: <https://observatoirevivreensemble.org/en/protocol-for-the-prevention-of-radicalization>.
-

- Meines, M. (2017). Local strategy: elements of an effective local action plan to prevent radicalisation and violent extremism. In D. Muro (Ed.), *Resilient Cities. Countering Violent Extremism at Local Level* (pp. 99-104). Barcelona, ES: Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB). Available at: [https://www.cidob.org/content/download/67479/2055336/version/3/file/99-104\\_MARIJE%MEINES.PDF](https://www.cidob.org/content/download/67479/2055336/version/3/file/99-104_MARIJE%MEINES.PDF).
- Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism, Home Office. (2015). Annex A of *Channel Duty Guidance: Protecting vulnerable people from being drawn into terrorism - Statutory guidance for Channel panel members and partners of local panels*. London, UK: HM Government. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/907614/Channel\\_Duty\\_Guidance\\_April\\_2015.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907614/Channel_Duty_Guidance_April_2015.pdf).
- Project-Management.com. *5 Stages of Team Development: Tuckman's Group Development*. Available at: <https://project-management.com/stages-of-team-development/>.
- Public Safety Canada. *Canada Centre for Community Engagement and Prevention of Violence*. Available at: <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/bt/cc/index-en.aspx>.
- Ranstorp, M. et al. (2016). *Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism. An Initial Rapid Evidence Assessment and Analysis Plan Examining Local Authority Action Plans and Programming Elements*. Stockholm, SE: Center for Asymmetric Threat Studies, Swedish Defence University. Available at: [https://cradpdf.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc274/p805336\\_A1b.pdf](https://cradpdf.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc274/p805336_A1b.pdf).

## Bibliographic Resources

- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Collection of Approaches and Practices - Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism: Approaches and Practices* (pp. 589-632). Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran\\_collection-approaches\\_and\\_practices\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran_collection-approaches_and_practices_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Ex Post Paper - Common P/CVE Challenges in the Western Balkans and European Union*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_policy\\_practice\\_common\\_pcve\\_challenges\\_sofia\\_04042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_policy_practice_common_pcve_challenges_sofia_04042018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Multi-agency working and preventing violent extremism I*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2016). *RAN Ex Post Paper - Handbook on How to set up a multi-agency structure that includes the health and social care sectors?* Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk_en.pdf).
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
-

## Appendix 1: Worksheet for Breakout Exercise #1

Team Members	Participation Challenges	Team Type
Traditional and non-traditional members	How to overcome?	What will work for your community?

## Appendix 2: Worksheet for Breakout Exercise #2

Team Leader	Trust Building	Information Sharing
Who is best positioned and why?	Increase transparency and consensus among members	Barriers and overcoming them
Government (national or local), NGO/CSO, academia ...	Events, activities, documents, agreements ...	Professional, classified, participant ...

## Module 7: Identifying Needs, Resources and Capacities of the Multi-Actor Team

### Learning Objectives

- Understand potential capacities, resources, gaps and needs.
- Understand how to mobilise adequate resources, so the team can meet its objectives.
- Identify resources and priorities necessary for the overall commonly-stated objectives of the team.

### Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	2 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation	Material resources	10 mins	15 mins
3. Breakout exercise	Intervention programmes	15 mins	30 mins
4. Presentation	Skills/expertise	10 mins	15 mins
5. Presentation	Training and other capacity-building needs	10 mins	15 mins
6. Breakout exercise	Identifying available and required capacities, resources, expertise, training, etc.	15 mins	30 mins
7. Debrief and conclusions		8 mins	10 mins
Total		70 mins	120 mins

### Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

## Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator should be familiar with what expertise, resources and capacities are typically required to develop and operationalise multi-actor P/CVE interventions as well as the different ways in which gaps in these areas can be addressed. He or she should also have some familiarity with the relevant existing expertise, resources, capacities and programmes in the local context in which the course is being offered. In addition, the facilitator should be familiar with the key messages to be delivered during this session.

### Key Messages

- There are many aspects to consider when it comes to resources (including financial and expertise and other capacities) and no single aspect should be overlooked.
- Resources are always limited: instead of reinventing the wheel, it is important to make the best possible use of whatever resources are available, including in related fields such as crime prevention, child protection and safeguarding.
- Team members will likely require some training and other support. Mapping and knowing how to address those needs will be important.

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

*(2 mins if online / 5 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 87 – 89 of the PowerPoint presentation**

At this point in the implementation of the curriculum, participants should have an understanding of some typical features and requirements of multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes and how to build a team that would be the foundation of such an initiative. Subsequent modules will introduce more technical skills, including ways to conduct tailored, individualised assessments, develop individualised interventions and broader support plans, evaluate the impact of the programme and navigate stigmas surrounding the programme.

The facilitator should draw attention to the importance of ensuring that the envisaged scope of and level of ambition for the programme takes into account the available resources, including both material (e.g., financial, human and infrastructure) and non-material (e.g., expertise). He or she should emphasise how designing a multi-actor intervention programme is often a complex task. For example, it usually involves bringing together experienced professionals who do have a solid base to build on, but still need to acquire new and specific skills. It also requires identifying which capacities are lacking and those that should be strengthened on a priority basis. Failure to address a capacity gap can have a negative impact on the ability to launch a programme as well as on its effectiveness in the long-term.

## Activity 2: Material Resources

*(10 mins if online / 15 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 90 – 93 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should stress that those involved in developing a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme consider what material resources the programme might need, and which ones are locally available. He or she should note that, since programmes vary to a great extent in scope and shape, participants cannot be provided with any sort of pre-established list (e.g., number of staff or size of office space). Moreover, the resources

---

available to them will vary considerably depending on the specific context. Ultimately, the facilitator would want participants to understand the diverse resources that a programme might need, which existing ones can be leveraged and how to acquire new ones.

The facilitator should also discuss the pros and cons of layering P/CVE onto an existing multi-actor intervention programme and of developing a P/CVE one from scratch, encouraging, where appropriate, participants to move in the direction of the former, which is likely to be more cost-effective and attract broader support from the community than the latter.

The facilitator should have some familiarity with such non-P/CVE intervention programmes, which can take many forms and cover different subjects, including trafficking in human beings, gender-based violence, protection of vulnerable children, and suicide prevention<sup>33</sup>.

The facilitator should highlight the programme's practical requirements, which might include an office, one or more professionals to oversee the programme, administrative staff, a hotline, and so on. He or she should emphasise how these requirements will depend on the shape the programme takes and whether, for example, it is incorporated into an existing programme and, more broadly, the extent to which it can leverage existing resources. What is important is that participants ask themselves the right questions, so they determine the right number of resources and find ways to meet the programme's needs<sup>34</sup>.

## Activity 3: Intervention Programmes

*(15 mins if online / 30 mins if in-person)*

### Slide 94 of the PowerPoint presentation

For this first breakout exercise, which serves as a basis for the second one in this module, the facilitator should break the participants into their preassigned groups and ask them to mention and describe intervention programmes with which they are already involved. Participants should not ask themselves yet whether any particular programme can incorporate a P/CVE component. At this point, the aim is merely to identify and present existing programmes and other resources that might be relevant.

Intervention programmes have been used when a comprehensive set of services, cutting across different agencies and/or disciplines, is needed to address the needs of vulnerable individuals. They exist in fields such as trafficking in human beings, gender-based violence, protection of vulnerable children, drugs consumption, suicide, eating disorders, and so on.

For the purpose of this exercise, it is important that participants understand the difference between an intervention and a more general prevention strategy or framework. If needed, the facilitator should stress that this exercise is not about general, primary prevention, but a specific intervention, whether in the secondary or tertiary prevention space. Also, in the interest of time, each participant should be invited to present only one programme.

Participants should be asked the following questions:

- Name and area/subject(s): what is the name of the programme and what does it deal with? Single or multiple issue(s)?

---

<sup>33</sup> For a presentation of the first three categories, see Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*, pp. 33-36.

<sup>34</sup> On the particular point of political support, see EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Ex Post Paper - How to Get Sustainable Political Support for Your Local P/CVE Strategy*.



- Level: at what level does the programme operate? National, regional, local?
- Point of entry: how are referrals made? Helpline, hotline, direct contact between professionals?
- Structure: Top-down or locally driven?
- Lead implementer: state entity, municipality, NGO?
- Service providers/partners: teachers, social workers, youth workers, mental health professionals, religious and community leaders, law enforcement?

If time permits, when back in plenary, participants may be invited to present one or two programmes which they find particularly interesting or promising.

## Activity 4: Skills/Expertise

*(10 mins if online / 15 mins if in-person)*

### Slides 95 – 97 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should remind participants that violent extremism is a complex, multi-faceted phenomenon and that, to maximise the likelihood of its success, a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme should be able to provide or facilitate the interventions/services that can address the vulnerabilities and needs most likely to be present in the target communities. The facilitator should briefly enumerate these vulnerabilities/needs and underscore how the programme will have to be able to rely on a wide range of skills and disciplines to address them.

The facilitator should guide participants through the steps to take to determine the particular skills/expertise that will be needed, which ones are already available, which ones need to be enhanced, and those that need to be developed:

- Understand the vulnerabilities and needs that the programme will need to be able to address;
  - Identify which existing professionals and other members of the community are best placed to address vulnerabilities/needs;
  - Identify the relevant capacities (and willingness) of these interveners or service providers. Will they require specialised P/CVE training? For example, social and mental health workers may be reluctant to engage with individuals who may pose a security risk or an issue that can be perceived as belonging to security practitioners;
    - The facilitator should underscore how a multi-disciplinary approach involves ensuring that the different professionals involved in the programme have both the capacity and willingness to communicate with each other and develop a common understanding of radicalisation and violent extremism. He or she should remind participants that it is often not “natural” for a psychologist to cooperate with a community worker, or a teacher with a religious leader, because different professionals approach violent extremism from different angles, which may not be compatible.
    - Mutual understanding will likely take time to develop.
  - Identify expertise and other local capacity gaps and whether there are capacities in other parts of the country that could be leveraged to address them;
  - Identify front-line practitioners, professionals and organisations which might be willing to participate in a multi-actor programme that handles VE cases. Some may be willing to be members of the team; others may prefer an ad hoc role; and
  - Determine whether they would be willing to participate on a pro bono basis or would require payment for this additional work.
-

## Activity 5: Training and Other Capacity-Building Needs

*(10 mins if online / 15 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 98 – 100 of the PowerPoint presentation**

This activity should allow participants to explore the specific types of training and other capacity-building support that multi-actor programmes may require in the P/CVE space as well as map those that most likely are going to be needed in their specific context.

The facilitator should highlight the different questions participants should consider when addressing this broad topic. These include:

- Whether training is required prior to launching the programme and/or on a continuing basis post-launch?
- Whether the training should focus on a single profession and/or emphasise multi-stakeholder collaboration?
- Whether the training should be introductory and/or more specialised in nature?
- Whether the training should include mentoring, train-the-trainer, and/or exchange of experience components?

The facilitator should stress how the training needs will likely vary depending on the particular set of stakeholders involved and should be in a position to share examples of what some of those needs have been in other contexts. This includes front line practitioners, such as social and mental health workers and other community members.

In addition to the above, specific training on multi-actor cooperation and collaboration, although not part of this curriculum, may be needed, including table-top and other role-playing exercises.

## Activity 6: Identifying Available and Required Capacities, Resources, Expertise, Training, etc.

*(15 mins if online / 30 mins if in-person)*

**Slide 101 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should break the participants into their preassigned groups and allow them to reflect on the relevant, existing material and other capacities and resources in their communities that could be leveraged for the purposes of developing a multi-action P/CVE intervention programme and identify what additional ones, as well as any training and other capacity-building support, would be required to develop and operationalise such a programme in the relevant local context. The participants' findings should then be discussed in plenary.

The facilitator needs to ensure that participants fully understand what is meant by "capacities" and "resources", especially with regards to P/CVE, as well as the consequences of an intervention programme not being adequately resourced.

## Activity 7: Debrief and Conclusions

*(8 mins if online / 10 mins if in-person)*

**Slide 102 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should reinforce the key messages and highlight some of the conclusions that emerged from the facilitated discussion.

---

## Resources

Center for the Prevention of Radicalization Leading to Violence (CPRLV). (n.d.). *Main page*. Available at: <https://info-radical.org/en/>.

European Commission. (n.d.). *Radicalisation Awareness Network*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network_en).

## Bibliographic Resources

- Center for the Prevention of Radicalization Leading to Violence (CPRLV). (2019). *Annual Report. Working Together for the Entire Community*. Available at: <https://indd.adobe.com/view/0f97d861-0ae6-410d-8118-85b14dbc2972>.
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Ex Post Paper - How to Get Sustainable Political Support for Your Local P/CVE Strategy*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran\\_local\\_how\\_get\\_sustainable\\_political\\_support\\_27\\_09\\_2018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran_local_how_get_sustainable_political_support_27_09_2018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Ex Post Paper - Tabletop exercises: Practicing multi-agency cooperation*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran\\_local\\_how\\_get\\_sustainable\\_political\\_support\\_27\\_09\\_2018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran_local_how_get_sustainable_political_support_27_09_2018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2017). *Ex Post Paper RAN Local - A step-by-step guide: The right training programme - preventing & countering radicalisation and violent extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran\\_local\\_right\\_training\\_programme\\_berlin\\_7-8\\_12\\_2017\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran_local_right_training_programme_berlin_7-8_12_2017_en.pdf).
  - European Commission. (2016). *Multi-agency approach*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/ran-creating\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/ran-creating_en).
  - European Commission. (2016). *Training for first line practitioners*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/ran-creating\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/ran-creating_en).
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
-

## Module 8: Developing a Case Intake and Management System

### Learning Objectives

- Identify and build upon participants' knowledge and understanding to be able to develop an effective shared case management system.
- Identify the appropriate referral mechanisms for the team.
- Understand how to work together to conduct a thorough initial multi-actor assessment.
- Develop a P/CVE case identification approach adequate for the local context.

### Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	5 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation and breakout exercise	Importance of team-oriented case management	25 mins	35 mins
3. Case studies		15 mins	20 mins
4. Presentation	Initial assessment	5 mins	10 mins
5. Breakout exercise	Case study feedback and discussion	25 mins	35 mins
6. Presentation	Case management/Disposal/Protocols	10 mins	10 mins
7. Debrief and conclusions		5 mins	5 mins
Total		90 mins	120 mins

### Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> <li>• Case study handouts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

## Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

This module is designed to help participants understand: a) why a case management system is important; b) what are the key elements of such a system; c) which are the different ways of satisfying the elements; and d) what approach makes most sense in the particular local context. The session should focus on the supportive nature of case management and its position within the non-criminal space. It should also stress the multi-agency nature of case management approaches and the importance of shared ownership and vision.

It begins by looking at different avenues for referring an individual to a programme and should allow participants to consider questions such as “whom to refer?”, “whom to refer to?”, “what to refer?”, “when a referral becomes a ‘case’?” and “when a ‘case’ is terminated?”.

The module provides an opportunity (if needed to support the discussions) to explore multi-stakeholder case management systems in Denmark, Germany and the UK, with the facilitator drawing attention to the similarities and differences between them, e.g., the legislated top-down context of the UK process vs. a more localised bottom-up approach in Germany. The session should also focus attention to the different roles that civil society organisations play in facilitating the referral of concerns from the community in different contexts, while underscoring the critical roles that these non-governmental actors play in P/CVE efforts in general and in multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes in particular.

To prepare for the session the facilitator should be familiar with the above-mentioned, and other relevant, multi-stakeholder case management systems and their strengths and weaknesses and the challenges in translating some of their features to less developed contexts. In addition, he or she should appreciate the advantages and disadvantages of various referral mechanisms (e.g., hotlines, emails, community organisation facilitation), as well as of police involvement at an early (or sometimes even any) stage.

The following are examples of hotlines/helplines:

- Denmark: includes them as part of the Info-Houses situated in each of the 12 police regions. Callers can receive counselling and relying on the network of Info-Houses. Cases can be referred to local intervention points, as necessary. Youth calling in can be matched with local mentors.
- United Kingdom: UK Home Office operates a national helpline called Act Early. It has developed guidelines for those operating the helpline and supports practitioners with clear checklists and advice on how to handle different types of calls. It is focussed on encouraging communities to refer concerns and gain support for family members who may be vulnerable.
- Some countries have established P/CVE-specific helplines (e.g., Germany and France) and others (e.g., Bulgaria and Malta), more general helplines that include radicalisation among the concerns they handle.

Finally, the facilitator should be familiar with the political debates around the P/CVE agenda particularly with regards to community impact and stigmatisation of minority or marginalised communities.

## Key Messages

- An effective case management system is a critical component of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme.
  - It can facilitate effective risk management and help to build trust among the relevant practitioners and professionals involved in the programme as well as between the programme and the community. It can help ensure programme resources are appropriately targeted.
-

- Key elements of such a system typically include multiple, ideally anonymous, avenues for case referrals, an intake process that allows for an initial assessment to help ensure the programme is only handling P/CVE cases (e.g., cases involving troubled youth should be referred to more generalised programmes and those involving individuals who may have crossed the criminal threshold or pose a risk of causing harm should be referred to the police).

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

*(5 mins)*

### **Slides 105 – 107 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should present the key objectives of the module from the slides and link back to the previous modules to bring the module into the context of the whole course – particularly to modules 5 and 6 in terms of multi-actor participation in P/CVE.

This module is operationally focussed and can, if appropriate, draw on case studies and operational practices in Denmark, Germany and the UK to inform the discussion. Depending on the local context/s of the participants, the facilitator may wish to include a case study from another country. The facilitator should underscore that while none of these three multi-stakeholder approaches are transferable in their entirety to other contexts, particularly less developed ones, discrete elements from each may be.

## Activity 2: Importance of Team-Oriented Case Management

*(25 mins if online / 35 mins if in-person)*

### **Slides 108 – 112 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should pose questions to the group without disclosing the content of the slides (e.g., “what is case management”, “why are we discussing case management?”, “why is case management important?”) and elicit the content of the slides through discussion. The facilitator should be aware where issues have not been identified and pose supplementary questions or use hooks to direct the discussion.

The aim of this section is for the groups to consider the various options for referrals and to identify the advantages and disadvantages of each. Participants should be split into their preassigned groups. Each group should consider one of the three questions posed on the slide and then outline their discussions in a plenary session, question by question. A series of case studies should follow to highlight the various discussion points. The facilitator should be familiar with the three examples to guide the discussions.

Key messages for this section are:

- Coordination and oversight through one trusted point of contact is important.
- The role of the police, if any, must be carefully considered at the outset to ensure trust in the process.
- The process is to refer behavioural concerns or seek advice about P/CVE cases and nothing else, e.g., criminal activity. Cases that are not considered to be P/CVE ones need to be referred elsewhere.

The facilitator should focus attention on where the referrals should come from, i.e., who should be making the referral? Key messages for this section are:

- Referrals often come from the police or other front-line professionals. Fewer typically come from concerned family or other community members.
  - To facilitate referrals from the community – including coaches, teachers and community leaders – consider offering multiple referral options that allow for anonymity.
-

- Consider leveraging existing hotlines, e.g., those for crime prevention or gender-based violence.
- Include an awareness-raising campaign focussed on relevant communities and key professionals, which includes an explanation of the programme's purpose and education on the observable, non-discriminatory, behavioural warning signs that an individual may be at risk of or on the path to violent extremism and thus appropriate for referral.

The facilitator should draw out discussion on how the referral should be made. Key messages for this section are:

- What works already or can fit the local context.
- Confidentiality/anonymity.
- Community accessibility.
- Age/gender considerations.
- No specific right/wrong answer.

The facilitator should draw out discussion on what should be referred. Key messages for this section are:

- P/CVE concerns or request for advice/support.
- How to avoid misinformed or misguided referrals.
- Not criminality.
- How the process that manages the referral will have a significant impact on perceptions surrounding and confidence in the programme.

The facilitator should encourage a discussion on who handles the initial referral. Key messages for this section are:

- Recognise that some community members might feel more comfortable contacting a government hotline and others might prefer an NGO/community-led one.
- To build community trust, the referral should not be handled by a police officer.
- The initial handler of the referral should be appropriately trained. Depending on the context, he or she could simply pass the case to the multi-actor team for assessment or could conduct an initial assessment based on the information shared over the phone and then pass the case to the team or another programme/service provider for follow-up.

### Activity 3: Case Studies

*(15 mins if online / 20 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 113 – 115 of the PowerPoint presentation**

**(Optional, depending on time and nature of discussions in the breakout sessions)**

This section should draw on the discussions that have taken place in the last activity and should require the facilitator to refer back to previous answers to highlight the practice demonstrated in the case studies.

The three case studies should demonstrate the range of multi-actor approaches in three European countries: Denmark, the UK and Germany. The facilitator should underscore that although these approaches are unlikely to be applicable or transferable in their entirety to non-Western contexts, some elements from them might be.

Key messages for this activity are:

- Each of the models allows for initial screening and information-sharing between professionals.
  - Whilst each model has a different access point, all referrals are directed to one point of contact in that locality for coordination purposes.
-

Points to note in each of the case studies:

- Denmark (Copenhagen): The Municipality of Copenhagen established a unit to receive referrals and provide advice through hotlines and email. The unit is an integral part of the response to any intervention and a key partner in the Danish system of Info Houses together with the police and municipal social service professionals. It follows a bottom-up approach, but as part of a national framework and with cooperation among police, schools, mental health workers and other relevant professionals.
- United Kingdom: Referrals are made through established but local statutory mechanisms to the police and local municipality. The law requires the police to be a key decision maker in the referral and assessment process. It is a top-down national approach with central government oversight.
- Germany: Violence Prevention Network is a government-funded NGO providing specialist professional advice and interventions to individuals referred to them. They refer to a single point of contact at the police only in the event that they identify a security issue. It follows a bottom-up approach, but as part of a national framework and funded by the federal government.

## Activity 4: Initial Assessment

*(5 mins if online / 10 mins if in-person)*

**Slide 116 of the PowerPoint presentation**

This activity sets out the initial considerations for a screening assessment in multi-actor P/CVE case management. The facilitator may wish to link back to the three case studies and look for commonality in that all three are focussed on P/CVE case work.

Key messages for this activity are:

- Does the person have a vulnerability and is there a link to violent extremism?
- Where non-violent extremism vulnerabilities and risks are present, the case could be referred to another more general, service provider or programme.
- Where an individual shows vulnerability to or risk of violent extremism upon initial intake, a more thorough assessment should follow.
- The process should manage P/CVE casework for the purposes of supporting an individual and nothing else. This will support the development of trust and confidence in the process in the community and between agencies/actors. Consideration may also need to be given to scenarios where P/CVE is layered into an existing programme that is designed to receive referrals on a broader set of issues than simply violent extremism.
- To assess and screen there needs to be exchange of information among members of the multi-actor team or others who hold information on the individual. This may necessitate further discussion among the team or in another wider group setting to determine whether the case is suitable.
- The assessment may require a meeting with the individual, if they consent.

## Activity 5: Case Study Feedback and Discussion

*(25 mins if online / 35 mins if in-person)*

**Slide 117 of the PowerPoint presentation**

This activity is aimed at allowing the group to make their own initial assessments and justify their decisions and what further information may be necessary to further inform that decision.

---



The facilitator should split participants into their preassigned groups and hand out all the case studies to each group. Cases are based on real examples and subsequent decisions, so they should need to be adapted to suit the local context, just like the proposed model answers.

Key messages for this activity are:

- Does the person have a potential vulnerability and does the person have a susceptibility to extremism/violent extremism?
- Is there agreement by the team on this? If not, where are the areas of divergence?
- If both conditions are present or believed to be present, consider this to be a P/CVE case.
- If not, then a decision needs to be made on whether the matter should be referred elsewhere for support.

A critical issue for a case management system is who is making the determination on the disposition of a referral. It can happen during the initial intake or in a multi-actor setting. The danger with the latter is that the team could end up spending time on a lot of non-P/CVE referrals, leaving less time for the violent extremism-connected ones, which could have been weeded out earlier.

## Activity 6: Case Management/Disposal/Protocols

*(10 mins)*

**Slides 118 – 120 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The aim of this presentation is to outline the broad principles that should underpin a case management system. These include:

- Determine whether the referred case is a P/CVE one? If not, then refer elsewhere.
- Rely on a multi-actor team to make this determination.
- Ensure that information is shared, as appropriate, among team members and privacy rights are protected.
- Appoint a case officer or responsible lead.
- Make defensible decisions and ensure they are recorded (following whatever practices exist in terms of documenting decision/actions in similar casework).
- Review decisions.
- Elaborate written protocols and ensure clear understanding among the relevant stakeholders in the multi-actor setting.

The facilitator should then show a broad level flowchart encompassing the previous discussion points. It is important to convey the message that this flowchart is just an example and that the stages (particularly the central row of boxes) can be interchanged to suit local capacities/needs. Key features of a case management system are:

- Initial screening process;
  - Information-sharing among partners; and
  - A mechanism for regular management and oversight.
-

## Activity 7: Debrief and Conclusions

(5 mins)

### Slide 121 of the PowerPoint presentation

Although no “one-size-fits-all”, a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme should typically feature a case management system that includes:

- An agreed and shared process with defined roles and responsibilities across a multi-actor team.
- Transparency and accountability to ensure community confidence.
- Clear and auditable decision-making by a multi-actor team.

## Appendices

Case studies for initial assessment.

## Resources

- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2020). *Conclusion Paper – Helplines and hotlines in preventing and countering violent extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_conclusion\\_paper\\_fcs\\_event\\_15-16092020\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_conclusion_paper_fcs_event_15-16092020_en.pdf).
- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *Ex Post Paper - Individual case management: When and how to intervene?* Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran\\_local\\_individual\\_case\\_management\\_milan\\_13-14\\_112019\\_en.pdf#:~:text=Individual%20case%20management%20Individual%20case%20management%20mostly%20takes,and%20is%20carried%20out%20in%20a%20multi-agency%20setting.](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran_local_individual_case_management_milan_13-14_112019_en.pdf#:~:text=Individual%20case%20management%20Individual%20case%20management%20mostly%20takes,and%20is%20carried%20out%20in%20a%20multi-agency%20setting.)
- Home Office. (2015). *Channel Duty Guidance. Protecting vulnerable people from being drawn into terrorism: Statutory guidance for Channel panel members and partners of local panels*. London, UK: HM Stationary Office. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/907614/Channel\\_Duty\\_Guidance\\_April\\_2015.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907614/Channel_Duty_Guidance_April_2015.pdf).
- Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
- VINK. (n.d.). *Bekymret for en du kender?* Available at: <https://vink.kk.dk/>.
- Violence Prevention Network. (n.d.). *Homepage*. Available at: <https://violence-prevention-network.de/>.

## Bibliographic Resources

- Hee, M. A. (2018). *Prevention of Extremism in Copenhagen* [PowerPoint slides]. Available at: <https://www.sirp.pt/assets/files/pdf/Muhammad%20Ali%20Hee.pdf>.
  - Hemmingsen, A-S. (2015). *An introduction to the Danish approach to countering and preventing extremism and radicalization* (DIIS Report, No. 2015:15). Copenhagen, DK: Danish Institute for International Studies. Available at: <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/144731/1/848331087.pdf>.
-

## Appendix: Case Studies for Initial Assessment: P/CVE Referrals?

- Call from an elementary school. A teacher reports that a 9-year-old boy is running around the playground pretending to shoot his classmates and that they feel his behaviour is excessive. They say he also has an unhealthy interest in war. They want to know whether this is a P/CVE referral.
- A manager from an organisation working with youth offenders in the community makes contact regarding a 15-year-old boy who has been arrested for painting a faith-hate slogan on the wall of a mosque. The manager knows that the boy has previous police warnings for assault on a Muslim boy outside a school and damage to a local shop owned by Muslims. The boy and his mother are known to local social work teams as he is regularly missing, and his mother has drug and alcohol dependencies.
- Call from a school regarding a student who has a history of mental health illness and has recently been placing notices around the school to other students which, whilst generally confused, mention the word “jihad”. Teachers are slightly concerned about his behaviour and want to refer him to a P/CVE programme.
- Police make a referral to the local government office following the arrest of a husband and wife at the conclusion of a counter-terrorism investigation. As a result of the ongoing investigation, they believe that this couple have been radicalising their two children (11 and 13 years old) using extremist videos over a period of 12 months. However, due to the ongoing investigation are unable to provide more detail.
- Contact from a further education college. A lecturer is concerned that one of their 20-year-old students has been asking numerous questions about the ideology of a terrorist organisation and been undertaking Google searches on this organisation on college computers. They believe this should be a P/CVE referral.
- Referrals come in from a local faith centre of two teenagers engaging in drinking, drug taking and other anti-social behaviour in the evenings on their premises. There are some concerns expressed by the community that the two youngsters are targeting the faith centre and may be extremists. They have contacted the P/CVE contact in their area for advice.

### Case studies considered P/CVE referrals

**Call from a school regarding a 15-year-old student who has recently not been attending school and has been falling behind in his studies.** *Teachers have spoken to his mother who said that he spends a lot of time alone on his computer and has been depressed after his brother was recently arrested with some other friends for being involved in a banned group. She does not know what he is looking at but is concerned that her son may be contemplating harming himself due to things he has recently said.*

**Call from a local woman who is concerned about her granddaughter who is living with her along with her great granddaughter.** *The woman has recently returned from travelling abroad in a conflict zone for over a year with her new husband, who has not returned with her. The granddaughter has adopted some very strict conservative views whilst away and has changed dramatically. She complains that religion is not practiced conservatively enough in her home country and has become quite isolated from the community. She seems to have undergone some significant mental trauma whilst in the conflict zone and is continually anxious and suspicious of others around her.*

## Module 9: Ensuring “Do No Harm” – Assessing Vulnerabilities, Needs and Strengths

### Learning Objectives

- Understand how to conduct a “Do No Harm” assessment for a multi-actor P/CVE intervention.
- Leverage capacities of each actor to integrate safeguards to mitigate possible harm during the assessment process.
- Understand the potential harm that could come from assessments and the need to adopt reduction/avoidance strategies.

### Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	5 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation	Assessment: What do we need to know? How to assess? Who should assess?	25 mins	30 mins
3. Breakout exercise	Case study: Identifying strengths/ needs and gathering information	25 mins	30 mins
4. Debrief and conclusions		5 mins	10 mins
Total		60 mins	75 mins

### Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> <li>• Case study handouts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

### Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator should review the case studies for this module and adapt them to the local context or, alternatively, provide new case examples.

---

## Key Messages

- Assessments are an important step in building trust with the intended programme beneficiaries. They should:
  - Cover needs and strengths, risks and barriers to engagement;
  - Draw information from a wide range of sources;
  - Span the social ecology, e.g., not just focussing on the individual;
  - Use a structured professional judgment approach; and
  - Be tailored to the particular age, gender and circumstances of the individual.

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

*(5 mins)*

**Slides 124 – 126 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should outline the goal, the learning objectives and the key elements of the module and should introduce the “whole of society approach” concept that should underpin assessments and interventions.

## Activity 2: Assessment – What Do We Need to Know? How to Assess? Who Should Assess?

*(25 mins if online / 30 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 127 – 147 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should deliver a presentation on conducting P/CVE assessments within a multi-actor team context. The presentation should draw attention to:

- An assessment framework that focuses on the strengths and needs of, risks presented by, and barriers to, engagement with the individual;
  - How to best assess an individual’s strengths and needs;
  - How “assessment” can mean different things depending on the type of professional involved (e.g., law enforcement vs. psychologist vs. social worker);
  - Different approaches to risk assessment, with a preference for “structured professional judgement”;
  - What sources of information to draw from;
  - Who should be involved in conducting the assessment; and
  - The key principles of assessment: a) take a strengths-based approach, b) use the assessment to build trust and relationship, c) learn what matters to the individual/family; and d) “do no harm”.
-

## Activity 3: Case Study – Identifying Strengths/Needs and Gathering Information

(25 mins if online / 30 mins if in-person)

### Slide 148 of the PowerPoint presentation

During the first 15-20 minutes of the activity, the facilitator should break participants into their preassigned groups, each of which should receive a case example. Groups should then be asked to read information from various sources and make notes in each column regarding: a) what areas of information are relevant to an assessment and where that information could be obtained from; and b) strengths that could be leveraged and needs that could be addressed. Groups should also be asked to put a star next to the case if they think of it as highest priority and to brainstorm possible ways of gathering information/people to interview as part of the process. Finally, participants should note any particular considerations related to gender or age that should be incorporated into the assessment. During the final 10 minutes of the session, groups should compare their results and discuss the differences, if any.

## Appendices

Case studies for initial assessment.

## Resources

- **Child trauma screening and assessment:** The National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (n.d.). *Screening and Assessment*. Available at: <https://www.nctsn.org/treatments-and-practices/screening-and-assessment>.
  - **Trauma informed care and evidence-based practices:**
    - **For children:**
      - The National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (n.d.). *Main page*. Available at: <https://www.nctsn.org/>.
      - Boston Children's Hospital. (n.d.). *Trauma and Community Resilience Center: Prevention & Intervention Models*. Available at: [https://www.childrenshospital.org/centers-and-services/programs/o\\_-z/refugee-trauma-and-resilience-center-program/prevention-and-intervention](https://www.childrenshospital.org/centers-and-services/programs/o_-z/refugee-trauma-and-resilience-center-program/prevention-and-intervention).
    - **For adults:**
      - The National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (n.d.). *Main page*. Available at: <https://www.nctsn.org/>.
      - American Psychological Association. (2017). *Clinical Practice Guideline for the Treatment of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in Adults*. Available at: <https://www.apa.org/ptsd-guideline/ptsd.pdf>.
  - **Adult trauma screening and assessment:** United States Department of Veteran Affairs. (n.d.). *PTSD: National Center for PTSD – Trauma Exposure Measures*. Available at: <https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/te-measures/index.asp>.
  - **Web-based toolkit supporting psychosocial assessment of child immigrants and refugees:** Boston Children's Hospital. (n.d.). *Refugee and Immigrant Core Stressors Toolkit*. Available at : [https://redcap.tch.harvard.edu/redcap\\_edc/surveys/?s=HRPDCPPA3H](https://redcap.tch.harvard.edu/redcap_edc/surveys/?s=HRPDCPPA3H).
-

## Bibliographic Resources

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Available at: [https://khoerulanwarbk.files.wordpress.com/2015/08/urie-bronfenbrenner\\_the\\_ecology\\_of\\_human\\_developbokos-z1.pdf](https://khoerulanwarbk.files.wordpress.com/2015/08/urie-bronfenbrenner_the_ecology_of_human_developbokos-z1.pdf).
  - Chowdhury Fink N., Zeiger S., and Bulai R. (2016). *A Man's World: Exploring the Roles of Women in Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism*. Washington, DC: Hedayah and The Global Center on Cooperative Security. Available at: [https://wiisglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/AMansWorld\\_FULLL.pdf](https://wiisglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/AMansWorld_FULLL.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Collection of Approaches and Practices - Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism: Approaches and Practices*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran\\_collection-approaches\\_and\\_practices\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran_collection-approaches_and_practices_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Protective and promotive factors building resilience against violent radicalisation*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_paper\\_protective\\_factors\\_042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_paper_protective_factors_042018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2017). *RAN ExPost Paper - Working with families and safeguarding children from radicalisation: Step-by-step guidance paper for practitioners and policy-makers*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran\\_yf-c\\_h-sc\\_working\\_with\\_families\\_safeguarding\\_children\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran_yf-c_h-sc_working_with_families_safeguarding_children_en.pdf).
  - Hart, S. D., Douglas, K. S., and Guy, L. S. (2017). The structured professional judgement approach to violence risk assessment: Origins, nature and advances. In D. P. Boer, A. R. Beech, T. Ward, L. A. Craig, M. Rettenberger, L. E. Marshall, and W. L. Marshall (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook on the theories, assessment, and treatment of sexual offending* (pp. 643-666). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.
  - Koehler, D. (2016). *Using Family Counseling to Prevent and Intervene Against Foreign Fighters: Operational Perspectives, Methodology and Best Practices for Implementing Codes of Conduct*. Washington, DC: Middle East Institute. Available at: <https://www.mei.edu/sites/default/files/Koehler.pdf>.
  - Lloyd, M. (2019). *Extremism Risk Assessment: A Directory*. Lancaster, UK: Centre for Research and Evidence on Security Threats (CREST). Available at: <https://crestresearch.ac.uk/resources/extremism-risk-assessment-directory/>.
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
  - Rousseau, C. et al. (2021). *Clinical Intervention to Address Violent Radicalization: the Quebec Model*. In K. Bhui and D. Bhugra (Eds.), *Terrorism, Violent Radicalization and Mental Health*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
  - RTI International. (2018). *Countering Violent Extremism: The Application of Risk Assessment Tools in the Criminal Justice and Rehabilitation Process - Literature Review*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International. Available at: [https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OPSR\\_TP\\_CVE-Application-Risk-Assessment-Tools-Criminal-Rehab-Process\\_2018Feb-508.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OPSR_TP_CVE-Application-Risk-Assessment-Tools-Criminal-Rehab-Process_2018Feb-508.pdf).
-

## Appendix: Case Studies for Initial Assessment

- A 15-year-old boy was referred to the team shortly after his older brother and two of his brother's friends were arrested for involvement in a local extremist group. The boy was very close with his brother and his brother's friends, and although there is no clear evidence of him being directly involved in extremist behaviour, he spends a good deal of time on extremist websites and posting images and slogans on his Facebook page that indicate a high level of interest and support. He has also made some angry posts saying that he would find a way to 'get back' at authorities for arresting his brother. The boy lives with his mother and younger sister. He is registered as a student at the local high school. In recent weeks, he has made off-hand statements conveying hopelessness, e.g., "I'm worth more dead than alive".
  - A 23-year-old woman has recently returned to her home country from Syria, where she is believed to have been married to a man who was involved with Da'esh. She has a three-year-old son and is pregnant. She is currently living with her grandmother. The woman continues to dress very conservatively and complains that the kind of Islam practiced locally is not pure. She is referred to the programme as part of an ongoing effort to support families returning from Syria and Iraq but has told the intake manager that she does not need any help from strangers.
-



# Module 10: Ensuring “Do No Harm” – Developing and Implementing Tailor-Made Individual Support Plans

## Learning Objectives

- Identify the key domains and potential tools/approaches for intervention under a multi-actor approach.
- Understand that available interventions must align with vulnerabilities and strengthen the protective factors identified during assessment.
- Describe special considerations by age and gender.
- Understand the potential harm that could come from interventions and the need to adopt reduction/avoidance strategies.

## Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	5 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation	Intervention: Addressing strengths, needs and risks – what interventions and who intervenes?	20 mins	25 mins
3. Facilitated discussion	Gender/Age considerations and “Do No Harm”	5 mins	10 mins
4. Breakout exercise	Case study (continuation): Focussing on addressing strengths, needs and risks	25 mins	30 mins
5. Debrief and conclusions		5 mins	5 mins
Total		60 mins	75 mins

## Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> <li>• Case study handouts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

## Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator should review the case studies for this module and adapt them to the local context or, alternatively, provide other case examples that might be more suitable to the local context of the participants.

## Key Messages

Interventions should be:

- Tailored to the individual's needs and strengths;
- Mindful of the "Do No Harm" principle;
- Built on trusting relationships and respect for the individual;
- The result of a collaborative, multidisciplinary effort; and
- Be tailored to the particular age, gender, and circumstances of the individual.

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

*(5 mins)*

**Slides 151 – 153 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should outline the goal, the learning objectives and the key elements of the module.

## Activity 2: Addressing Strengths, Needs and Risks – What Interventions and Who Intervenes?

*(20 mins if online / 25 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 154 – 166 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should deliver a presentation on addressing the strengths and needs and mitigating the risks identified through the assessment. The presentation should draw attention to:

- The social, cultural, relational, psychological and practical needs that will need to be addressed;
  - The different ways in which these diverse needs can be addressed;
  - How to integrate the different aspects of the intervention and the benefits of an integrated approach;
  - The importance of having interventions be supportive, facilitate dignity, avoid stigma and be mindful of unintended consequences; and
  - Which professionals/practitioners and/or community members are best placed to intervene.
-

## Activity 3: Gender/Age Considerations and “Do No Harm”

*(5 mins if online / 10 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 167 – 171 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should lead a discussion about the importance of ensuring assessments/interventions are age- and gender-sensitive and seek to “do no harm”. Key themes to highlight include:

- Ensuring assessments/interventions are appropriate to developmental levels and address age-specific areas.
- Recognising the gendered nature of violent extremism, with men and women and boys and girls often experiencing it differently. For example, men and women can be attracted to it for different underlying reasons and can perform different roles within terrorist organisations. Tactics to recruit women and men can differ as well.
- Understanding the impact that gender and identity-related issues can have on trajectories of radicalisation to violence.
- P/CVE assessments/interventions should integrate a gender perspective and there are practical ways to integrate such a perspective.
- Recognising the typically unintended harm that P/CVE assessments and interventions might cause (e.g., linked to over-intervention, community resentment and securitisation of psychosocial support) and how to avoid them.

## Activity 4: Case Study (Continuation) – Focussing on Addressing Strengths, Needs and Risks

*(25 mins if online / 30 mins if in-person)*

**Slide 172 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should put up Slide 172 and ask participants to return to their preassigned groups. Using the same case examples analysed in Activity 3 of Module 9, he or she should ask them to discuss the following:

- What type of interventions would you recommend?
- Who might provide these interventions?
- What strategies could you use to engage the individual?
- What are some strengths, either of the individual or in his/her social ecology, which could be emphasised to help with the treatment?
- Are there any specific gender, age or other individual context factors that need to be taken into consideration as the intervention plan is built?

After 15-20 minutes of discussion, the facilitator should ask each group to share back the highlights of their discussion.

## Appendices

Case studies for intervention.

---

## Resources

- **Child trauma screening and assessment:** The National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (n.d.). *Screening and Assessment*. Available at: <https://www.nctsn.org/treatments-and-practices/screening-and-assessment>.
- **Trauma informed care and evidence-based practices:**
  - **For children:**
    - The National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (n.d.). *Main page*. Available at: <https://www.nctsn.org/>.
    - Boston Children's Hospital. (n.d.). *Trauma and Community Resilience Center: Prevention & Intervention Models*. Available at: [https://www.childrenshospital.org/centers-and-services/programs/o\\_-\\_z/refugee-trauma-and-resilience-center-program/prevention-and-intervention](https://www.childrenshospital.org/centers-and-services/programs/o_-_z/refugee-trauma-and-resilience-center-program/prevention-and-intervention).
  - **For adults:**
    - The National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (n.d.). *Main page*. Available at: <https://www.nctsn.org/>.
    - American Psychological Association. (2017). *Clinical Practice Guideline for the Treatment of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in Adults*. Available at: <https://www.apa.org/ptsd-guideline/ptsd.pdf>.
- **Adult trauma screening and assessment:** United States Department of Veteran Affairs. (n.d.). *PTSD: National Center for PTSD – Trauma Exposure Measures*. Available at: <https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/te-measures/index.asp>.
- **Web-based toolkit supporting psychosocial assessment of child immigrants and refugees:** Boston Children's Hospital. (n.d.). *Refugee and Immigrant Core Stressors Toolkit*. Available at: [https://redcap.tch.harvard.edu/redcap\\_edc/surveys/?s=HRPDCPPA3H](https://redcap.tch.harvard.edu/redcap_edc/surveys/?s=HRPDCPPA3H).

## Bibliographic Resources

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Available at: [https://khoerulanwarbk.files.wordpress.com/2015/08/urie\\_bronfenbrenner\\_the\\_ecology\\_of\\_human\\_developbokos-z1.pdf](https://khoerulanwarbk.files.wordpress.com/2015/08/urie_bronfenbrenner_the_ecology_of_human_developbokos-z1.pdf).
  - Chowdhury Fink N., Zeiger S., and Bulai R. (2016). *A Man's World: Exploring the Roles of Women in Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism*. Washington, DC: Hedayah and The Global Center on Cooperative Security. Available at: [https://wiisglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/AMansWorld\\_FULLL.pdf](https://wiisglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/AMansWorld_FULLL.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Collection of Approaches and Practices - Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism: Approaches and Practices*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran\\_collection-approaches\\_and\\_practices\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran_collection-approaches_and_practices_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Protective and promotive factors building resilience against violent radicalisation*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_paper\\_protective\\_factors\\_042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_paper_protective_factors_042018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2017). *RAN ExPost Paper - Working with families and safeguarding children from radicalisation: Step-by-step guidance paper for practitioners and policy-makers*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran\\_yf-c\\_h-sc\\_working\\_with\\_families\\_safeguarding\\_children\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran_yf-c_h-sc_working_with_families_safeguarding_children_en.pdf).
  - Hart, S. D., Douglas, K. S., and Guy, L. S. (2017). The structured professional judgement approach to violence risk assessment: Origins, nature and advances. In D. P. Boer, A. R. Beech, T. Ward, L. A. Craig, M. Rettenberger, L. E. Marshall, and W. L. Marshall (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook on the theories, assessment, and treatment of sexual offending* (pp. 643-666). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.
-

- Koehler, D. (2016). Using Family Counseling to Prevent and Intervene Against Foreign Fighters: Operational Perspectives, Methodology and Best Practices for Implementing Codes of Conduct. Washington, DC: Middle East Institute. Available at: <https://www.mei.edu/sites/default/files/Koehler.pdf>.
- Lloyd, M. (2019). *Extremism Risk Assessment: A Directory*. Lancaster, UK: Centre for Research and Evidence on Security Threats (CREST). Available at: <https://crestresearch.ac.uk/resources/extremism-risk-assessment-directory/>.
- Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
- Rousseau, C. et al. (2021). Clinical Intervention to Address Violent Radicalization: the Quebec Model. In K. Bhui and D. Bhugra (Eds.), *Terrorism, Violent Radicalization and Mental Health*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- RTI International. (2018). *Countering Violent Extremism: The Application of Risk Assessment Tools in the Criminal Justice and Rehabilitation Process - Literature Review*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International. Available at: [https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OPSR\\_TP\\_CVE-Application-Risk-Assessment-Tools-Criminal-Rehab-Process\\_2018Feb-508.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OPSR_TP_CVE-Application-Risk-Assessment-Tools-Criminal-Rehab-Process_2018Feb-508.pdf).

## Appendix: Case Studies for Intervention

After conducting a thorough assessment of the 15-year-old boy, you learn some additional information. He lost his father to a medical illness a few years before, a loss that also impacted the family financially. His mother appears very depressed and has difficulty managing the tasks of the household and parenting as a result. It appears that the financial strain and loss of the father contributes to her depression. After reaching out to the school (with the mother's consent), you learn that over the past year the boy has been attending school only sporadically, a change from his previous attendance record. As a result of his poor attendance and failing grades, the school told him he was no longer able to play in the soccer team. This hobby had been a major pastime for him and he was a quite skilled player. When you ask the mother about this, she says that since he stopped being able to play on the team, he has spent much of his time either with his brother (prior to his arrest) or alone in his room/on his computer. In recent weeks, he has made off-hand statements conveying hopelessness, e.g., "I'm worth more dead than alive". When you ask him what he was thinking about when he said this, the boy tells you that he feels worthless because he is not good at anything and cannot even help his mother earn money.

Although the woman who returned from Syria refuses to speak with an evaluator, the grandmother with whom she lives is able to provide additional information. The grandmother has welcomed her granddaughter despite the grandmother being ill and frail. Although she has parents in the area, she is estranged from them. According to the grandmother, there are family rumours that she (the 23-year-old) was sexually abused by her father as a child. She does not have a job, dropped out of college when she left for Syria and spends most of the day at home caring for her daughter. Her grandmother worries that, when the new baby comes, there will be too many people living in her apartment, but she does not know where her granddaughter can go. She says that her granddaughter had been an excellent student at college and that she had hoped she would go on to be an accountant. However, those hopes were dashed when she dropped out of school. She reports that her granddaughter rarely leaves the home, has frequent nightmares and seems chronically 'on edge'. The grandmother further reports that her granddaughter is devoted to her 3-year-old child, but the child is non-verbal and does not seem to play and smile like other children.

# Module 11: Monitoring and Evaluating (M&E) a Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programme

## Learning Objectives

- Understand monitoring and evaluation (M&E) as a tool for learning how to strengthen a team and its impact.
- Identify indicators and plan M&E for the team's intervention.
- Leverage data for adaptation, efficiency and resource mobilisation.

## Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	5 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation/facilitated discussion	How to define M&E and M&E purposes	15 mins	15 mins
3. Facilitated discussion	Process monitoring	15 mins	25 mins
4. Breakout exercise	Monitoring and evaluating programme impact	15 mins	25 mins
5. Breakout exercise	M&E planning simulation exercise	30 mins	40 mins
6. Debrief and conclusions		10 mins	10 mins
Total		90 mins	120 mins

## Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> <li>• Breakout rooms</li> </ul>

## Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator should review international good practices on M&E, both in terms of the functioning of a multi-actor P/CVE team and the individual interventions. In addition, he or she should gain familiarity with existing M&E tool kits (e.g., UNDP/International Alert and Hedayah/RUSI) and P/CVE M&E approaches in the specific local context and any challenges that may have arisen.

---

## Key Messages

- M&E is key to programme efficiency and credibility.
- It is important to measure both the multi-actor collaborative process and the interventions themselves.
- It is essential to think about what the programme is trying to achieve and then figure out how to measure that both in terms of outcomes and outputs.
- Combining various evaluation tools will help solidify findings.
- Both qualitative and quantitative data should be included, which should go hand in hand with a reflection on who the data is for and what decision-makers' requirements and priorities are.

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

*(5 mins)*

**Slides 176 – 178 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The purpose of this activity is to provide an introduction on M&E in the context of P/CVE programmes and interventions. The facilitator should highlight the importance of ensuring there is a comprehensive plan to monitor and evaluate the impact of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme. He or she should explain how such a plan is critical to ensuring the programme's sustained financial, political and community-based support.

He or she should also highlight the challenges involved in developing such a plan. These apply to the P/CVE field more broadly, given the inherent difficulties of proving that someone decided not to commit an act of violence because of an intervention that resulted from the programme.

## Activity 2: How to Define M&E and M&E Purposes

*(15 mins)*

**Slides 179 – 181 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The objective of this activity is to present and contextualise definitions. Regarding monitoring, the facilitator should divide participants in their preassigned groups and ask them to provide concrete examples of how data can be captured in a multi-actor P/CVE programme. The facilitator should provide additional examples, emphasising how monitoring ultimately contributes to the evidence-base for evaluating various programme components.

The facilitator should also touch upon the various types of evaluations that can be carried out and explain the module's focus on process and impact M&E and how this relates in particular to evaluating a multi-actor approach.

---

## Activity 3: Process Monitoring

(15 mins if online / 25 mins if in-person)

**Slides 182 – 184 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should introduce key questions that structure process monitoring and evaluation and provide concrete examples of how these questions can be answered. These key questions are:

- What is process monitoring and evaluation?
- What happened and why?
- Have performance standards been achieved?
- Has the envisaged collaboration materialised?
- Has the intervention/programme been implemented as planned?

Other questions that the facilitator could ask participants include:

- In a multi-actor framework, what process/es should be monitored and evaluated?
- What criteria should be used to measure performance?
- How to collect the data?

## Activity 4: Monitoring and Evaluating Programme Impact

(15 mins if online / 25 mins if in-person)

**Slides 185 – 187 of the PowerPoint presentation**

Monitoring and evaluating impact is critical to demonstrate the effectiveness of a particular programme, as well to ensure it does not have harmful, unintended consequences in the community.

The facilitator should introduce the activity by defining impact monitoring. He or she should then outline its foundational elements (programme objectives and the theory of change) and explain how to derive from them impact indicators that are specific, *measurable*, *assignable*, *realistic*, and *time-bound* (S.M.A.R.T). He or she should also clarify the difference between quantitative and qualitative measurements.

The facilitator should split participants in their preassigned groups and ask them to provide examples of programme impact/effects that should be monitored and evaluated. When undertaking this exercise, he or she should advise participants to consider the various levels at which a programme intends to have impact: the micro/individual level, the meso/community level, as well as the macro/regional or national level.

## Activity 5: M&E Planning Simulation Exercise

(30 mins if online / 40 mins if in-person)

**Slides 188 – 192 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should start the activity by presenting key questions for defining M&E objectives and selecting indicators:

- What is the programme trying to achieve?
    - Change in attitude or behaviour?
    - Increase or reduction in a particular activity?
-



- How to select indicators?
  - Indicators are measurable variables.
  - Main categories of indicators (structural, process, performance)
  - S.M.A.R.T. approach to indicator formulation.

The facilitator should then introduce the simulation exercise by presenting the “Together” programme, a fictitious multi-actor P/CVE programme and its objectives (listed in Slide 190). Once again, participants should be split into their preassigned groups, each of which should be assigned one of these objectives and asked to consider how it can be monitored in terms of process and impact, including by drafting a list of process and impact indicators that are S.M.A.R.T. Participants should be reminded to consider carefully how the objective is described and to “unpack” it in a more specific and measurable way. This group exercise should be followed by a plenary discussion to talk about each group’s findings. As the discussion progresses, the facilitator should make sure to flag on the key “dos” and “don’ts” that have been identified.

The facilitator should conclude the activity by outlining the main uses of M&E data, in particular how it can be used during the programme cycle to correct course, improve the efficiency of key processes, as well as demonstrate the cost-effectiveness that a P/CVE approach provides.

The facilitator should then outline key principles of good M&E planning and dissemination, emphasising the need to think ahead about whom the data is intended for and to research carefully funders’ interests, priorities and requirements so that M&E data is made as relevant as possible to potential funders.

## Activity 6: Debrief and Conclusions

*(10 mins)*

### Slides 193 – 194 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should summarise the key questions that practitioners should have in mind when considering how to design an M&E system. These include:

- What actually takes place in the programme (process outputs)?
- How well is it done (process effectiveness and efficiency)?
- What is the impact (effects and outcomes)?

The facilitator should then recap the key methodological steps in designing an M&E system for a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme. These include:

- Know what you want to monitor and evaluate.
  - Consider both process (output) and impact (outcomes).
  - Use programme goals/theory of change to define M&E objectives.
  - Formulate accurate research questions.
  - Select indicators using the S.M.A.R.T. approach.
  - Decide how to collect data in an ethical way.
  - Use recognised qualitative and quantitative methods to analyse data.
  - Think ahead about funders’ priorities and requirements.
  - Leverage data for adaptation, improvement and securing funding.
-

## Resources

- Hedayah. (n.d.). *MASAR*. Available at: [https://www.hedayahcenter.org/resources/interactive\\_cve\\_apps/masar/](https://www.hedayahcenter.org/resources/interactive_cve_apps/masar/).
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and International Alert. (2018). *Improving the impact of preventing violent extremism programming. A toolkit for design, monitoring and evaluation*. Oslo, NO: Oslo Governance Centre, UNDP. Available at: [https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Global%20Policy%20Centres/OGC/PVE\\_ImprovingImpactProgrammingToolkit\\_2018.pdf](https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Global%20Policy%20Centres/OGC/PVE_ImprovingImpactProgrammingToolkit_2018.pdf).

## Bibliographic Resources

- Counter-Terrorism Monitoring, Reporting and Support Mechanism (CT MORSE). (n.d.). *CVE Sector Indicator Guidance*. Available at: <https://ct-morse.eu/cve-sector-indicator-guidance/>.
  - Dawson, L., Edwards, C., and Jeffray, C. (2014). *Learning and Adapting - The Use of Monitoring and Evaluation in Countering Violent Extremism: a Handbook for Practitioners*. London, UK: Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). Available at: <https://rusi.org/publication/rusi-books/learning-and-adapting-use-monitoring-and-evaluation-countering-violent>.
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Ex Post Paper: Guideline Evaluation of PCVE Programmes and Interventions*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ms\\_workshops\\_guidelines\\_evaluation\\_of\\_pcve\\_programmes\\_and\\_interventions\\_july\\_2018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ms_workshops_guidelines_evaluation_of_pcve_programmes_and_interventions_july_2018_en.pdf).
  - Hofman, J. and Sutherland, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Evaluating interventions that prevent or counter violent extremism: A practical guide*. Santa Monica, CA, and Cambridge, UK: RAND Corporation. Available at: [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR2094.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2094.html).
  - Holmer, G., Bauman, P. and Aryaeinejad, K. (2018). *Measuring Up: Monitoring and Evaluating P/CVE Programs*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace. Available at: <https://www.usip.org/publications/2018/09/taking-stock-analytic-tools-understanding-and-designing-pcve-programs>.
-

# Module 12: Navigating Stigma

## Learning Objectives

- Understand the impact of stigma e.g., on the community/targets of the programmes and/or on the professionals involved in it) on the team’s ability to develop/operationalise multi-actor P/CVE interventions.
- Identify opportunities for mitigating stigma within the team to increase community willingness to engage with and support intervention activities.

## Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	5 mins	5 mins
2. Facilitated discussion	Challenges: stigma	20 mins	30 mins
3. Facilitated discussions	Overcoming challenges: opportunities for mitigating stigma	20 mins	30 mins
4. Debrief and conclusions		5 mins	5 mins
Total		50 mins	70 mins

## Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projector/screen</li> </ul>

## Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator should familiarise themselves thoroughly with the PowerPoint presentation and with the resources used to design this session. In addition, he or she should have some basic understanding of the stigmas associated with violent extremism and P/CVE in the local context and how they can be mitigated.

## Key Messages

- Key barriers to building and sustaining multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes in any context often relate to stigma.
- Stigma can affect the different stakeholders involved in the development/implementation of the programme in different ways, creating barriers to their engagement in/support for the programme.

- Efforts to mitigate stigma should focus on: a) the terminology used in and to describe the programme; b) the programme's scope; c) risk/needs assessments tool/s and interventions; d) targeted individuals/communities; e) training; and f) cultural sensitivities surrounding mental health support.

## **Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives**

*(5 mins)*

**Slides 197 – 199 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The previous sessions have focussed on the various components of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme and highlighted some of the challenges that will inevitably be faced when designing and seeking to implement such programmes: these include trust and capacity/resource-related challenges.

This session focuses on perhaps the often most significant challenge, which has yet to receive dedicated attention in the course: the stigma often associated with involvement in these programmes. The goals for this activity are for participants to identify: 1) the ways in which they can stigmatise certain individuals and communities, and 2) possible ways to mitigate the stigma.

## **Activity 2: Challenges – Stigma**

*(20 mins if online / 30 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 200 – 201 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should briefly outline how stigma surrounding the concept of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme can complicate efforts to develop let alone operationalise it.

Stigma can manifest itself in a number of ways, e.g., a) the scope and branding of and the terminology used to describe the programme is not sensitive to the concerns and priorities of the communities it is meant to support; b) a lack of awareness and transparency concerning the programme and its purpose in the target communities; c) the reliance on a checklist approach to conducting assessments that risks wrongfully targeting individuals; d) focussing on legally-protected ideas and beliefs rather than the behaviours of individuals; e) having assessments conducted by individuals who have not received the necessary training; or f) focussing the programme on a specific ethnic or religious group. In addition, practitioners involved in the programme can feel stigmatised or pressured from their peers or members of the community because they are working with individuals that have been identified as being “at risk” of becoming violent extremists.

Participants should be asked to identify the stigmas that will likely need to be navigated in their particular local context.

## **Activity 3: Overcoming Challenges – Opportunities for Mitigating Stigma**

*(20 mins if online / 30 mins if in-person)*

**Slides 202 – 205 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should recap some of the stigmas identified in the prior activity before asking the participants to share their ideas of steps to take to mitigate them. Some possible ones are listed below, and the facilitator should highlight those they believe might be most salient in this context.

---

- Expand the focus of the programme so that it addresses all forms of violent extremism or even a wider set of violence-related and/or safeguarding issues of concern to the relevant community.
- Effectively communicate the goals/benefits of the programme to the targeted communities, which may see them as potentially stigmatising.
- Ensure that the programme is focussed on addressing the vulnerabilities in individuals demonstrating behaviours and manifestations that can lead to violent extremism and not on individuals who are simply expressing ideological, political or religious beliefs that are protected by human rights law.
- Develop new (or rely on existing) tools or criteria to assess the risks posed by and the needs of the individuals who have been referred to the mechanism, using a set of observable risk and protective factors.
- Ensure that these are designed and implemented by trained professionals without resorting to profiling based on any discriminatory grounds prohibited by international law.
- Ensure that professionals involved in assessing risk and needs receive the necessary training and have the relevant expertise to use the tool correctly, avoiding a “checklist” approach to assessment.
- Ensure that people considered “at risk” are not treated as potential terrorists or suspects.
- Ensure that the support provided through the programme is proportionate to the needs and vulnerabilities of the individual. “Over-intervention” should be avoided as it can stigmatise the individual.
- Provide training for teachers, social workers and other professionals whose involvement in the programme will be critical to its effectiveness. Training could focus, for instance, on how to detect behavioural signs of violent extremism, how to respond to them, who to turn for help and with whom to build coalitions.

## Activity 4: Debrief and Conclusions

(5 mins)

**Slides 206 – 207 of the PowerPoint presentation**

The facilitator should conclude by highlighting what participants have shared as the most likely ways stigma will manifest itself in the local context and how to mitigate it, while reinforcing the key messages (see above) of the module.

## Resources

- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Collection of Approaches and Practices - Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism: Approaches and Practices*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran\\_collection-approaches\\_and\\_practices\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/ran_collection-approaches_and_practices_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Ex Post Paper - Common P/CVE challenges in the Western Balkans and European Union*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_policy\\_practice\\_common\\_pcve\\_challenges\\_sofia\\_04042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_policy_practice_common_pcve_challenges_sofia_04042018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Multi-agency working and preventing violent extremism I*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018_en.pdf).
-

- Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF). (2020). *Memorandum on Good Practices on Strengthening National-Local Cooperation in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism Conducive to Terrorism*. The Hague, NL: GCTF. Available at: <https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Framework%20Documents/2020/GCTF%20Memorandum%20on%20Good%20Practices%20on%20Strengthening%20NLC%20in%20PCVE.pdf?ver=2020-09-29-100315-357>.
- Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.

## Bibliographic Resources

- Bilazarian, T. (2016). *Countering Violent Extremism: Lessons on Early Intervention from the United Kingdom's Channel Program*. Washington, DC: George Washington University. Available at: <https://extremism.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs2191/f/downloads/Channel%20CVE%20UK.pdf>.
  - Hemmingsen, A-S. (2015). *An introduction to the Danish approach to countering and preventing extremism and radicalization* (DIIS Report, No. 2015:15). Copenhagen, DK: Danish Institute for International Studies. Available at: <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/144731/1/848331087.pdf>.
  - Sivenbring, J., and Andersson Malmros, R. (2019). *Mixing logics: Multiagency approaches for countering violent extremism*. Göteborg: Segerstedtsinstitutet, Göteborgs Universitet.
-

# Module 13: Review of Key Principles and Lessons Learned from Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programmes

## Learning Objective

- Identify key elements of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme for the local context.

## Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Presentation	Introduction, overview and objectives	5 mins	5 mins
2. Presentation/Facilitated discussion	Review and discussion of key principles and lessons learned	25 mins	25 mins
Total		30 mins	30 mins

## Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
PowerPoint presentation	Projector/screen

## Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator should familiarise themselves thoroughly with the PowerPoint presentation and with the resources used to design this session.

## Key Messages

- Ensure that the multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme is part of a comprehensive, “whole of society”, rule of law-based approach to violent extremism that is enshrined in a national P/CVE strategy or other relevant national framework.
  - Avoid a “top-down” approach and follow an inclusive and collaborative process.
  - Address all forms of violent extremism and, where possible, as part of a wider set of violence-related and/or safeguarding issues of concern to the relevant communities.
  - Leverage existing resources and capacities.
  - Sustain support from communities and key professionals – scope, terminology and branding matter.
-

- Avoid creating parallel structures – leverage or integrate into existing programmes/platforms where possible.
- Include transparent protocols/frameworks.
- Follow a non-discriminatory, human rights-based approach.
- Follow a deliberative process, bearing in mind there are no “quick fixes”.
- Include joint messaging/communications strategy.
- Include monitoring/evaluation framework – process and interventions.

## Activity 1: Introduction, Overview and Objectives

(5 mins)

### Slides 210 – 211 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should introduce the session, goals and learning objectives and provide justification for the messages and their relevance to applying the key principles that should underpin the design and implementation of multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes, as well as the lessons learned from existing programmes.

## Activity 2: Review and Discussion of Key Principles and Lessons Learned

(25 mins)

### Slides 212 – 217 of the PowerPoint presentation

Multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes contribute to operationalising a comprehensive, whole-of-society approach to P/CVE. The training course has been informed by experts and programmes from different regions. It was designed to highlight not only the benefits of these programmes but also the different approaches to and challenges in designing them.

Although there is no “one size fits all” approach, there are principles that should underpin any such programmes and those involved in developing them should be mindful of the lessons learned from existing ones.

During the first 10 minutes of this activity, the facilitator should present these principles and lessons learned, pointing to examples of specific programmes where possible. During the last 15 minutes, the facilitator should ask participants which of the principles/lessons learned can be transferred to their local context and which might not be able to be.

## Resources

- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). Multi-Agency Approach. In EU RAN, *Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating\\_counter\\_violent\\_extremism\\_infrastructures\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating_counter_violent_extremism_infrastructures_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). Training for first line practitioners. In EU RAN, *Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating\\_counter\\_violent\\_extremism\\_infrastructures\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating_counter_violent_extremism_infrastructures_en.pdf).
-



- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Ex Post Paper - Strasbourg's P/CVE approach and its multi-agency partners*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_study\\_visit\\_strasbourg\\_21-22052019\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_study_visit_strasbourg_21-22052019_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Multi-Agency Working and preventing violent extremism: Paper 2*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran\\_hsc\\_policy\\_mawr\\_report\\_sarma\\_26032019\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran_hsc_policy_mawr_report_sarma_26032019_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Multi-agency working and preventing violent extremism I*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2016). *Ex Post Paper - Handbook on how to set up a multi-agency structure that includes the health and social care sectors?* Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk_en.pdf).
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
  - Sivenbring, J., and Andersson Malmros, R. (2019). *Mixing logics: Multiagency approaches for countering violent extremism*. Göteborg: Segerstedtsinstitutet, Göteborgs Universitet.
  - United Nations General Assembly. (2015). *Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism: Report of the Secretary-General (A/A/70/674)*. Available at: <https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/plan-of-action-to-prevent-violent-extremism>.
-

## Module 14: Capstone, Break-Out Group Exercise

### Learning Objectives

Apply the human rights-based principles that should underpin the development of a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme in a context-specific and conflict-sensitive way.

Apply the lessons learned from existing multi-actor P/CVE intervention programmes.

Design and present a model programme.

### Timing and Methods

Activities	Content	Time (online)	Time (in-person)
1. Breakout exercise – Pecha kucha format	Customising a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme appropriate for the local context	45 mins	90 mins
2. Presentation/Facilitated discussion	Presentation and discussion of model programmes	30 mins	30 mins
Total		75 mins	120 mins

### Resources Needed

Files	Equipment and supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PowerPoint presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projector/screen</li> <li>Breakout rooms</li> <li>Pecha kucha PowerPoint template</li> <li>Handouts for breakout exercise</li> </ul>

### Instructions for the Preparation of the Session

The facilitator should familiarise themselves thoroughly with the *pecha kucha* ("chit chat" in Japanese) format, which should be used for the breakout exercise. *Pecha kucha* is a presentation style in which 20 slides are shown for 20 seconds each (6 minutes and 40 seconds in total). It is a collaborative exercise, which keeps presentations concise and fast-paced.

## Key Messages

- Ensure that the multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme is part of a comprehensive, “whole of society”, rule of law-based approach to violent extremism that is enshrined in a national P/CVE strategy or other relevant national framework.
- Avoid a “top-down” approach and follow an inclusive and collaborative process.
- Address all forms of violent extremism and, where possible, as part of a wider set of violence-related and/or safeguarding issues of concern to the relevant communities.
- Leverage existing resources and capacities.
- Sustain support from communities and key professionals – scope, terminology, and branding matter.
- Avoid creating parallel structures – leverage or integrate into existing programmes/platforms where possible.
- Include transparent protocols/frameworks.
- Follow a non-discriminatory, human rights-based approach.
- Follow a deliberative process, bearing in mind there are no “quick fixes”.
- Include joint messaging/communications strategy.
- Include monitoring/evaluation framework – process and interventions.

## Activity 1: Customising a Multi-Actor P/CVE Intervention Programme Appropriate for the Local Context

*(45 mins if online / 90 mins if in-person)*

### Slides 220 – 225 of the PowerPoint presentation

The facilitator should split participants into their preassigned groups and ask each group to choose a note taker and a PowerPoint drafter. The groups should then be asked to design a multi-actor P/CVE intervention programme appropriate for the local context, underpinned by the cross-cutting principles and lessons learned presented and discussed throughout the course.

Each group should then develop a PowerPoint presentation following the *pecha kucha* format (20 slides, 20 seconds per slide – 6 minute 40 second presentation), which should be presented by the group in the following session. Participants should be encouraged to spend the first 30-75 minutes of the activity discussing key elements of the intervention programme and 15 minutes in developing the slides.

Each group should be asked to ensure that their model/presentation addressed a series of questions that are outlined in the Slides 221 – 225. These are:

- Scope:
    - Single or all forms of violent extremism?
    - Violent extremism or other forms of violence?
    - Group or individual interventions?
    - Secondary and/or tertiary intervention?
    - National or local?
    - Top-down or bottom-up?
  - Legal/policy framework:
    - Are the necessary legal/policy frameworks in place to support the development of the programme? If not, what adjustments and/or additions are required?
-

- Stakeholders:
  - Which actor/s, organisation/s, /professional/s, should be involved?
  - How to incentivise involvement?
  - Which actor/s should lead?
  - What is an appropriate role for law enforcement?
  - What is the role for national and/or local government? And for civil society?
  - What type of training is needed?
- Case management:
  - How are referrals made?
  - Who are the most likely stakeholders to make referrals?
  - How to facilitate information-sharing among stakeholders while protecting privacy?
  - How are risks/needs/protective factors assessed?
  - What are the interventions offered? Who delivers them?
  - Is the focus on disengagement or on deradicalisation?
- Resources/sustainability:
  - Which existing resources/platforms can be leveraged?
  - What is the approach to monitoring and evaluation?
  - How to ensure sustainability and "Do No Harm"?
- What are the biggest challenges to operationalising this model?

## Activity 2: Presentation and Discussion of Model Programmes

(30 mins)

### Slide 226 of the PowerPoint presentation

Each breakout group should use the *pecha kucha* format to present their model programme to the other participants. Following all of the presentations, the facilitator should lead a discussion to draw out common themes and challenges highlighted in the different presentations. One of the objectives of this discussion is to identify what mentoring, training or other capacity-building support might be required to help participants operationalise these or other models in their country.

---

## Resources

- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). Multi-Agency Approach. In EU RAN, *Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating\\_counter\\_violent\\_extremism\\_infrastructures\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating_counter_violent_extremism_infrastructures_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). Training for first line practitioners. In EU RAN, *Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating\\_counter\\_violent\\_extremism\\_infrastructures\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating_counter_violent_extremism_infrastructures_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Ex Post Paper - Strasbourg's P/CVE approach and its multi-agency partners*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_study\\_visit\\_strasbourg\\_21-22052019\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_study_visit_strasbourg_21-22052019_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Multi-Agency Working and preventing violent extremism: Paper 2*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran\\_hsc\\_policy\\_mawr\\_report\\_sarma\\_26032019\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran_hsc_policy_mawr_report_sarma_26032019_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Multi-agency working and preventing violent extremism I*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2016). *Ex Post Paper - Handbook on how to set up a multi-agency structure that includes the health and social care sectors?* Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk_en.pdf).
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
  - Sivenbring, J., and Andersson Malmros, R. (2019). *Mixing logics: Multiagency approaches for countering violent extremism*. Göteborg: Segerstedtsinstitutet, Göteborgs Universitet.
  - United Nations General Assembly. (2015). *Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism: Report of the Secretary-General (A/A/70/674)*. Available at: <https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/plan-of-action-to-prevent-violent-extremism>.
-

# List of Resources

## 1. Core Resources

- Crone, M., and Nasser, K. (2018). *Preventing Violent Extremism in Lebanon: Experience from a Danish-Lebanese Partnership*. Barcelona, ES: European Institute of the Mediterranean (IEMed). Available at: [https://www.euromesco.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/EuroMeSCo38\\_Preventing-Violent-Extremism-in-Lebanon.-Experience-from-a-Danish-Lebanese-Partnership.pdf](https://www.euromesco.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/EuroMeSCo38_Preventing-Violent-Extremism-in-Lebanon.-Experience-from-a-Danish-Lebanese-Partnership.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAM). (2020). *Rehabilitation Manual: Rehabilitation of radicalised and terrorist offenders for first-line practitioners*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/default/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_rehab\\_manual\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/default/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_rehab_manual_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *Multi-agency Working and preventing violent extremism: Paper 2*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran\\_hsc\\_policy\\_mawr\\_report\\_sarma\\_26032019\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran_hsc_policy_mawr_report_sarma_26032019_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Multi-agency working and preventing violent extremism I*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/multi-agency-working-preventing-violent-extremism-042018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2016). *RAN Ex Post Paper - Handbook on How to set up a multi-agency structure that includes the health and social care sectors?* Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk_en.pdf).
  - Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF). (2020). *Memorandum on Good Practices on Strengthening National-Local Cooperation in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism Conducive to Terrorism*. Available at: <https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Framework%20Documents/2020/GCTF%20Memorandum%20on%20Good%20Practices%20on%20Strengthening%20NLC%20in%20PCVE.pdf?ver=2020-09-29-100315-357>.
  - Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF). (2018). *Initiative to Address Homegrown Terrorism: Rabat-Washington Good Practices on the Prevention, Detection, Intervention and Response to Homegrown Terrorism*. Available at: [https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Framework%20Documents/2018/GCTF-Rabat-Washington-Good-Practices\\_ENG.pdf?ver=2018-09-21-122245-707](https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Framework%20Documents/2018/GCTF-Rabat-Washington-Good-Practices_ENG.pdf?ver=2018-09-21-122245-707).
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Non-custodial Rehabilitation and Reintegration in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: A Guidebook for Policymakers and Practitioners in South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/d/7/444838.pdf>.
  - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). (2019). *Understanding Referral Mechanisms in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalization That Lead to Terrorism: Navigating Challenges and Protecting Human Rights - A Guidebook for South-Eastern Europe*. Available at: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/7/4/418274.pdf>.
  - Rosand, E., Winterbotham, E., Jones, M., and Praxl-Tabuchi, F. (2018). *A Roadmap to Progress: The State of the Global P/CVE Agenda*. The Prevention Project and Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). Available at: [https://organizingagainstve.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/GCCS\\_ROADMAP\\_FNL.pdf](https://organizingagainstve.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/GCCS_ROADMAP_FNL.pdf).
-

- Search for Common Ground and Hedayah. (2019) *Countering Violent Extremism: An Introductory Guide to Concepts, Programming, and Best Practices: Adapted for the Middle East and North African Region*. Available at: [https://www.sfcg.org/countering-violent-extremism/SFCG-Countering\\_Violent\\_Extremism-An\\_Introductory\\_Guide\\_MENA\\_English.pdf](https://www.sfcg.org/countering-violent-extremism/SFCG-Countering_Violent_Extremism-An_Introductory_Guide_MENA_English.pdf).
- Sivenbring, J., and Andersson Malmros, R. (2019). *Mixing logics: Multiagency approaches for countering violent extremism*. Göteborg: Segerstedtsinstitutet, Göteborgs Universitet. Retrieved from [https://segerstedtinstitutet.gu.se/digitalAssets/1760/1760437\\_mixing-logics\\_digital.pdf](https://segerstedtinstitutet.gu.se/digitalAssets/1760/1760437_mixing-logics_digital.pdf).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2015). *Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism: Report of the Secretary-General (A/A/70/674)*. Available at: <https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/plan-of-action-to-prevent-violent-extremism>.
- United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT). (2018). *Reference Guide - Developing National and Regional Action Plans to Prevent Violent Extremism*. New York, NY: UNOCT. Available at: [https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/sites/www.un.org.counterterrorism/files/unoct\\_pverferenceguide\\_final.pdf](https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/sites/www.un.org.counterterrorism/files/unoct_pverferenceguide_final.pdf).
- United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC). (2018). *Addendum to the 2015 Madrid Guiding Principles (S/2018/1177)*. Available at: [https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/2018-Addendum-to-the-2015-Madrid-Guiding-Principles\\_as\\_adopted.pdf](https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/2018-Addendum-to-the-2015-Madrid-Guiding-Principles_as_adopted.pdf).
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID). (2020). *Policy for Countering Violent Extremism through Development Assistance*. Available at: <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/USAID-publication-Policy-for-Countering-Violent-Extremism-through-Development-Assistance-April2020.pdf>.
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID). (2011). *The Development Response to Violent Extremism and Insurgency – Putting Principles into Practice*. Available at: [https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/Pdacs400.pdf](https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdacs400.pdf).

## 2. Assessments and Interventions

- Davey, J., Tuck, H., and Amarasingam, A. (2019). *An imprecise science: Assessing interventions for the prevention, disengagement, and de-radicalisation of left and right-wing extremists*. London, UK: Institute for Strategic Dialogue. Available at: <https://www.isdglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/An-imprecise-science-1.pdf>.
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *RAN Issue Paper - Protective and promotive factors building resilience against violent radicalisation*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_paper\\_protective\\_factors\\_042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_paper_protective_factors_042018_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2017). *RAN Ex Post Paper – Risk assessment of lone actors*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran\\_h-sc\\_risk\\_assessment\\_lone\\_actors\\_11-12\\_12\\_2017\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran_h-sc_risk_assessment_lone_actors_11-12_12_2017_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2017). *RAN ExPost Paper - Working with families and safeguarding children from radicalisation: Step-by-step guidance paper for practitioners and policy-makers*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran\\_yf-c\\_h-sc\\_working\\_with\\_families\\_safeguarding\\_children\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-h-and-sc/docs/ran_yf-c_h-sc_working_with_families_safeguarding_children_en.pdf).
  - Hart, S. D., Douglas, K. S., and Guy, L. S. (2017). The structured professional judgement approach to violence risk assessment: Origins, nature and advances. In D. P. Boer, A. R. Beech, T. Ward, L. A. Craig, M. Rettenberger, L. E. Marshall, and W. L. Marshall (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook on the theories, assessment, and treatment of sexual offending* (pp. 643-666). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.
-



- Koehler, D. (2016). Using Family Counseling to Prevent and Intervene Against Foreign Fighters: Operational Perspectives, Methodology and Best Practices for Implementing Codes of Conduct. Washington, DC: Middle East Institute. Available at: <https://www.mei.edu/sites/default/files/Koehler.pdf>.
- Lloyd, M. (2019). *Extremism Risk Assessment: A Directory*. Lancaster, UK: Centre for Research and Evidence on Security Threats (CREST). Available at: <https://crestresearch.ac.uk/resources/extremism-risk-assessment-directory/>.
- Rousseau, C. et al. (2021). Clinical Intervention to Address Violent Radicalization: the Quebec Model. In K. Bhui and D. Bhugra (Eds.), *Terrorism, Violent Radicalization and Mental Health*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- RTI International. (2018). *Countering Violent Extremism: The Application of Risk Assessment Tools in the Criminal Justice and Rehabilitation Process - Literature Review*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International. Available at: [https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OPSR\\_TP\\_CVE-Application-Risk-Assessment-Tools-Criminal-Rehab-Process\\_2018Feb-508.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OPSR_TP_CVE-Application-Risk-Assessment-Tools-Criminal-Rehab-Process_2018Feb-508.pdf).
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2019). *Risk Management for Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) Programmes – Guidance Note for Practitioners*. Available at: <http://www.pvetoolkit.org/media/1178/josie-kaye-and-giordano-segneri-2019-risk-management-for-pve-programmes-guidance-for-practitioners.pdf>.
- van der Heide, L., van der Zwan, M., and van Leyenhorst, M. (2019). *The Practitioner's Guide to the Galaxy – A Comparison of Risk Assessment Tools for Violent Extremism*. The Hague, NL: International Centre for Counter-Terrorism. Available at: <https://icct.nl/app/uploads/2019/09/ThePractitionersGuidetotheGalaxy-1.pdf#:~:text=The%20Practitioner%27s%20Guide%20to%20the%20Galaxy%20-%20A,use%20either%20in%20pre-trial%2C%20detention%2C%20or%20post%20settings>.

### 3. Building a Team and Case Management

- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2020). *Conclusion Paper - Helplines and Hotlines in Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_conclusion\\_paper\\_fcs\\_event\\_15-16092020\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_conclusion_paper_fcs_event_15-16092020_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *Ex Post Paper - Individual case management: When and how to intervene?* Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran\\_local\\_individual\\_case\\_management\\_milan\\_13-14\\_112019\\_en.pdf#:~:text=Individual%20case%20management%20Individual%20case%20management%20mostly%20takes,and%20is%20carried%20out%20in%20a%20multi-agency%20setting](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran_local_individual_case_management_milan_13-14_112019_en.pdf#:~:text=Individual%20case%20management%20Individual%20case%20management%20mostly%20takes,and%20is%20carried%20out%20in%20a%20multi-agency%20setting).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Ex Post Paper - Strasbourg's P/CVE approach and its multi-agency partners*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_study\\_visit\\_strasbourg\\_21-22052019\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_study_visit_strasbourg_21-22052019_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2016). *RAN Ex Post Paper - Handbook on How to set up a multi-agency structure that includes the health and social care sectors?* Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ex-post-paper-handbook-ran-hsc-18-19-may-2016-copenhagen-dk_en.pdf).
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Ex Post Paper - Tabletop exercises: Practicing multi-agency cooperation*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran\\_local\\_how\\_get\\_sustainable\\_political\\_support\\_27\\_09\\_2018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran_local_how_get_sustainable_political_support_27_09_2018_en.pdf).
-



- The Global Network for Community Safety. (n.d.). *Multiagency Early Risk Intervention Tables (MERIT) – Ottawa*. Available at: <http://globalcommunitysafety.com/resources/community/ottawa>.
- Russell, H.C. (2016). *Situation Table Guidance Manual*. Available at: <http://ckfirst.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Situation-Table-Manual-Dr.-Hugh-Russell.pdf>.

## 4. Gender

- Choudhury Fink N., Zeiger S., and Bulai R. (2016). *A Man's World: Exploring the Roles of Women in Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism*. Washington, DC: Hedayah and The Global Center on Cooperative Security. Available at: [https://wiisglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/AMansWorld\\_FULLL.pdf](https://wiisglobal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/AMansWorld_FULLL.pdf).
- Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF). (2018). *Initiative to Address the Life Cycle of Radicalization to Violence: Neuchâtel Memorandum on Good Practices for Juvenile Justice in a Counterterrorism Context*. Available at: <https://theij.org/wp-content/uploads/English-Neucha--tel-Memorandum-on-Juvenile-Justice.pdf>.
- Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF). (2016). *Good Practices on Women and Countering Violent Extremism*. Available at: <https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Framework%20Documents/2016%20and%20before/GCTF-Good-Practices-on-Women-and-CVE.pdf?ver=2016-09-09-112914-837>.
- Idris, I. and Abdelaziz, A. (2017). *Women and countering violent extremism*. Birmingham, UK: Governance and Social Development Resource Centre (GSDRC). Available at: [http://www.gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/HDR\\_1408.pdf](http://www.gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/HDR_1408.pdf).
- Ndung'u, I. and Shadung, M. (2017). *Can a Gendered Approach Improve Responses to Violent Extremism?* Pretoria, ZA: Institute for Security Studies. Available at: <https://issafrica.s3.amazonaws.com/site/uploads/aitwr-5.pdf>.
- Winterbotham, E. and Pearson, E. (2016) *Different Cities, Shared Stories: A Five-Country Study Challenging Assumptions Around Muslim Women and CVE Intervention*. London, UK: Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). Available at: <https://rusi.org/publication/rusi-journal/different-cities-shared-stories-five-country-study-challenging-assumptions>.

## 5. Local Strategy Development

- CVE Reference Guide for Local Organizations. (n.d.). Assessment Process. Available at: <https://www.cverefereceguide.org/assess/assessment-process>.
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Ex Post Paper - How to Get Sustainable Political Support for Your Local P/CVE Strategy*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran\\_local\\_how\\_get\\_sustainable\\_political\\_support\\_27\\_09\\_2018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran_local_how_get_sustainable_political_support_27_09_2018_en.pdf).
  - Meines, M. (2017). Local strategy: elements of an effective local action plan to prevent radicalisation and violent extremism. In D. Muro (Ed.), *Resilient Cities. Countering Violent Extremism at Local Level* (pp. 99-104). Barcelona, ES: Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB). Available at: [https://www.cidob.org/content/download/67479/2055336/version/3/file/99-104\\_MARIJE%MEINES.PDF](https://www.cidob.org/content/download/67479/2055336/version/3/file/99-104_MARIJE%MEINES.PDF).
  - Ranstorp, M. et al. (2016). *Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism. An Initial Rapid Evidence Assessment and Analysis Plan Examining Local Authority Action Plans and Programming Elements*. Stockholm, SE: Center for Asymmetric Threat Studies, Swedish Defence University. Available at: [https://cradpdf.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc274/p805336\\_A1b.pdf](https://cradpdf.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc274/p805336_A1b.pdf).
-

## 6. Monitoring and Evaluation

- Counter-Terrorism Monitoring, Reporting and Support Mechanism (CT MORSE). (n.d.). *CVE Sector Indicator Guidance*. Available at: <https://ct-morse.eu/cve-sector-indicator-guidance/>.
- Dawson, L., Edwards, C., and Jeffray, C. (2014). *Learning and Adapting - The Use of Monitoring and Evaluation in Countering Violent Extremism: a Handbook for Practitioners*. London, UK: Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). Available at: <https://rusi.org/publication/rusi-books/learning-and-adapting-use-monitoring-and-evaluation-countering-violent>.
- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Ex Post Paper: Guideline Evaluation of PCVE Programmes and Interventions*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ms\\_workshops\\_guidelines\\_evaluation\\_of\\_pcve\\_programmes\\_and\\_interventions\\_july\\_2018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ms_workshops_guidelines_evaluation_of_pcve_programmes_and_interventions_july_2018_en.pdf).
- Hassan, G., Brouillette-Alarie, S., et al. (2021). *A systematic review on the outcomes of primary and secondary prevention programs in the field of violent radicalisation*. Montreal, CA: Canadian Practitioners Network for the Prevention of Radicalization and Extremist Violence. Available at: <https://cpnprev.ca/systematic-review-2/>.
- Hedayah. (n.d.). *MASAR*. Retrieved from [https://www.hedayahcenter.org/resources/interactive\\_cve\\_apps/masar/](https://www.hedayahcenter.org/resources/interactive_cve_apps/masar/).
- Hofman, J. and Sutherland, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Evaluating interventions that prevent or counter violent extremism: A practical guide*. Santa Monica, CA, and Cambridge, UK: RAND Corporation. Available at: [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR2094.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2094.html).
- Holmer, G. and Bauman, P. (2018). *Taking Stock: Analytic Tools for Understanding and Designing P/CVE Programs*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace. Available at: <https://www.usip.org/publications/2018/09/taking-stock-analytic-tools-understanding-and-designing-pcve-programs>.
- Khalil J., and Zeuthen, M. (2016). *Countering Violent Extremism and Risk Reduction: A Guide to Programme Design and Evaluation* (Whitehall Report 2-16). Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). Available at: [https://rusi.org/sites/default/files/20160608\\_cve\\_and\\_rr.combined.online4.pdf](https://rusi.org/sites/default/files/20160608_cve_and_rr.combined.online4.pdf).
- Mattei, C. and Zeiger, S. (2018). *Evaluate Your CVE Results: Projecting Your Impact*. Abu Dhabi, AE: Hedayah. Available at: <https://hedayah-wp-offload.s3.eu-central-1.amazonaws.com/hedayah/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/17114010/File-16720189339.pdf>.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and International Alert. (2018). *Improving the impact of preventing violent extremism programming. A toolkit for design, monitoring and evaluation*. Oslo, NO: Oslo Governance Centre, UNDP. Available at: [https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Global%20Policy%20Centres/OGC/PVE\\_ImprovingImpactProgrammingToolkit\\_2018.pdf](https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Global%20Policy%20Centres/OGC/PVE_ImprovingImpactProgrammingToolkit_2018.pdf).

## 7. No One Size Fits All

- Center for the Prevention of Radicalization Leading to Violence (CPRLV). (2019). *Annual Report. Working Together for the Entire Community*. Available at: <https://indd.adobe.com/view/0f97d861-0ae6-410d-8118-85b14dbc2972>.
  - Danish Centre for Prevention of Extremism. (n.d.). *Prevention of extremism in Denmark*. Available at: <https://stopekstremisme.dk/en/prevention>.
  - EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). *RAN Ex Post Paper - Strasbourg's P/CVE approach and its multi-agency partners*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_study\\_visit\\_strasbourg\\_21-22052019\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_study_visit_strasbourg_21-22052019_en.pdf).
-

- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). Chapter 7: Multi-Agency Approach. In EU RAN, *Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating\\_counter\\_violent\\_extremism\\_infrastructures\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating_counter_violent_extremism_infrastructures_en.pdf).
- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2019). Chapter 9: Training for first line practitioners. In EU RAN, *Preventing Radicalisation to Terrorism and Violent Extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating\\_counter\\_violent\\_extremism\\_infrastructures\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/docs/creating_counter_violent_extremism_infrastructures_en.pdf).
- The Global Network for Community Safety. (n.d.). *Multiagency Early Risk Intervention Tables (MERIT) – Ottawa*. Available at: <http://globalcommunitysafety.com/resources/community/ottawa>.
- Hee, M. A. (2018). *Prevention of Extremism in Copenhagen* [PowerPoint slides]. Available at: <https://www.sirp.pt/assets/files/pdf/Muhammad%20Ali%20Hee.pdf>.
- Hemmingsen, A-S. (2015). *An introduction to the Danish approach to countering and preventing extremism and radicalization* (DIIS Report, No. 2015:15). Copenhagen, DK: Danish Institute for International Studies. Available at: <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/144731/1/848331087.pdf>.
- Interministerial Committee for the Prevention of Crime and Radicalisation (2018). *Prevent to Protect: National Plan to Prevent Radicalisation*. Paris, FR: Government of France. Available at: [https://www.cipdr.gouv.fr/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/PNPR\\_English\\_final\\_sansmediakit.pdf](https://www.cipdr.gouv.fr/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/PNPR_English_final_sansmediakit.pdf).
- Ministry of Justice and Security, The Netherlands (2016, Oct 7). *Safety Houses* [Video file]. Available at: [https://www.veiligheidshuizen.nl/nieuws/2016/120516\\_engelse-versie-animatiefilm-veiligheidshuizen#.W\\_1mZfZFW2x](https://www.veiligheidshuizen.nl/nieuws/2016/120516_engelse-versie-animatiefilm-veiligheidshuizen#.W_1mZfZFW2x).
- Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism, Home Office. (2015). Annex A of *Channel Duty Guidance: Protecting vulnerable people from being drawn into terrorism - Statutory guidance for Channel panel members and partners of local panels*. London, UK: HM Government. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/907614/Channel\\_Duty\\_Guidance\\_April\\_2015.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907614/Channel_Duty_Guidance_April_2015.pdf).
- ReDirect. (n.d.). *Learn How We are Stopping Violence in Youth through the ReDirect Program*. Available at: <http://redirect.cpsevents.ca/>.
- Shift. (n.d.). *Supporting People for Safer Communities*. Available at: <https://shift.gov.bc.ca/>.
- VINK. (n.d.). *Bekymret for en du kender?*. Retrieved from <https://vink.kk.dk/>.
- Violence Prevention Network. (n.d.). *Homepage*. Available at: <https://violence-prevention-network.de/>.

## 8. Public Health Approach

- Challgren, J., et al. (2016). *Countering Violent Extremism: Applying the Public Health Model*. Washington, DC: Center for Security Studies. Georgetown University. Available at: <http://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/NSCITF-Report-on-Countering-Violent-Extremism.pdf>.
- Eisenman, D. P., and Flavahan, L. (2017, August). Canaries in the coal mine: Interpersonal violence, gang violence, and violent extremism through a public health prevention lens. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 29(4), 341-349. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28805121/>.
- Weine, S., and Eisenman, D. P. (2016, April 5). *How Public Health Can Improve Initiatives to Counter Violent Extremism*. University of Maryland National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism. Available at: <https://www.start.umd.edu/news/how-public-health-can-improve-initiatives-counter-violent-extremism>.

## 9. Stigma and Mental Health

- Bilazarian, T. (2016). *Countering Violent Extremism: Lessons on Early Intervention from the United Kingdom's Channel Program*. Washington, DC: George Washington University. Available at: <https://extremism.gwu.edu/sites/g/files/zaxdzs2191/f/downloads/Channel%20CVE%20UK.pdf>.
- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2018). *Ex Post Paper - Common P/CVE challenges in the Western Balkans and European Union*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/ran\\_policy\\_practice\\_common\\_pcve\\_challenges\\_sofia\\_04042018\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/ran_policy_practice_common_pcve_challenges_sofia_04042018_en.pdf).
- Murray, L. et al. (2011, November). Building capacity in mental health interventions in low resource countries: an apprenticeship model for training local providers. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 5:30. Available at: <https://ijmhs.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1752-4458-5-30>.
- Weine, S. M., Ellis, B. H., Haddad, R., Miller, A. B., Lowenhaupt, R., and Polutnik, C. (2015). *Supporting a Multidisciplinary Approach to Violent Extremism: The Integration of Mental Health in Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) and What Law Enforcement Needs to Know*. College Park, MD: National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START). Available at: [https://start.umd.edu/pubs/START\\_LessonsLearnedfromMentalHealthAndEducation\\_LawEnforcementSummary\\_Oct2015.pdf](https://start.umd.edu/pubs/START_LessonsLearnedfromMentalHealthAndEducation_LawEnforcementSummary_Oct2015.pdf).
- Weine, S. M., Ellis, B. H., Haddad, R., Miller, A. B., Lowenhaupt, R., and Polutnik, C. (2015). *Supporting a Multidisciplinary Approach to Violent Extremism: What Role Can Mental Health Professionals Play?*. College Park, MD: National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START). Available at: [https://start.umd.edu/pubs/START\\_LessonsLearnedfromMentalHealthAndEducation\\_MentalHealthSummary\\_Oct2015.pdf](https://start.umd.edu/pubs/START_LessonsLearnedfromMentalHealthAndEducation_MentalHealthSummary_Oct2015.pdf).

## 10. Terminology

- Care Quality Commission. (n.d.). *Safeguarding People*. Available at: <https://www.cqc.org.uk/what-we-do/how-we-do-our-job/safeguarding-people>.
- European Commission's Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development, CIVI.POL Conseil, and the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). (2017). *Operational Guidelines on the preparation and implementation of EU financed actions specific to countering terrorism and violent extremism in third countries*. Available at: <http://kbb9z40cmb2apwafcho9v3j.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/EU-CT-CVE-guidelines.pdf>.
- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2016). *RAN Issue Paper - The Root Causes of Violent Extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-papers/docs/issue\\_paper\\_root-causes\\_jan2016\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-papers/docs/issue_paper_root-causes_jan2016_en.pdf).
- Glazzard, A., and Zeuthen, M. (2016). *Violent Extremism*. Birmingham, UK: Governance and Social Development Resource Centre (GSDRC). Available at: [https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Violent-extremism\\_RP.pdf](https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Violent-extremism_RP.pdf).

## 11. Training

- EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). (2017). *Ex Post Paper RAN Local - A step-by-step guide: The right training programme - preventing & countering radicalisation and violent extremism*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran\\_local\\_right\\_training\\_programme\\_berlin\\_7-8\\_12\\_2017\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-local/docs/ran_local_right_training_programme_berlin_7-8_12_2017_en.pdf).
  - European Commission. (2016). *Training for first line practitioners*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation\\_awareness\\_network/ran-best-practices/ran-creating\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/ran-best-practices/ran-creating_en).
-





**The International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law**  
University of Malta - Valletta Campus  
Old University Building, St. Paul Street, Valletta, Malta

[info@theij.org](mailto:info@theij.org)

[@ijmalta](https://twitter.com/ijmalta)

[@ijmalta\\_fr](https://twitter.com/ijmalta_fr)

[www.theij.org](http://www.theij.org)