United Nations Security Council
Counter-Terrorism Committee

Advance unedited draft

Global survey of the implementation of Security Council resolution 1624 (2005) by Member States

Executive summary

The present "Global survey of the implementation of Security Council resolution 1624 (2005) by Member States" was prepared by the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) pursuant to the request of the Security Council, contained in its resolution 2395 (2017), that CTED update the previous survey (S/2016/50), issued in January 2016. It contains a detailed regional overview of the steps taken by States to implement Security Council resolutions aimed at countering incitement to commit terrorist acts, violent extremism, and terrorist narratives, focusing primarily on the implementation of resolution 1624 (2005), which calls on all States to prohibit by law incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts.

According to CTED's analysis, as of 1 March 2021, 112 States had expressly criminalized incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts in their national legislation (compared with a figure of "at least 76 States", as of 1 November 2015).

The survey also considers steps taken by States to implement other provisions of resolution 1624 (2005), such as measures to prevent incitement to commit terrorist acts; deny safe haven to persons credibly suspected of being guilty of incitement to commit terrorist acts; and counter incitement of terrorist acts motivated by violent extremism conducive to terrorism.

Two other Security Council resolutions are directly relevant to the preparation of the present survey. Council resolution 2178 (2014), on the threat to international peace and security posed by foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs), contains a provision encouraging States to engage relevant local communities and non-governmental actors in developing strategies "to counter the violent extremist narrative that can incite terrorist acts". It proposes that this can be achieved by addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of violent extremism, which can be conducive to terrorism, including by "empowering youth, families, women, religious, cultural and education leaders, and all other concerned groups of civil society". This approach has come to be known as countering violent extremism (CVE).

The survey also takes into account Security Council resolution 2354 (2017), on the threat to international peace and security posed by terrorist narratives spread by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), also known as Daesh; Al-Qaida; and other terrorist groups. That resolution encourages States to develop programmes to counter terrorist narratives, stressing that States have the primary responsibility in countering terrorist acts and violent extremism conducive to terrorism and noting that counter-narrative efforts "can benefit through

engagement with a wide range of actors, including youth, families, women, religious, cultural, and education leaders, and other concerned groups of civil society".

The survey makes clear that States have made considerable progress, since the publication of the previous survey, on prohibiting incitement to commit acts of terrorism and taking related steps to prevent incitement to commit acts of terrorism, to counter violent extremism conducive to terrorism, and to counter terrorist narratives. It also addresses the human rights challenges that States continue to face in this area, most notably in connection with ensuring respect for the right to freedom of expression. The survey observes that States are now facing an increased threat due to incitement to commit terrorist acts based on xenophobia, racism and other forms of intolerance.[1] It shows that many States are taking active measures to monitor and prevent the abuse of information and communications technologies (ICT) for terrorist purposes, noting that those measures can benefit from partnerships between Government and the private sector.

Effectively countering incitement of terrorist acts motivated by violent extremism conducive to terrorism presents many challenges for Member States, but it is critical to confronting the threats to international peace and security posed by terrorism and violent extremism conducive to terrorism. The present survey shows that States are employing a range of innovative approaches to address these threats, often based on strong partnerships involving all concerned actors in society.

Global survey of the implementation of Security Council resolution 1624 (2005) by Member States

I. Introduction

1. The present Global survey of the implementation of Security Council resolution 1624 (2005) by Member States was prepared by the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) pursuant to the request of the Security Council, contained in its resolution 2395 (2017), that CTED update the previous survey (S/2016/50), issued in January 2016. It contains a detailed regional overview of the steps taken by States to implement Security Council resolutions aimed at countering terrorist incitement, violent extremism, and terrorist narratives,

[1] While the Security Council has not established an internationally agreed terminology regarding this threat, the Counter Terrorism Committee noted, in previous documents, that many of the Member States recently assessed by the CTC have referred to terrorist acts committed by such individuals) through a wide range of terminologies.

focusing primarily on the implementation of resolution 1624 (2005), which calls on all States to prohibit by law incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts.

2. According to CTED's analysis, as of 1 March 2021, 112 States had expressly criminalized incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts in their national legislation (compared with a figure of "at least 76 States", as of 1 November 2015).

3. Of all the means deployed by terrorists to commit their atrocities, one of the most potent has been their ability to communicate their message. Effective communication is vital to terrorism — it is the channel through which terrorists recruit, fundraise, mobilize, plan, and incite. Terrorist attacks have a devastating impact on their direct targets, but unless terrorists and terrorist groups can communicate about those acts to others (including to incite further such attacks) they will likely be deemed a failure. Effective communication is an essential item in the terrorist toolkit. States continue to face challenges in their efforts to effectively counter terrorist communications within a framework of respect for human rights and the rule of law.

A. Incitement to commit terrorist acts

4. The Security Council took decisive action against incitement to commit terrorist acts in 2005, with its adoption of resolution 1624 (2005). In its preamble, the resolution expresses deep concern that incitement of terrorist acts "poses a serious and growing danger to the enjoyment of human rights, threatens the social and economic development of all States, undermines global stability and prosperity, and must be addressed urgently and proactively by the United Nations and all States". The resolution calls on all States to prohibit by law incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts; take steps to prevent such incitement; deny safe haven to persons credibly suspected of being guilty of such incitement; and strengthen the security of their international borders to prevent entry by those who are guilty of such conduct. Council resolution 1624 (2005) also calls on States to continue international efforts to enhance dialogue and broaden understanding among civilizations and to take all measures as may be necessary and appropriate, and in accordance with their obligations under international law, to counter incitement of terrorist acts.

5. The Council further developed its approach to countering incitement to commit terrorist acts with its resolution 2178 (2014), on the threat to international peace and security posed by foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs). In that resolution, the Council encourages States to engage relevant local communities and non-governmental actors in developing strategies "to counter the violent extremist narrative that can incite terrorist acts". It proposes that this can be achieved by addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of violent extremism, which can be conducive to terrorism, including by "empowering youth, families, women, religious, cultural and education leaders, and all other concerned groups of civil society". The Council also encourages States to adopt tailored approaches to countering recruitment to violent extremism and promoting social

inclusion and cohesion. This approach is now widely referred to as countering violent extremism (CVE).

6. In 2017, the Council took a further step in addressing these issues with its adoption of resolution 2354 (2017), which focuses on the threat to international peace and security posed by terrorist narratives spread by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), also known as Daesh; Al-Qaida; and other terrorist groups. The resolution built upon the Comprehensive International Framework to Counter Terrorist Narratives (S/2017/375), which had been developed by the Counter-Terrorism Committee and submitted to the Council. It stresses that States have the primary responsibility in countering terrorist acts and violent extremism conducive to terrorism. It also states that counter-narrative efforts "can benefit through engagement with a wide range of actors, including youth, families, women, religious, cultural, and education leaders, and other concerned groups of civil society". It notes that counternarratives "should take into account the gender dimension" and should address specific concerns and vulnerabilities of both men and women.

7. The Counter-Terrorism Committee and its Executive Directorate (CTED) have consistently placed the implementation of resolution 1624 (2005) and related resolutions at the centre of their dialogue with Member States. They have gathered data on laws that prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts and discussed with States complementary approaches to countering incitement motivated by violent extremism conducive to terrorism and to countering terrorist narratives, including through partnerships with non-governmental actors and the development of CVE strategies. One crucial area of inquiry has been the religious domain and the steps that States have taken to "prevent the subversion of educational, cultural, and religious institutions by terrorists and their supporters" in accordance with resolution 1624 (2005).

B. Human rights dimension

8. As with all measures taken by States to counter terrorism and violent extremism conducive to terrorism, the question of respecting human rights is a critical aspect of the discussion of incitement to commit terrorist acts. The right to freedom of expression is not absolute, and States have a legitimate basis to take enforcement action against genuine incitement to commit terrorist acts, in accordance with the requirements of their international legal obligations and commitments, as applicable, including the provisions of article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). However, States' actions in these areas can raise profound and challenging human rights issues, implicating most directly the rights to freedom of expression, and freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. Indeed, United Nations human rights bodies and other international experts have raised concerns over counter-incitement measures that appear to have violated these rights.

9. Council resolution 1624 (2005) is noteworthy in recalling, in its preamble, the right to freedom of expression. It is also the first Security Council counter-terrorism resolution to stress, in the resolution itself, that States must ensure that any measures taken to implement the resolution comply with all their obligations under international law, in particular international human rights law, refugee law, and humanitarian law. CTED routinely raises the human rights aspects of counter-incitement and CVE measures in its discussions with Member States, acting in accordance with the seventh preambular paragraph of Council resolution 2178 (2014), which states that "respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law are complementary and mutually reinforcing with effective counter-terrorism measures, and are an essential part of a successful counter-terrorism effort".

10. Security Council resolution 1624 (2005) calls upon all States to prohibit by law incitement to commit terrorist acts. The Committee and CTED have regularly raised the need to ensure compliance of such measures with States' obligations under international human rights law. Their recommendations are generally directed towards encouraging States to clarify the scope of the offence to ensure that it complies with the principle of legality. This requires that the offence be clearly drafted, thereby reducing the risk of criminalizing free speech. The Committee specifically draws States' attention to best practices outlined in reports of United Nations human rights bodies. In order to enhance legal precision, they have often recommended that the offence should expressly include both a subjective element (intent that a terrorist act be committed as a result) and an objective element (creation of a danger that this will in fact happen). They have also noted that the offence of incitement to commit terrorist acts, if it is tied to a definition of terrorism or of terrorist acts, will reflect any problems with the underlying definition of terrorism itself. If that underlying definition includes overly broad terms, then the incitement to commit terrorist acts offence will likely also be problematic.

11. A particular issue of concern in this area is the impact of counter-incitement and CVE measures on civic space and on the ability of civil society organizations (CSOs) and other independent actors to conduct their activities in full respect for their human rights, including the rights to freedom of expression and personal security. The Security Council has clearly called on States to consider including such actors in developing comprehensive approaches to effectively counter terrorist threats, and the Committee and CTED have identified a number of initiatives in which civil society's role has been highly beneficial. However, United Nations human rights bodies have also decried policies and practices in some States that have failed to safeguard independent actors or, more disturbingly, have directly targeted them with repressive measures.

12. CTED has devoted considerable effort, since the adoption of resolution 1624 (2005), to bringing Governments and civil society actors together to find common ground in addressing the threats of terrorism and violent extremism conducive to terrorism, including the threat of incitement to commit terrorist acts. Many such initiatives have led to the recognition that it is possible to achieve more by working together in an atmosphere of dialogue and mutual respect.

The Council, in its resolution 1963 (2010), stresses the value to States of developing, in accordance with their obligations under international law, strategies "which include countering incitement of terrorist acts motivated by extremism and intolerance", as called for in resolution 1624 (2005).

C. New trends in incitement to commit acts of terrorism on the basis of xenophobia, racism and other forms of intolerance

13. Over recent years, there has been a notable increase in the dissemination of communications aimed at inciting terrorism and violent extremism conducive to terrorism, including on the basis of xenophobia, racism and other forms of intolerance. CTED's recent analysis cited research showing that there had been a 320 per cent rise in attacks conducted by individuals affiliated with such movements and narratives over the previous five years, mostly in Western States. Preventing and countering the spread of this threats is a new and growing challenge for Member States. Enforcement action and international legal cooperation in this area are complicated by that fact that States classify similar acts differently in their respective laws. Nonetheless, CTED has observed that many States are devoting increased resources to the terrorist threat presented by such narratives, including online.

14. The threat of incitement to commit terrorist acts has been further aggravated by the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Terrorists have sought to exploit the fact that large numbers of people around the world remain in lockdown and are spending more time online. They have taken the opportunity to escalate messaging aimed at spreading COVID-19-related grievances and conspiracy theories in an effort to radicalize and recruit individuals to terrorism and incite terrorist acts.[2] These developments have placed added pressure on States and technology companies to effectively counter incitement to terrorism regardless of the motivation while also ensuring respect for the rights to freedom of expression, freedom of opinion, and freedom of thought.

D. Information and communications technologies; public-private partnerships

15. Terrorists have become particularly adept at exploiting new and emerging information and communications technologies (ICT) for terrorist purposes, including for purposes of incitement to commit terrorist acts. The private sector therefore has an especially crucial role to play in countering those activities. Council resolution 1624 (2005) stresses the import role played by the business community, among other actors, in "efforts to enhance dialogue and broaden understanding, and in promoting tolerance and coexistence, and in fostering an environment which is not conducive to incitement of terrorism". The above-mentioned Comprehensive International Framework stresses the concern that ISIL and other terrorist entities are using ICT in increasingly sophisticated ways to facilitate their activities and notes that companies that maintain ICT platforms can play an important role in preventing such abuse. Council resolution 2354 (2017)

requests CTED to "further develop initiatives to strengthen public-private partnerships in countering terrorist narratives".

16. In preparing the present global survey, CTED noted that public-private partnerships had become an increasingly vital means of preventing and countering incitement to commit terrorist acts. States take different approaches to monitoring and regulating communications through ICT, and some of those approaches raise significant human rights issues. Some States and regional bodies maintain "internet referral units" (IRUs), through which private companies are notified about content that may violate their terms of service or otherwise raise security concerns. For its part, CTED has led the development of the *Tech against Terrorism* initiative, which was created to support smaller platforms in supervising posted content while also complying with international human rights standards. CTED is also a permanent observer to the Independent Advisory Committee of the industry-led Global Internet Forum to Counter Terrorism (GIFCT).[3] The GIFCT and *Tech against Terrorism* partner in their efforts to prevent and counter terrorist exploitation of online platforms as well. In considering steps that have been taken to implement resolution 1624 (2005), it is essential to bear in mind the role of the private sector and the need for public-private partnership.

II. Progress achieved by Member States in the implementation of Security Council resolution 1624 (2005) and related resolutions

17. The previous survey (S/2016/50), issued in January 2016, mainly identified principles and good practices that are helpful to effectively implementing resolution 1624 (2005). The present survey contains a more detailed regional overview of steps that States have taken to implement Security Council resolutions aimed at countering terrorist incitement, violent extremism conducive to terrorism, and terrorist narratives. It is based on CTED's analysis and its ongoing dialogue with Member States, including in the framework of country visits conducted on behalf of the Committee.

North Africa

(Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Tunisia)

18. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** All six States of this subregion have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts.

19. ***Freedom of expression:*** Several States have introduced definitions of incitement or terrorism that appear to be vague or overbroad, leading to concern over their anti-incitement measures. Some States have also criminalized glorification. Resolution 1624 (2005), in its

[3] www.gifct.org

preamble, repudiates attempts at the justification or glorification (apologie) of terrorist acts that may incite further terrorist acts. However, United Nations human rights mechanisms have raised concerns over these offences, on grounds that they may be interpreted too broadly, leading to infringements on the right to freedom of expression. In some States, the lack of clarity over relevant definitions appears to limit the ability of persons associated with CSOs to operate and express their views freely, resulting in serious concerns over personal security.

20. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Some States of this subregion have effective provisions in place to deny safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and to maintain effective border control in that respect. However, lengthy borders across sparsely populated regions present significant challenges.

21. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** Most States of this subregion have programmes to prevent incitement and counter violent extremism conducive to terrorism. Religious affairs ministries in these States actively engage with religious institutions, including both places of worship and schools, and are taking steps to address the dissemination of messages of terrorist incitement and related intolerance.

22. One State has adopted a comprehensive national CVE strategy emphasizing partnerships between government bodies and other actors, including faith leaders, CSOs, youth groups and the private sector. Another State is home to a leading religious research institution which, inter alia, analyses and counters narratives disseminated by international terrorist organizations, including ISIL; conducts training programmes; and distributes publications that address erroneous or abusive interpretations of religious texts. Another State actively promotes moderation and scholarly analysis of religious texts and operates training programmes for religious leaders from other States. One feature of its programmes is the training of women to serve as religious leaders *(mourchidates)*.

East Africa

(Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania)

23. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Four of the 11 States of this subregion have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. Four others have generic prohibitions on the incitement of criminal conduct. Three States do not appear to have introduced provisions that are readily applicable to incitement to terrorism.

24. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions of most States of this subregion raise significant concerns regarding respect for the right to freedom of expression. Many appear to be vague or overbroad, and potentially applicable against communication that deserves protection

under international human rights law. One State prohibits "incitement to do any act, with the intent to overthrow the Government", while another includes the concept of "solicit". Several States lack clear objective and subjective elements in their respective offences. At least two States hold open the possibility of applying the death penalty to incitement offences, which raises concern over proportionality and respect for the right to life.

25. ***International cooperation; border control:*** The laws of most States of this subregion contain gaps concerning the denial of safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and maintaining effective border controls in that respect. Only two States appear to have introduced provisions in these respects. However, more information is needed.

26. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** At least four States have introduced comprehensive programmes to prevent incitement and counter violent extremism. A further State is considering adopting such a programme, with the support of the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Several States implement whole-of Government CVE approaches that include some level of community-level dialogue. However, there are significant levels of mistrust between Governments and CSOs in some States of this subregion.

27. Several States attach high importance to monitoring communication over the Internet and other ICTs, but resources are generally scarce and activities in this area may raise significant human rights issues. Several States support focused efforts to counter terrorist narratives and promote interreligious understanding, including through messages broadcast over television and radio that, in some cases, have included the voices of family members of violent extremists and voices of victims. Several States have also taken steps to strengthen school curriculums, including through peace education. The Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), through its Centre of Excellence for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism, provides guidance and support to States of this subregion in the development of effective CVE programmes and counter-narratives.

Regional spotlight: Somalia

Adopted in September 2016, Somalia's National Strategy and Action Plan on Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism have been consistently supported by the international community. During their initial development, a stakeholder analysis was conducted to identify key partners and constituencies from local communities and civil society who should be involved in their further development and implementation. Initial research was conducted to identify the main recurring conditions conducive to recruitment and radicalization leading to terrorism in the country. Relevant Federal Government partners were also identified.

The key objectives of Somalia's P/CVE National Strategy and Action Plan include:

- Organizing across the Government and with other partners
- Strengthening research on the root causes and drivers of terrorism and violent extremism leading to terrorism
- Capacity-building
- Effective communication
- Measurement of progress and regular recalibration to ensure that implementation is strategic, coherent, sustainable, and fit for purpose.

The Strategy and Action Plan are part of Somalia's national security architecture. Since their adoption, Somalia has taken to steps to advance their implementation. A coordination office was established in the Office of the Prime Minister in 2017, and national and state-level coordinators were appointed to promote implementation at the local level, including in areas such as strategic communication, the treatment of former terrorist fighters, educational and job security programmes for youth, and programmes for victims of terrorism. Somalia is currently considering ways to further operationalize and implement the National Strategy and Action Plan within the framework of its national security architecture, including through the adoption of appropriate legal frameworks.

Southern Africa

(Botswana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe)

28. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Seven of 12 States have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. Other States appear to lack directly relevant legislation.

29. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions of at least two States of this subregion appear clearly drafted, taking into account the right to freedom of expression. Legal definitions in other States appear to be vague (including by using terms such as "promote" and "encourage"). At least one State provides for the possibility of sentencing offenders to life imprisonment for incitement, which raises a concern with respect to proportionality.

30. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Most States of this subregion have relatively weak legal frameworks for denying safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and maintaining effective border controls in that respect. However, more information is needed.

31. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** There are only limited initiatives under way in this subregion relating to prevention, CVE and countering terrorist narratives. Some States have national programmes aimed at combating racism and promoting local community empowerment. However, these programmes are concerned with broader social goals that are not directly linked to countering terrorism, incitement or violent extremism conducive to terrorism.

32. In one State, a provincial government has prepared a recovery and stabilization plan with CVE elements intended to address a recent string of terrorist attacks. The plan appears to be designed primarily to assist internally displaced persons (IDPs) and direct victims of the violence (although some elements are focused on addressing radicalization to violence among persons released by the criminal justice system). In the same State, a faith-based organization drafted a "good practices" document relating to religion, which was disseminated to religious centres in a region recently afflicted by terrorist violence.

West Africa

(Benin, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo)

33. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Eight of the 15 States of this subregion have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. At least two others have introduced related provisions that would seem effective for this purpose. Several States do not appear to have introduced provisions that are readily applicable to incitement to terrorism.

34. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions of several States appear to contain shortfalls regarding respect for the right to freedom of expression. These States rely on terms that are vague or overbroad, including such concepts as "promotion" and "encourage". At least one State has introduced a clear objective element, requiring that the incitement create a risk that terrorist acts be carried out.

35. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Most States of this subregion have legal gaps relating to denial of safe haven and ensuring effective border security in that respect with neighbouring States. Two States, however, appear to have introduced relevant provisions.

36. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** Two States have introduced relatively well-developed programmes to counter violent extremism, and others are developing such programmes. Several States have created mechanisms that, although not aimed specifically at terrorism or violent extremism conducive to terrorism, may be beneficial

in alleviating those threats. These include such mechanisms as a national peace council, a national youth authority and, in several States, truth and reconciliation commissions. Several States emphasize the promotion of interfaith dialogue and understanding. An externally funded programme has supported radio stations in several States in the subregion to develop creative programming aimed mainly at youth to counter terrorist narratives and offer positive alternative approaches to local issues of concern.

37. Several States are taking steps to address financial support of educational and religious institutions by terrorists and their supporters, including by funders that advocate violent extremist views conducive to terrorism, including entities based outside their borders. These States are working to limit terrorist influences. The approach some States have taken includes increasing oversight of school curriculums and sermons delivered in religious institutions. Such measures should be consistent with the Security Council resolutions 1624 (2005) and 2354 (2017). Religious leaders of several States have attended study programmes in other countries, including a programme established by Morocco on non-violent interpretations of religious doctrine.

Regional spotlight: Nigeria

The Counter-Terrorism Centre established in Nigeria's Office of the National Security Adviser (ONSA) leads implementation of the Policy Framework and National Action Plan for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism ("Partnering for Safer and Resilient Communities"). Adopted in 2017, the P/CVE Policy Framework was formulated through an inclusive, consultative process that involved several meetings of a dedicated working group that cut across line ministries, civil society, religious leaders, women's groups, youth representatives, law enforcement agencies, and the media. Inputs from state governments and other stakeholders were solicited to help ensure a comprehensive, whole-of-Government and whole-of-society approach that is locally relevant and culturally sensitive.

Nigeria's P/CVE Policy Framework contains a series of guiding principles and identifies the key core constituencies that should partner with the Government in its implementation. Prior to the Framework's adoption, ONSA had worked with civil society to build trust and create strategic alliances such as the Partnership against Violent Extremism (PAVE), which is currently involved in relevant programming. The P/CVE National Action Plan consists of four components, including a component focused on the coordination of efforts to prosecute, rehabilitate and reintegrate terrorist suspects in accordance with Security Council resolutions 2178 (2014) and 2396 (2017). The Counter-Terrorism Centre houses the P/CVE Unit, which coordinates the implementation of Nigeria's P/CVE Policy Framework.

Central Africa

(Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Republic of the Congo, Sao Tome and Principe)

38. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** In this subregion, States' level of implementation in prohibiting by law incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts is low. Only one State appears to have adopted legislation specifically for this purpose. Other States have generic incitement provisions and other laws that could be applied against acts of incitement.

39. ***Freedom of expression:*** There are concerns that provisions applicable against incitement in several States may be vague or overbroad. In some States, measures criminalizing glorification (or "apologie") of acts of terrorism could lead to human rights violations. Council resolution 1624 (2005), in its preamble, repudiates "attempts at the justification or glorification (apologie) of terrorist acts that may incite further terrorist acts", but international human rights mechanisms have cautioned that the concept could be applied against speech which, while repugnant, does not rise to the level of incitement.

40. ***International cooperation; border control:*** States of this subregion generally lack measures specifically aimed at denying safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement. However, more information is needed.

41. ***Preventing incitement; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** At least two States of this subregion have established programmes designed to counter violent extremism. The national CVE strategy of one State includes elements aimed at promoting interreligious dialogue and understanding; engaging with youth; and developing effective counternarratives, including in religious education. Other States have developed programmes that are tied more closely to post-conflict rebuilding strategies. Despite the general absence of comprehensive CVE strategies, interreligious dialogue is a significant policy goal for several States.

Asia

Pacific Islands

(Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu)

42. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Seven of 12 States have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. Four others have generic provisions that could be used for the same purpose.

43. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions of most States of this subregion appear to pose little risk of application in violation of the right to freedom of expression. Several States expressly exclude non-violent acts of advocacy or protest from their definitions of terrorist acts and terrorist incitement. A few States, however, have provisions that are vague or overbroad and could raise human rights issues.

44. ***International cooperation; border control:*** There are few provisions in the subregion on denial of safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and maintaining effective border control in that respect.

45. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** There are no comprehensive programmes or policies in this subregion specifically aimed at preventing incitement or countering violent extremism conducive to terrorism. This is undoubtedly due to the generally low threat level and limited resources of States of the subregion.

South-East Asia

(Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Timor-Leste, Thailand, Viet Nam)

46. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Eight of 11 States have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. Three others do not appear to have introduced provisions that are readily applicable to terrorist incitement.

47. ***Freedom of expression:*** Several States have introduced vague or unclear definitions of incitement or terrorist acts, which create a risk that they could be used against communication that deserves protection under international human rights law. At least one State provides for the possible application of the death penalty for incitement, which appears severely disproportionate and could threaten the right to life.

48. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Most States of this subregion face challenges in denying safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement. Effective border security in this respect is also a challenge, in part due to the subregion's lengthy maritime borders. A few States, however, have relatively strong border-control regimes.

49. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** A few States have established CVE programmes, including with an emphasis on partnerships with CSOs, women and youth groups, and other non-governmental partners. However, most States of this subregion have not established CVE programmes. Those States with such programmes have also

introduced mechanisms to enhance interreligious dialogue. One State has supported multicultural youth camps aimed at enhancing dialogue and understanding, acting in partnership with CSOs. However, mistrust between Governments and CSOs and relevant human rights concerns create certain challenges in this subregion. One State supports a think tank that is an international leader in analysing and promoting effective counternarratives.

Regional spotlight: Philippines

During its 2019 assessment visit to the Philippines, the Committee learned about the country's National Action Plan on Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism (NAP/PCVE). Adopted earlier that year, the NAP/PCVE reflected the stated commitment of the Government of the Philippines to address the threat of violent extremism leading to terrorism through a comprehensive, whole-of-Government approach and through partnerships with non-governmental actors, including CSOs, academic experts, faith-based organizations and local communities. The NAP/PCVE was adopted following consultations with a range of government and non-governmental stakeholders.

One of the main aims of the NAP/PCVE is to develop innovative approaches to the local "push-and-pull" factors that may be conducive to violent extremism leading to terrorism. Intervention programmes are led by the Department of the Interior and Local Government but are based on a multi-sectoral approach. During its visit, the Committee learned of the Government's commitment to maintaining transparency in the implementation process. All relevant government departments, offices and agencies are encouraged to develop partnerships with CSOs, religious leaders and other stakeholders in implementing relevant projects through a "whole-of-nation" approach. Development of the NAP/PCVE included a strong gender element, which continues to be a key focus (with support being provided by UN-Women).

South Asia

(Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka)

50. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Four States have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. Three others have generic provisions that could be applied against incitement.

51. ***Freedom of expression:*** Most States of the subregion have definitions of incitement or terrorism that appear to be vague or overbroad. This creates a risk that anti-incitement provisions could be used against conduct deserving of protection under international human rights law (e.g.,

human rights advocacy or the peaceful expression of contrary political views). The use of vague terms such as "instigate" and "encourage" is also a cause of concern.

52. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Most States of this subregion have significant gaps in their measures to deny safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and to effectively control their borders against entry by such persons.

53. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** Several States have established formal CVE programmes or policies that include commitments to engaging with CSOs, youth groups, academia and other non-governmental actors. However, there are significant levels of mistrust between Governments and CSOs in some States. Dedicated government departments of several national interior ministries work specifically on counter-extremism and counter-radicalization programmes. In one State, the ministries of information and culture have developed television and radio programming that challenge terrorist narratives, and they have encouraged private media to broadcast content with the same purpose.

54. Several States attach high importance to monitoring communication over the Internet and other ICTs to counter terrorism and violent extremism conducive to terrorism, but resources are generally scarce and there are human rights concerns relating to the identification, blocking and removal of some content. In some States, religious affairs ministries and cultural institutions actively oversee content of textbooks and classroom curriculums in religious schools and closely monitor religious messages. However, a major concern in several States is that many schools are unregistered and therefore unregulated. Several States have invested in strengthening youth resilience through educational and vocational training programmes. One State has established a council for cultural relations that is mandated to promote cultural exchanges with other States. Some States support counter-narratives and alternative narratives, including online, by law enforcement and intelligence agencies involving moderate elements from different religious communities, intellectuals and religious leaders. One State maintains an emergency response team to undertake immediate counter-measures to combat the growing use of cyber space for spreading communal hatred.

Central Asia and South Caucasus

(Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

55. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Six of eight States have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. Two others have laws that may be suitable for that purpose.

56. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions of some States of this subregion present possible concerns regarding respect for the right to freedom of expression. Those concerns are mainly linked to the use of vague or overbroad language and definitions, including such terms as "extremism" and "extremist activity" without expressly being linked to violence conducive to terrorism**,** or terrorism.

57. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Most States of this subregion appear to have relatively effective legal provisions aimed at denying safe haven to those credibly suspected of being guilty of incitement and maintaining effective border control in that respect.

58. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** There are some programmes aimed at preventing incitement and countering violent extremism conducive to terrorism in this subregion. At least four States have developed CVE programmes (managed primarily by education ministries) that include elements intended to strengthen critical thinking and the resilience of young people to violent extremism conducive to terrorism. Several States have supported the development of counternarratives through the production of films and other media outputs. One State has paid particular attention to enhancing the roles of women (including women who have returned from conflict zones) and youth in counternarrative campaigns. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) supports several related initiatives in the subregion.

59. In at least four States, national CVE programmes emphasize action at the community level. Several States support programmes aimed at strengthening intercultural understanding, including through structures that bring together people from different cultures for dialogue and experience-sharing. Some States seek to empower CSOs in the implementation of their CVE strategies, although there are significant levels of mistrust between Governments and civil society. The Governments of several States devote considerable resources to monitoring communication over the Internet and other ICTs, which could raise significant human rights issues.

Western Asia

(Bahrain, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Yemen)

60. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Five of 12 States have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. The others do not appear to have introduced specific legislation in this area, but at least three have generic provisions that could likely be used against terrorist incitement.

61. ***Freedom of expression:*** In several States, anti-incitement provisions, combined with vague or overbroad national definitions of terrorist acts, create risks with respect to the right to

freedom of expression. Some States rely on vague concepts (e.g., "instigate", "subvert national principles", and "glorify") that could pose problems in this regard. The use of the death penalty in this subregion raises a serious concern that persons convicted of incitement under overbroad laws could be executed, in violation of the right to life.

62. ***International cooperation; border control:*** There is uneven progress in this subregion in adopting provisions to deny safe haven to persons who may be guilty of incitement. Border controls are also uneven. Some States have effective systems for these purposes, but others do not (whether because of lengthy unpopulated border regions or lack of government capacity).

63. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** Almost all States of this subregion devote significant resources to preventing incitement and CVE (although some States' programmes are more fully developed than others). Most States strictly control religious messaging in places of worship and the content of religious curriculums, through their religious affairs ministries. In some cases, religious sermons must be pre-approved. These and related measures raise issues concerning compliance with international human rights obligations and commitments, including the rights to freedom of religion and expression.

64. Two States are home to advanced centres of excellence established to analyse and counter terrorist narratives. Other States are engaged in countering terrorist narratives through messages broadcast over various media channels. At least one State promotes the role of women *(mourchidates)* in delivering religious guidance. In some States, former members of terrorist groups have been involved in developing counter-narratives. Some States implement comprehensive CVE policies that involve both governmental and non-governmental actors, including youth. Several States actively support initiatives to promote interreligious dialogue and understanding, at both the national and global levels. Most States apply rigorous oversight to communications over the Internet and other ICTs, sometimes raising significant human rights concerns.

East Asia

(China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, Mongolia, Republic of Korea)

65. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Four of five States have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts, and the fifth has generic provisions that could serve the same purpose.

66. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions introduced by States of this subregion raise possible issues concerning respect for the right to freedom of expression. This is mainly due to the use of vague or overbroad terms, which creates a risk that they could be used against speech deserving of protection under international human rights law.

67. ***International cooperation; border control:*** States of this subregion have varying levels of capacity to deny safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and maintain effective border controls in that respect. Some States have introduced relevant laws and have enhanced border security.

68. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** States of this subregion take different approaches to preventing incitement and countering violent extremism. Two States have strategies that are based upon whole-of-Government and whole-of-society involvement. These include roles for cultural, educational and religious institutions, media, and local communities in strengthening counter-terrorism publicity and education. One State has a legal provision stipulating that, to be effective, relevant measures must address both the symptoms and root causes of terrorism, using legal, cultural, educational and other means.

69. Some States also promote interfaith and intercultural dialogue, including to counter violent extremism conducive to terrorism. The law in one State declares that religious and non-religious citizens shall respect one another and co-exist in harmony. Religious leaders in some States have organized interfaith activities based on a declared commitment to respect for religious freedom and diversity. States generally implement strict oversight of communications over the Internet and ICTs, raising human rights concerns.

Latin America

Mexico and Central America

(Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama)

70. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Two of eight States have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. At least four others have generic prohibitions on incitement of criminal conduct, which could potentially be applied against terrorist incitement.

71. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions of at least four States of this subregion appear to be vague or overbroad. In at least one State, those concerns are linked to the use of the term “apologia”. Proposed anti-incitement legislation in one State was withdrawn on grounds that it was too broad.

72. ***International cooperation; border control:*** The legislation of most States of this subregion contains gaps with respect to denying safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and maintaining effective border controls in that respect.

73. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** There are few national projects or programmes aimed at countering violent extremism in this subregion, reflecting the relatively low risk level. Several States are pursuing initiatives to promote dialogue and understanding with indigenous communities. There are concerns in some States with respect to the human rights of persons working with CSOs.

Caribbean

(Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago)

74. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** At least nine of the 13 States of this subregion have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. Four others have generic provisions that could serve the same purpose.

75. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions of most States of this subregion appear to pose little risk of violation of the right to freedom of expression. A few States use vague terminology, such as "suggest", "instigate", and "glorify". Several States provide for severe penalties of 15 or even as much as 25 years' imprisonment for incitement. This could raise concerns with respect to proportionality.

76. ***International cooperation; border control:*** There are few provisions in place in this subregion aimed at denying safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and maintaining effective border control in that respect. This is likely due to the relatively low threat level.

77. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** Some States are moving toward the adoption of CVE-related policies. One State established a steering committee in 2018 to develop a CVE strategy that would form part of its national counter-terrorism strategy. Another finalized a draft CVE strategy in 2019. Some States have developed related programmes, based in part on outreach to community and civil society representatives and faith leaders, which include elements aimed supporting at-risk youth and countering online radicalization to terrorism.

78. Regional organizations are supporting relevant initiatives in this area. Several States participate in the "Champions for Change" programme of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), which is designed to build social resilience among primary school students and could serve to prevent terrorist recruitment in schools. A series of virtual dialogues has been organized in the subregion, under the leadership of the Inter-American Committee against Terrorism (CICTE), to raise awareness of the threat of violent extremism leading to

terrorism. CSOs have also participated in related events organized by the Commonwealth Secretariat's CVE Unit.

South America

(Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of))

79. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Two of the 12 States of this subregion criminalize incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. At least six others have generic incitement provisions that could be used for that purpose.

80. ***Freedom of expression:*** There are concerns that the anti-incitement provisions of several States of this subregion may be vague or overbroad. In respect of three States, concerns have been raised over the inclusion in relevant legislation of the term "apologia", which could lead to criminal sanctions violating the right to freedom of expression.

81. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Most States of this subregion have shortfalls with regard to denying safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and ensuring effective border security in that respect. However, more information is needed.

82. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** There are few initiatives in this subregion specifically aimed at countering incitement or violent extremism conducive to terrorism, likely due to the relatively low risk level. A couple of States support peacebuilding programmes that actively involve local communities and CSOs. Several States have also established programmes that promote enhanced dialogue and understanding with indigenous communities. Some States also support programmes of interfaith dialogue.

Regional spotlight: Peru

During its 2019 assessment visit, the Committee learned about Peru's national multi-sectoral approach to combating terrorism, which incorporates CVE-related elements. Led by the Ministry of the Interior, the development of the policy included consultations with 13 institutions and representatives of civil society. Those consultations led to the adoption of the National Multi-Sectoral Policy to Combat Terrorism, 2019-2023, which has three major objectives: (i) to reinforce a culture of peace in society; (ii) to restore the exercise of the rights of individuals affected by terrorism; and (iii) to neutralize terrorist acts and related national and transnational phenomena on the national territory, all under the umbrella of a holistic approach focused on prevention.

Peru's Multi-Sectoral Policy addresses the many structural issues (including poverty, discrimination and lack of development) that could represent conditions conducive to radicalization leading to terrorism. During its visit, the Committee learned that the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals were an important source of inspiration for the Policy, which also includes a rigorous monitoring and evaluation component. The Government considers that a commitment to tackling economic, social and cultural issues and other human rights concerns is an important part of its comprehensive approach to countering terrorism and violent extremism conducive to terrorism.

Europe and North America

Eastern Europe

(Belarus, Czechia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Ukraine)

83. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** All 11 States of this subregion have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts.

84. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions of some States of this subregion may pose a risk to the right to freedom of expression, due to vague or unclear terminology. In some States, the use of the term "extremism" is a potential issue of concern.

85. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Most States have effective measures in place for denying safe haven to those suspected of being guilty of incitement and maintaining effective border security in that respect.

86. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** Several States of this subregion have developed comprehensive programmes to counter violent extremism conducive to terrorism that are supported by inter-agency committees and other mechanisms, reflecting a whole-of-Government approach. These programmes emphasize active community engagement, including at the local level, and attention to local concerns and conditions that could be conducive to violent extremism leading to terrorism.

87. Several States of this subregion also pay close attention to countering forms of terrorism, including on the basis of xenophobia, racism and other forms of intolerance. These States implement programmes to enhance dialogue and understanding among different ethnic and religious populations on their territory and to support the integration of ethnic minorities. Some States use traditional media, including television and radio, to counter hate and disseminate

narratives to counter violent extremism conducive to terrorism. Several States exercise strict oversight over communications through the Internet and other forms of information technology, taking the position that this is in accordance with the call in Council resolution 1624 (2005) to take steps to prohibit and prevent incitement to commit acts of terrorism. Some of these measures raise concerns regarding the resolution's provision on compliance with States' obligations under international law.

Western Europe, North America and Other States

(Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States)

88. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Twenty-two of 30 States in this subregion have adopted legislation to prohibit by law incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. Eight other States have generic provisions on incitement or related criminal offences that would allow for prosecution of incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts.

89. ***Freedom of expression:*** The anti-incitement provisions of some States present possible issues with respect to the right to freedom of expression. Several States criminalize "apologie" for acts of terrorism. Council resolution 1624 (2005), in its preamble, repudiates attempts to commit such offences, stating that they may incite further terrorist acts. However, United Nations human rights mechanisms have expressed concern that legal provisions based on "apologie" may be overbroad, possibly allowing for punishment of expression that does not create an objective risk of incitement. Other concerns include the use of vague terms such as "promotion" and "terrorist purposes". One State has raised human rights concerns through its use of the concept of "reckless" incitement, thereby dispensing with strict *mens rea* requirements. Another State has raised significant concerns through its use of anti-incitement provisions against academics, human rights defenders and other civil society actors. Several States, however, have introduced clear definitions of the offence which also contain exclusion clauses specifying that acts of peaceful advocacy or protest cannot be considered acts of terrorism or incitement to commit terrorist acts.

90. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Most States of this subregion have effective measures in place with respect to denying safe haven to those credibly suspected of being guilty of incitement to commit terrorist acts and maintaining effective border security in that respect.

91. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** Many States of this subregion have developed comprehensive programmes to counter violent extremism conducive to terrorism and terrorist narratives. Most States have formally adopted national CVE strategies. Several States actively support programmes of community dialogue aimed at better

understanding local concerns. Some States also support enhanced interreligious dialogue and intercultural understanding.

92. Several States emphasize the importance of engaging with young people in schools to strengthen resilience to radicalization leading to terrorism. However, concerns have been raised that some of these programmes could stigmatize or target certain ethnic or religious populations and risk placing educators and other social service professionals in security roles. Several States actively support counternarrative efforts in partnership with CSOs, including with the involvement of individuals who have been rehabilitated and integrated and, in some cases, victims' associations. Some counternarrative programmes are directed towards persons who could be susceptible to incitement to commit terrorist acts based on xenophobia, racism and other forms of intolerance.

93. Several States support programmes to facilitate the integration of minority and immigrant populations into society, although concerns have been raised in some cases over possible stigmatization of certain communities. Some States invest resources in religious oversight programmes aimed at ensuring that religious and cultural institutions are not subverted by terrorists and their supporters. One State has established a programme in its religious affairs authority that monitors religious sermons and analyses the narratives disseminated by terrorist organization, in order to more effectively counter them. It also offers relevant training to religious and government officials of other States.

Regional spotlight: Australia

Australia (which was visited by the Committee in July 2018) has adopted a comprehensive and multi-layered approach to CVE under the coordination of the Department of Home Affairs (DHA). The National Counter-Terrorism Plan 2017 included a specific section on CVE in its chapter on "Prevention", with reference to three key objectives: (i) building resilience; (ii) supporting the diversion of individuals at risk; and (iii) rehabilitating and reintegrating violent extremist offenders. Those objectives were further developed at the Commonwealth-level through the adoption of a nationwide CVE programme for the period 2014-2018 entitled "Living Safe Together", which emphasized early intervention, community engagement, and addressing online radicalization. Elements of that programme continue to be implemented. The programme also encourages awareness-raising for frontline officials, including school leaders, law enforcement agents, and health workers, aimed at facilitating early intervention with respect to individuals at risk of becoming radicalized to violent extremism conducive to terrorism The Government uses a range of online and open media channels to provide information to the public on Australia's range of CVE strategies, policies, and programmes.

Related programmes developed at the state level are often underpinned by an evaluation framework and further reinforced by strategic communication activities. Specific programme

elements include: (i) the establishment of helpline and online support services called "Step Together", aimed at assisting members of the community who are seeking help with respect to vulnerable individuals; (ii) the provision of awareness-raising resources and specialist advice to schools; and (iii) the creation of dedicated teams working within law enforcement. One state government has created an office to promote community harmony and social cohesion through cooperation between government and civil society, focusing on community resilience, youth engagement, and conflict resolution. Another has adopted a multicultural policy statement and provides related funding aimed at reinforcing social cohesion and community resilience. A prominent CSO created to support multiculturalism has developed pioneering online tools to raise the awareness of service providers and community organizations on issues relating to violent extremism conducive to terrorism and terrorism.

South-East Europe

(Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia)

94. ***Prohibition of incitement of terrorist acts:*** Six of nine States have adopted legislation to prohibit incitement to commit a terrorist act or acts. The others have generic prohibitions on the incitement of criminal conduct.

95. ***Freedom of expression:*** Some States of this subregion appear to have well-defined anti-incitement provisions, but definitions in others appear to be vague or overbroad, creating a risk of human rights abuse.

96. ***International cooperation; border control:*** Most States of this subregion appear to have effective measures in place to safeguard their borders against those credibly suspected of being guilty of incitement. Others appear to lack relevant legislation. However, more information is needed.

97. ***Preventing incitement of terrorist acts; CVE and countering terrorist narratives:*** At least three States have adopted national CVE strategies, with implementing mechanisms to conduct research and promote interfaith understanding and assist in the reintegration of former FTFs. Several States pay close attention to vulnerable young populations and are implementing programmes to strengthen resilience in schools. Some States are investing resources in the promotion of dialogue and understanding among cultures, as well as measures to counter hate and xenophobia against immigrants and refugees. Several States emphasize the importance of engaging with faith leaders and CSOs (although, in some cases, civil society groups operate in insecure conditions). At least one State implements a media strategy and is developing counternarratives against intolerance through a department of interreligious dialogue.