

Periodic data collection on the migration situation in the EU

February Highlights

(1 December 2017 to 31 January 2018)

Contents

Key fundamental rights concerns.....	2
Situation at the border	3
Asylum procedure.....	5
Return procedure.....	7
Reception.....	8
Child protection.....	11
Immigration detention.....	14
Legal, social and policy responses.....	15
Hate speech and violent crime.....	19
Stakeholders interviewed in January 2018	21

DISCLAIMER: The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) commissioned these reports under contract. The content was prepared by FRA’s contracted research network, FRANET. The reports contain descriptive data that were based mainly on interviews, and do not include analyses or conclusions. They are made publicly available for information and transparency purposes only, and do not constitute legal advice or legal opinion. The reports do not necessarily reflect the views or official position of FRA.

Throughout the text, hyperlinks are embedded to sources of information that are available in the public domain.

In view of the increasing numbers of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants entering the EU, the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights has been collecting relevant data since November 2015. These focus on the fundamental rights situation of people arriving in Member States particularly affected by large migration movements. The countries covered are: Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain and Sweden. This report addresses fundamental rights concerns between 1 December 2017 and 31 January 2018.

Key fundamental rights concerns

Key emerging fundamental rights concerns

In harsh winter conditions including heavy snowfall, an increasing number of people in need of protection crossed from **Italy** to **France** via a new route across the mountains in the Region of Piedmont to reach [Briançon](#). The municipality of Bardonecchia in Italy set up an emergency night shelter at the railway station, where volunteers provided basic medical assistance and warned migrants about the risks of the journey.

At the end of January, authorities in **Hungary** reduced the daily cap on people admitted into the transit zones – which FRA visited in December – from ten persons to only two (one in each transit zone), [NGOs](#) reported and the [Prime Minister's Office](#) confirmed. This may result in even longer waiting periods – up to years – for people stranded in Serbia.

In the **Netherlands**, [long waiting periods for family reunification](#) emerged as an issue. Applications were examined over an average of 319 days, instead of the six-month period prescribed by law. According to [media reports](#), despite a backlog, the Ministry of Security and Justice reduced the staff working on these cases in September 2017; 6,600 applications were pending in December 2017.

Key persisting fundamental rights concerns

One year after **Italy** and Libya signed an agreement on migration and border control, [Médecins Sans Frontières](#) and other NGOs voiced concerns about its implementation given the critical conditions for migrants in Libya.

In the **Greek** hotspots in Lesbos, Samos and Chios, progress has been made in terms of preparing [overcrowded](#) Reception and Identification Centres for winter and increasing their capacity, but not sufficiently so. In [a joint statement](#), 12 humanitarian NGOs criticised the slow transfer of asylum seekers to the mainland. More than 3,800 asylum seekers eligible for family reunification under the Dublin Regulation have been waiting for over six months to depart for Germany, as reported by the Ecumenical Refugee Program of the Church of Greece.

In **Hungary**, police continued to escort all migrants in an irregular situation apprehended in the country to the [outer side](#) of the border fence, without

fingerprinting or registering them. Xenophobic attitudes persisted, although most citizens have never met asylum seekers or irregular migrants. For example, locals of [Cegléd](#) called the police when an Arab tourist group travelled through their town. In Szekszárd, the [mayor claimed](#) that “somebody is making preparations to help migrants settle in town”.

In **Croatia**, allegations of [pushbacks](#) at the border continued. According to the Croatian Law Center, other concerns relate to long asylum procedures (which can take more than a year), the complex procedure for family reunification, a lack of appropriate reception conditions for vulnerable groups, and gaps in the guardianship system for unaccompanied children.

According to the State Agency for Refugees, **Bulgarian** municipalities remained reluctant to integrate persons granted international protection. The State Agency for Refugees also reported that unaccompanied children were still not adequately represented and did not receive the support needed. The [new legal rules](#) on the representation of unaccompanied children who have not applied for international protection or whose applications were rejected will enter into force in June 2018.

Poland continued to refuse entry to asylum seekers at the Terespol and Medyka land border crossing points. In December 2017, only 100 people lodged asylum claims, according to the Headquarters of the Border Guard – the lowest monthly figure in 2017. Furthermore, due to poorly functioning procedures to identify and refer asylum seekers and other migrants who had been victims of violence, many of them continued to end up in detention, although this is prohibited by [Polish law](#).

The two-year suspension of family reunification for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection in **Germany** will be prolonged until July 2018. According to the [proposed coalition agreement](#) between the conservative Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Social Democratic Party (SPD), as of August 2018, every month, 1,000 family members of beneficiaries of subsidiary protection will be admitted for family reunification. The criteria for the selection process are unclear, according to [media reports](#).

The situation of asylum seekers and irregular migrants in **France** deteriorated. The Public Defender of Rights [criticised](#) the general climate of suspicion towards foreigners. Tensions between migrants and law enforcement authorities in the informal camps in northern France remained high, which led to a number of serious incidents, the NGO ‘Service centre for the migrants in Calais’ reported.

The situation of people arriving irregularly in **Spain** by sea remained critical. According to the [Ministry of Interior](#), this concerned more than 22,100 people in 2017 – almost triple the number of that in 2016. According to [media reports](#) and the [Spanish Refugee Aid Commission](#), some 223 people died last year and 75 have already lost their lives trying to cross the Mediterranean Sea to reach Spain this year. According to the Jesuit Migrant Service, UNHCR, the Spanish Ombudsman and the Spanish Refugee Aid Commission, newcomers faced difficulties in accessing the asylum procedure. Furthermore, the identification

and treatment of vulnerable people, such as children, women or victims of trafficking, was inappropriate.

The [law](#) in **Sweden** imposing temporary restrictions on granting residence permits to refugees and limiting family reunification affects the mental health of the persons concerned, and their ability to integrate into society, according to the National Board of Health and Welfare and several NGOs. Several NGOs pointed out further persisting concerns. These included returning to Afghanistan unaccompanied children and young adults who have had their age re-registered or who turned 18 before receiving their negative asylum decision. Similarly, the police reported that the increasing number of migrants who stay in the country in an irregular situation after their asylum claims have been rejected remained a major concern.

In **Finland**, inadequate mental health services at the reception centres due to a lack of resources was a key persistent problem.

Authorities in **Denmark** continued to withdraw, and refused to renew, residence permits of Somalis granted asylum because Denmark considers Somalia to be a safe return destination, which was criticised by civil society organisations and experts.

In the **Netherlands**, authorities continued to grant hardly any residence permits under the children's amnesty procedure ([Kinderpardon](#)), according to the Dutch Council for Refugees. This procedure foresees granting, under certain conditions, residence permits to children whose asylum claims have been rejected and who have lived in the country for at least five years. In December, a group of famous Dutch persons launched a [campaign](#) calling for a more lenient implementation of the procedure.

Situation at the border

Austria, Denmark, France, Germany and **Sweden** plan to maintain internal [border controls](#) until April or May 2018.

The **Hungarian** police prevented 1,061 people from crossing the border into Hungary in December and January, the National Headquarters of the Police reported. This was a significant decrease from the previous monthly figures (1,114 people in November 2017 alone). This involved people who attempted to enter Hungary in an irregular manner, most frequently through the fence alongside the border with Serbia, and who were apprehended either by the police or the army.

According to the Ombudsperson and [UNHCR](#), **Croatian** police continued to force asylum seekers back to Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, in some cases using violence, without giving them an opportunity to lodge claims for international protection. For example, a Syrian national who had allegedly been subject to abuse and sexual exploitation was pushed back to Bosnia and Herzegovina although the police was informed about his vulnerability, the Croatian Law Center reported. A 6-year-old Afghani girl, who had already applied for asylum with her family in Croatia, [lost her life](#) after a train hit her at the border between Croatia and Serbia. According to [media reports](#), the police had allegedly instructed the family to follow the railroad tracks back to Serbia, instead of processing the asylum application.

The situation along the French-Italian border (especially in the Department Alpes-Maritimes) remained problematic. Authorities in **France** continued to send several migrants back to Italy without a formal decision and denied them the possibility to apply for asylum, the NGOs ANAFE and GISTI reported. This practice has increasingly pushed migrants seeking safety to take risks, as a result of which two deadly accidents were reported (one in [Roquebrune-Cape-Martin](#) and one in [Menton](#)).

Asylum procedure

Trends

According to [EASO](#), in 2017, the overall number of asylum applications in the EU+ countries (28 EU Member States plus Norway and Switzerland) decreased by 43 % compared to 2016. At the same time, applications for international protection [increased](#) in **France, Greece, Italy** and **Spain** over the last year, although in December asylum applications in Italy dropped to some 5,220 (compared to some 8,495 in November and 9,900 in October), according to [Eurostat](#). In **Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Poland** and **Sweden** [numbers in December continued to decrease](#).

France registered a historical record number of asylum applications in 2017 (more than 100,000 claims), which represents a 17 % increase compared to 2016, according to the French asylum authority (OFPRA). To process the exceptionally high number of asylum applications and to reduce the backlog,

the authorities resorted to accelerated asylum procedures in roughly [one third](#) of all cases.

In **Spain**, the number of asylum applicants continued to rise. In October 2017, [the number of applications for asylum in 2017](#) had already increased by 64 % (25,845) compared to the [previous year](#) (15,755).

In the **Netherlands**, the total number of asylum applications remained at a similar level in 2017 compared to 2016. However, there was a slight increase in December 2017.

Access to asylum procedures

The **Italian** [Legal Network for Transiting Migrants](#) published a report about difficulties asylum seekers faced when applying for protection between April and October 2017. According to the report, police officers at the Police Headquarters in Rome required proof of stay to register applications. The Police Headquarters only accepted some 20 applications per day, sometimes selecting applicants based on their nationality.

In **Croatia**, the asylum procedure can take more than one year and there is a lack of sufficiently qualified interpreters, the Croatian Law Center reported. The competent department of the Ministry of Interior underwent structural changes that led to a decrease in the quality of the asylum procedure. According to the Croatian Law Center, many negative decisions provided only general copy-pasted reasons for the rejection without assessing the individual case. The Croatian Law Center, an institution sponsored by UNHCR Croatia, is the only institution in the country providing support to newcomers in accessing international protection. In December 2017, only three persons contacted them and sought information (none did so in January 2018). However, they did not apply for asylum in the end, as they were allegedly afraid to go to the police to do so.

The authorities in **Hungary** continued to decide on the admission of asylum seekers stranded in Serbia to the transit zones on the basis of so-called "[waiting lists](#)". These are compiled by the Serbian Commissariat for Refugees, in cooperation with volunteering community leaders. Currently one person is [admitted](#) to each transit zone per day.

In **Bulgaria**, the State Agency for Refugees stated that they continued to experience difficulties in recruiting qualified interpreters for Kurdish, Arabic, Persian and Dari languages.

In **Poland**, no systematic legal assistance was provided to asylum seekers in detention centres and open reception facilities due to the continuing lack of funding, as several NGOs pointed out. (The Polish authorities have not announced calls under the EU Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund for a while.)

The **Austrian** Ombudsmen Board reported a significant drop in complaints against the duration of asylum procedures. At the same time, as the NGO Caritas Vienna reported, the quality of interviews at the Federal Office for

Alien Matters and Asylum (first instance authority in asylum proceedings) declined, as caseworkers felt pressure to conduct a minimum number of interviews per week.

NGOs continued to note significant delays ([three months](#) on average) in accessing the asylum procedure in **France**, particularly in certain departments. The Ministry of the Interior issued a [circular](#) to reduce the waiting period to lodge an asylum application to 10 days by mid-2018, and then to three days by the end of the year.

Asylum seekers in **Spain** faced different challenges in accessing the asylum system. For example, authorities did not sufficiently inform newly arriving migrants about their possibility to apply for asylum, in particular in Ceuta and Melilla, according to a [report of the Spanish Refugee Aid Commission](#).

The staff of the **Swedish** Migration Agency [voiced criticism](#) of several shortcomings related to the asylum procedure. The procedure was described as neither legally secure, uniform or predictable, nor sustainable due to, among others, the lack of support and training offered to the staff.

The Refugee Advice Center in **Finland** was particularly concerned about the lack of adequate legal aid services, especially for asylum seekers who lodged subsequent asylum applications.

Relocation and resettlement

As of January 2018, 21,726 asylum seekers had been [relocated](#) from **Greece** to other EU Member States, mainly to Germany, France, the Netherlands and Sweden. Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta and Sweden, as well as Norway, Switzerland and Ireland have fully complied with their obligations under the temporary relocation scheme, according to the [Greek government and the International Organization for Migration](#).

Asylum seekers in **Italy** complained about not receiving information regarding their relocation eligibility, as the [Legal Network for Transiting Migrants](#) reported.

Due to the delayed formation of a government, **Germany** has not yet offered places for the [resettlement of refugees](#) from UNHCR camps in North Africa and the Middle East in 2018. **France** announced intentions to resettle some 10,000, and **Sweden** some 8,750 people, from these camps.

In December 2017, the [Ministry of the Interior](#) confirmed that **Finland** would receive Syrian refugees from Turkey and Congolese refugees from Zambia under its refugee quota of 750 persons for 2018.

[Return procedure](#)

Returns to Afghanistan continued at least from **Austria, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden**.

In **Hungary**, rejected asylum seekers subject to return decisions either remained in the transit zones or were transferred to closed detention centres pending their removal, the Ministry of Interior stated.

According to the Ombudspersons Office, police stations at the Eastern border of **Croatia** recorded only some 150 asylum applications, while 1,100 persons were returned to Serbia or Bosnia and Herzegovina. All decisions on expulsion had the same non-individualised wording. As no interpreter was available, procedures were held in English.

The forced return of a well-integrated Chechen family triggered significant [media attention](#) in **Austria**. The family had applied for asylum in Austria in 2011, received a final negative decision in 2015, and applied for residence on humanitarian grounds, which was still pending at the time of the removal. A number of supporters protested for the family's right to stay, and over 3,700 people signed an [online-petition](#) but could not prevent the removal.

In **Sweden**, Save the Children and the Swedish Red Cross voiced concerns about the lack of individualised assessments of the situation of individuals if returned. As of 1 January 2018, a [new legislative amendment designated](#) the Swedish Migration Agency as the entity carrying out the forced return monitoring under the Return Directive ([Directive 2008/115/EC](#)). As the Swedish Migration Agency is also responsible for issuing return decisions, it remains to be seen whether this arrangement will be compatible with the requirement of an "effective" forced return monitoring system under the Return Directive.

The asylum centre in Avnstrup, **Denmark** will be converted into a [return centre](#) for rejected asylum seekers, with the aim to speed up the return procedure.

Dutch authorities [deported](#) a rejected asylum seeker to Sudan, not applying an [unofficial moratorium](#) on deportations to Sudan, which had lasted for more than three years. According to [media reports](#), the deported person was allegedly detained for hours immediately after arriving in Sudan, and is obliged to report to the headquarters of the security apparatus in Khartoum on a daily basis. Dozens of Sudanese and Dutch activists [protested](#) against deportations to Sudan.

Reception

Reception capacity

Sufficient reception capacity was available in **Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Netherlands, Poland** and **Sweden**.

Reception capacity remained inadequate in **France, Greece** and in parts of **Italy** and **Spain**.

Reception capacity in **France** has been [increased](#) to 80,000 places, and the Ministry of the Interior intends to further expand the overall capacity by 7,500 additional places by 2019. However, overall reception capacity still remained insufficient, as close to 110,000 asylum applicants remained in need of accommodation, GISTI and [La Cimade](#) reported. Authorities continued to take – sometimes violent – evacuation measures against reappearing informal camps in the north of France (at Calais and Grande-Synthe, with several hundreds of people living there), NGOs reported.

On the **Greek** islands, the Reception and Identification Centres in the hotspots of Lesbos, Samos and Chios remained [overcrowded](#) and continued to face difficulties in hosting new arrivals.

The Italian [Legal Network for Transiting Migrants](#) reported that there was insufficient reception capacity in Rome in 2017, which resulted in many people staying on the streets. According to the [Italian Chamber of Deputies' Inquiry Commission on the Reception, Identification, and Expulsion System](#), the main problem with reception in **Italy** was, however, not the capacity of the facilities but the fact that people had to stay in the Extraordinary Reception Centres (*Centri di Accoglienza Straordinaria* - CAS) coordinated by local prefectures instead of the local reception centres in the framework of the Protection System for Asylum Seekers and Refugees (SPRAR) network. CAS centres are generally located in the outskirts of the cities, with poor connections to local society and generally hosting high numbers of asylum seekers; these centres include former military facilities. By contrast, SPRAR centres are smaller, managed by local stakeholders and more connected to the local community.

Reception facilities in **Spain** remained overcrowded, according to the Chair of Refugees and Forced Migrants of Comillas.

Reception conditions

Reception conditions in the hotspots of Pozzallo and Taranto, **Italy**, [slightly improved](#), but key concerns persist. For example, in Pozzallo, more places and a playroom were built, hot water and toilets were restored, and the food was improved. The hotspot of Taranto still consisted of tents, in which people stayed on average well beyond 72 hours, the Senate Commission reported. In Lampedusa, reception conditions were still unsatisfactory: compounds and toilets were run-down, and there were no common areas, such as dining rooms or play areas for children. A positive development was the presence of

a representative of the [National Institute for Health, Migration and Poverty](#) in the hotspots, applying a multidisciplinary approach for age assessments of children.

In **Greece**, in the hotspots on the islands of Chios and Samos, several people – including families with very small children – were living in tents without heating and faced harsh weather conditions. [Protests](#) against inadequate reception conditions took place in the Reception and Identification Centre in Lesbos and Chios, leaving several injured. In Chios, [residents blocked](#) the government's efforts to expand the Reception and Identification Centre with additional prefabricated housing units.

Reception and integration services for some 40 persons who were resettled in Zadar, **Croatia** were insufficient, according to the Jesuit Refugee Service.

The **French** Ministry of the Interior issued a [circular](#) aiming to check the legal status of foreigners staying in emergency accommodation and identify those in an irregular situation. The Public Defender of Rights [condemned](#) this new practice, underlining that the only criteria to provide emergency accommodation is the vulnerability of the persons concerned, regardless of their legal or migratory status. Civil society organisations filed court actions to have the circular annulled, according to GISTI.

Asylum seekers in **Spain** had no place to stay until they formally registered their asylum claim; it can take up to five months to get an appointment at the Asylum and Refugee Office, according to the NGO *La Merced Migraciones*. The Ministry of the Interior discontinued the use of Archidona, a newly built prison, as a pre-removal facility after the Spanish Ombudsman and others questioned the prison-like [conditions of the centre](#) and started investigations into alleged suicide by one of the inmates.

Vulnerable persons

In **Greece**, the NGO *Médecins Sans Frontières* (MSF) opened a [mobile clinic](#) in Moria (Lesvos) for pregnant women and children under 16 years of age, to provide primary health care and treat cold weather-related diseases among the most vulnerable population. MSF [announced](#) that they would also increase access to mental health care in Lesbos in response to the growing needs.

In some cases, vulnerable people (e.g. persons with disabilities, pregnant women, and the elderly) initially admitted to the **Hungarian** transit zones were transferred to open reception centres. However, authorities continued to seemingly randomly select those who may leave the transit zone to be placed in open facilities, UNHCR reported.

Reception centres in **Croatia** did not respect procedural and reception guarantees for vulnerable people as prescribed by law, the Croatian Law Center stated. No identification procedures, interpreters or specialised support services for victims of torture, trauma or human trafficking, people with mental health problems or addictions were available, according to the Centre for Peace Studies. Asylum seekers in need of a psychiatrist were referred to a remote hospital and when asylum seekers attempted suicide, they were

hospitalised for one or two days and then returned to the Reception Centre without any further support, according to the Society for Psychological Assistance.

The **Bulgarian** Ombudsperson reported that there was still a shortage of qualified psychologists to support vulnerable persons. Some reception centres were still lacking accessible infrastructure for persons with disabilities. According to the State Agency for Refugees, specialised care facilities and support services for victims of torture or trauma remained unavailable.

In **Finland**, the number of registered self-harm cases has more than doubled compared to 2016, from 140 to over 300 cases, according to a media report in the *Helsingin Sanomat*. Some 35–40 % of the cases have been registered as attempted suicides, 50 % as self-inflicted violence, and 10 % as threats of self-injury.

Child protection

Figures and trends

As of 31 December 2017, according to the [National Centre for Social Solidarity](#), some 3,350 unaccompanied children were estimated to be in **Greece**. A total of 2,290 were on waiting lists for appropriate shelter. Some of them remained in completely inadequate facilities, including 438 in Reception and Identification Centres (hotspots) and 54 in protective custody – not considered adequate accommodation for children. The total number of available places for unaccompanied children in all of Greece was 1,101 at year's end. These figures demonstrate a persisting protection gap over the past months.

By 31 January, 407 unaccompanied children had arrived in **Italy** in 2018, according to the [Ministry of the Interior](#).

Reception

According to [media reports](#), many children in Ventimiglia, **Italy** lacked adequate accommodation – living in informal camps in appalling conditions or hosted in the local reception centre together with adult asylum seekers. In Sicily, the NGO '*Terres des Hommes*' [reported](#) that some children who arrived from Libya in extremely poor psychological and physical condition had to wait up to 13 months in local first reception centres before being transferred to child-specific reception centres.

A lack of specialised facilities and translators were the main fundamental rights concerns regarding unaccompanied children in **Croatia**, according to the Ombudsperson's Office. Access to education significantly improved when the authorities made it possible for children without Personal Identification Numbers (PIN/OIB) to formally enrol in schools.

Despite the decreasing numbers of unaccompanied children in **Germany**, the quality of accommodation and care still needed improvement, especially in the

field of child care and in the assistance for young adults, according to a [survey of the Federal Association for Unaccompanied Minor Refugees](#).

Inadequacies in child protection persisted in **France**. These include limited resources, not allowing support to be provided to all children; the lack of accommodation for some; and the often insufficient support received from guardians, the Public Defender of Rights pointed out. Ending child protection support when a child turns 18 can cause hardship and create feelings of hopelessness. In an extreme case, a young migrant in Paris [committed suicide](#) when he stopped receiving child welfare support after his 18th birthday.

In **Sweden**, the housing provided for unaccompanied children has been converted into a new type of accommodation called 'supported housing' in many municipalities. However, it does not provide the same support and supervision from qualified staff, the National Board of Health and Welfare pointed out. In addition, it remained difficult to find adequate housing for girls and to meet their special needs.

Guardianship for unaccompanied children

In **Hungary**, the authorities continued to assign child protection guardians only to unaccompanied children under the age of 14, who are placed in a children's home. Unaccompanied children over 14 were still placed in the Röszke transit zone until their asylum claims are decided upon, FRA observed. They are [considered](#) to have full legal capacity, so only have a formal representative for the asylum procedure, as FRA found during its visit to the transit zones.

In **Croatia**, sufficient guardians were available for all unaccompanied children. In 2017, the Social Welfare Centre appointed some 480 special guardians for 334 unaccompanied children, according to the Ministry of Demography, Family, Youth and Social Policy. However, many of the guardians lacked professional qualifications, according to the Ombudsperson Office for Children. To address these gaps, the Croatian Law Centre gives advice and training for special guardians as part of the project "Together in protection of unaccompanied children", which started in November 2017 and will last until December 2018.

Safeguards and specific support measures

In **Italy**, the [Authority for the protection of detained people](#) recommended applying a multi-disciplinary approach to age assessments of unaccompanied migrant children. This involves methods besides only x-raying the wrist to avoid unlawful returns of children due to a wrong assessment.

The Ombudsperson Office in **Croatia** urged the Ministry of the Interior to investigate allegations made against the Croatian police, who were said to have turned back children at borders without letting them claim asylum.

On 22 January 2018, the Administrative Court of Nice (**France**) delivered a [ruling](#) condemning the summary return of a 12-year-old Eritrean unaccompanied migrant child to Italy (Ventimiglia). Given that the return was

implemented in breach of French law, the court required the French authorities to contact their Italian counterparts for the issuance, within three days, of the necessary travel documents allowing the child to return to France. The court also called on the French authorities to promptly appoint a guardian and to provide the child with all the necessary information about the possibility to apply for international protection.

In **Greece**, the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights, in cooperation with the European Asylum Support Office, provided [capacity building](#) training for child protection staff of the Reception and Identification Service in December 2017 and January 2018 in all hotspots, with the exception of Leros. The training addressed practical challenges for the protection of unaccompanied children in hotspots. These challenges include age assessment, missing children, reception conditions, guardianship and accessing schools. The Greek government [announced](#) an imminent language and cultural education training programme for children of 15-18 years of age, covering 5,000 people in total this year. These children will first undertake fast-track language courses for a smoother transition into formal education.

Age assessments remained of poor quality in the **Hungarian** transit zones. These continued to be very short and superficial (focusing on the wisdom teeth and the maturity of the body), and the benefit of the doubt has not been applied, NGOs reported. Children placed in the transit zones have had access to basic education (mainly Hungarian and English language courses) since mid-September 2017, according to the Office of Immigration and Asylum. Theoretically, all children under 16 years of age [are obliged](#) to go to school. However, the asylum authorities have not actually enforced this, civil society organisations reported.

According to Caritas **Bulgaria**, the Ministry of Education and Science (*Министерство на образованието и науката*) approved a new training [curriculum](#) for children, which will provide additional Bulgarian language classes for asylum-seeking children and children granted international protection in school. NGOs continued to organise educational and recreational activities.

According to a [survey of the Federal Association for Unaccompanied Minor Refugees](#), 58 % of professionals working with unaccompanied children in **Germany** said that children often or always reported having suffered maltreatment, force and abuse in their countries of origin and on their transit routes to the EU.

The **Spanish** Ombudsman started to investigate the death of two children in child reception centres in Melilla, according to [media reports](#). One of the boys was seventeen years old and had allegedly suffered several incidents of cardiorespiratory arrest.

The National Board of Health and Welfare and Amnesty International reported that, in **Sweden**, although the asylum authorities are obliged to carry out an overall assessment of the unaccompanied child's situation in each individual case, the views of the social services who were in daily contact with the

children were not taken into consideration in the decision-making process. The methods used for medical age assessments, carried out by the National Board of Forensic Medicine, remained unchanged and thus problematic, NGOs reported.

According to the **Danish** Refugee Council, authorities did not process the asylum application of some 30 unaccompanied children as they did not consider them mature enough for the asylum procedure. The authorities would also not grant them a residence permit as unaccompanied children because they still had family in their countries of origin. The Danish Immigration Service eventually reassessed the intellectual maturity of several of the children and granted asylum to four who were considered mature enough.

In the **Netherlands**, the State Secretary for Justice and Security [rejected](#) the Mayor of Amersfoort's appeal regarding the return of a five-year-old boy with Down's syndrome to Iraq. The State Secretary for Justice and Security decided not to use its discretionary powers to issue a residence permit to the child and his family.

Missing children

Between 1 December 2017 and 21 January 2018, 33 children went missing during the asylum procedure in **Denmark**, according to the Danish Immigration Service.

In **Sweden**, 1,353 unaccompanied children went missing in 2017; and 191 did so during the reporting period, according to Save the Children. Authorities have made few efforts to reduce this number or to trace missing children, NGOs pointed out.

Practical and legal challenges to family reunification in **Germany** were among the main reasons for unaccompanied children to "disappear", as they planned to look for their relatives on their own, according to a [survey](#).

In **Spain**, the [Ministry of the Interior](#) reported 2,341 complaints about missing children in 2017, of whom approximately 85 % were foreigners.

Immigration detention

In early January 2018, seven **Italian** NGOs – including the Italian Refugees Council – started implementing [five cooperation projects in Libya](#), funded with some two million Euro by the Ministry of the Interior. The NGOs will provide assistance and support to detained migrants and training for Libyan staff employed in three detention centres in Libya.

The total number of people held in pre-removal detention in **Greece** was 4,360 (including 78 unaccompanied children as of the end of December 2017), according to the data of the Hellenic Police Headquarters. As reported by the NGO "ARSIS", there has been a rise in the number of children held in pre-removal detention in Greece, and the length of their detention has also increased (with an average detention time between one and two-and-a-half months). Some of these children were held for a long time at the Korinthos

pre-departure centre and police stations before being sent to the Amygdaleza facility, where conditions were reportedly very poor.

In **Hungary**, pre-removal detention was ordered against 49 people, while asylum detention was ordered against only one single man, according to the Office of Immigration and Asylum and the National Headquarters of the Police.

During the reporting period in **Croatia**, 40 immigrants were detained, including a girl who had been a trafficking victim. She was detained for five weeks before being transferred to the Centre for missing and abused children, according to the Jesuit Refugee Service.

In **Bulgaria**, 229 persons were placed in pre-removal detention, the majority coming from Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq and Syria, the Ministry of the Interior stated. The detention facility in Elhovo was closed due to poor living conditions and lack of funding. Therefore, the overall capacity of detention facilities decreased from 940 to 700 places, according to the Ministry of the Interior.

The Children's Rights Ombudsman in **Poland** announced intentions to [start investigations](#) concerning immigration detention of children and the practical impact of recent legislative amendments relating to migrant children, including detention conditions. Some improvements have been made in the Kętrzyn detention facility (for families with children and persons with disabilities), where the window bars were removed and 'safe windows' were installed, the Headquarters of the Border Guard stated.

Regional courts in Poland continued to fail to apply the principle of the best interests of the child when deciding on placing children in detention (either in the pre-removal or the asylum contexts) or prolonging their deprivation of liberty, even though this is expressly stipulated in Polish law, several NGOs reported.

According to the Joint Centre for Return Support, several federal states in **Germany** planned to build new immigration detention centres – in addition to the already nationwide existing 419 facilities for deportation custody (*Ausreisegewahrsam*) and deportation detention (*Abschiebehaft*).

In **France**, immigration detention largely remained prevalent, leading to the widespread pre-removal detention (up to 48 hours) of children with families. According to the Public Defender of Rights, 275 children were placed in detention in mainland France in 2017, compared to 182 in 2016. The NGO *La Cimade* reported that judges (e.g. courts in Toulouse and Bastia) increasingly resort to video-hearings when deciding on the legality or prolongation of immigration detention. This might raise issues regarding the right to fair trial, of which a public hearing is an essential component, the Public Defender of Rights pointed out.

The [Spanish Refugee Aid Commission](#) alleged that immigration detention is increasingly used in a systematic way in **Spain** – and not always as a measure of last resort but for the purpose of deterrence.

According to the Swedish police and the Red Cross, pre-removal detention facilities in **Sweden** were stretched to the maximum of their capacity, where access to health care and the lack of information about the reasons and the rules of detention remained issues of concern.

The National Preventive Mechanism published its annual [review](#) of detention conditions and treatment of detainees in the **Netherlands**. It found that persons in immigration detention were generally cared for in an adequate and conscientious manner. In December 2017, a second centre with extra supervision was [opened](#) in Hoogeveen for asylum seekers who caused disturbances in regular reception centres.

Legal, social and policy responses

Legal developments

Case law

During the reporting period, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) and the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) decided on a number of cases relating to asylum, immigration detention, returns and visas.

Court of Justice of the European Union

Following a request for a preliminary ruling by a **Finnish** Supreme Administrative Court, the CJEU [clarified](#) how the consultation procedure in cases where a return decision accompanied by an entry ban is issued to a third-country national, who holds a valid residence permit issued by another Member State, should be initiated and under which conditions the return decision and entry ban can be enforced.

In a preliminary ruling requested by **Germany**, the CJEU [explained](#) how the Dublin Regulation must be interpreted if a person, transferred under the Dublin Regulation from one Member State to another (the responsible) Member State, returns to the first Member State without a residence permit and the Member State wants to transfer the person anew.

The CJEU [ruled](#), in a preliminary ruling requested by a **Hungarian** court, that the Qualification Directive (Directive [2011/95/EU](#)), read in the light of the right to respect for private and family life (Article 7 of the Charter), precludes the use of a psychologist's expert report based on projective personality tests to indicate the sexual orientation of an applicant for international protection.

In a preliminary ruling requested by the **Polish** Supreme Administrative Court, the CJEU [ruled](#) that Member States must provide for appeal procedures when authorities issue a decision refusing a visa under the Visa Code, including the possibility for a judicial appeal at a certain stage of proceedings.

European Court of Human Rights

The ECtHR [held](#) that **Bulgaria** violated the prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment (Article 3 ECHR) by detaining three accompanied migrant

children for a brief time period in a border police's detention facility, which had unsuitable conditions for children.

The ECtHR [held](#) that **Greece** violated Article 5 (2) ECHR (right to be informed promptly of the reasons for arrest) when detaining three migrants in a reception centre in Chios in order to return them to Turkey under the EU-Turkey Statement.

National courts

The Supreme Court of **Croatia** approved the [extradition of a Kurdish national to Turkey](#), who filed a constitutional complaint against this decision stating that it violated his right to life, the prohibition of torture and the right to a fair trial, as Switzerland had granted him refugee status under the Geneva Convention. The Croatian Constitutional Court delayed the extradition, as it needed more time to decide on the merits due to the complexity of the case.

The **Italian Constitutional Court** ruled that forced returns could constitute an infringement of the right to personal freedom if adopted exclusively by the police without approval of judicial authorities.

In the **Netherlands**, the Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State noted in a [ruling](#) that Libya could be considered a safe country to which rejected asylum seekers could be deported. It noted that the general security situation in Libya, particularly in Benghazi, was not so bad as to preclude returns.

The Regional Administrative Court in Warsaw (**Poland**) [quashed](#) a negative asylum decision on several accounts and ordered the authorities to start the procedure anew. The asylum authority had not considered the applicant's (a Russian national of Chechen origin) family ties in other EU Member States, and had not sufficiently addressed the statements of the applicants by simply disregarding them as not credible, in breach of administrative procedural law.

Legislation

In **Austria**, the new government formed of the People's Party and the Freedom Party, which took over in December, [announced](#) further restrictions in the area of asylum, especially quicker procedures and quicker removals as well as the goal of bringing persons rescued at sea to "rescue centres" outside of the EU. The new Minister of the Interior from the Freedom Party [ordered](#) the establishment of a specific border protection unit, which shall be able to establish controls and barricades at the borders within hours. Caritas expressed concerns regarding the government's plan of a "Federal Agency for Care- and Support Services" making legal counselling for asylum seekers exclusively state-provided.

The **Croatian** government drafted a new protocol regulating the conduct of stakeholders dealing with unaccompanied children, according to the Ministry of Demography, Family, Youth and Social Policy. The draft aims to improve the enrolment of unaccompanied children in the educational system as well as their access to healthcare.

The **Danish** Parliament adopted an [amendment to the Danish Aliens Act](#), restricting permanent residence permits for foreigners who actively opposed the clarification of their identity while applying for a residence permit. In line with another adopted [amendment](#), the Minister for Immigration and Integration will regulate on an annual basis the number of United Nations refugee resettlement quotas, making the procedure more flexible.

The government in **France** prepared a [new bill](#) "for a guaranteed right to asylum and managed immigration", to be adopted in the first half of 2018. Amongst others, it aims to introduce the "safe third country" concept into French law. The National Consultative Commission for Human Rights severely [criticised this plan](#), especially for creating a new scenario of excluding applicants from international protection and being contrary to the right to an effective remedy (it would shift the burden of proof to the applicant).

The [potential coalition plan](#) of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Social Democratic Party (SPD) in **Germany** proposes establishing central reception, decision and return centres (*zentrale Aufnahme-, Entscheidungs- und Rückführungseinrichtungen, ANKER*), where asylum seekers, including unaccompanied children, would be obliged to stay until their final asylum decision. Additionally, Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco, as well as other countries with a so-called low perspective to stay, are planned to be declared as safe countries of origin.

The **Hungarian** government prepared a draft legislative package entitled "[Stop Soros](#)", currently subject to public consultation before it is submitted to parliament. The draft aims to impose financial and other sanctions on NGOs who support 'illegal migration' using 'foreign funds' (e.g. by introducing mandatory registration, special taxes). Also, 'restraining orders' are envisaged against members of such organisations and other individuals supporting 'illegal migration' to ban their entry into the 8 km zone from Hungary's borders.

In **Poland**, the government prepared a [draft law](#) to amend the asylum legislation. The draft envisages, amongst others, the introduction of a border procedure and the setting up of an independent appeals commission. The legislative amendments are planned to enter into force in April 2018.

A new [legislative proposal](#) in **Sweden** envisages longer residence permits for unaccompanied children under certain conditions. Amnesty International voiced concerns about the proposal, since it would only cover unaccompanied children who arrived after the end of November 2015. It would also exclude a large number of children who, for other reasons, do not meet the eligibility criteria.

Policy responses

According to [media reports](#), the new Minister of the Interior from the Freedom Party in **Austria** said that asylum seekers should be "concentrated" in one place. The statement sparked [protests](#) alleging that this was a reference to Nazi concentration camps.

The Ministry of Education and Science in **Bulgaria** approved the Bulgarian language training [curricula](#) for adult refugees and asylum seekers, as pointed out by Caritas Bulgaria.

The House of Representatives of the **Dutch** parliament rejected a [motion](#) calling for an end to deportations of children to Afghanistan.

The president of **France** announced in a [public statement](#) in mid-January that the government was going to handle the distribution of meals in Calais – this service, however, had not yet been implemented as of the end of the reporting period, according to NGOs.

In **Greece**, the National Commission for Human Rights issued a set of [recommendations](#) on better migration management to the government. These include the transfer of all vulnerable people to urban settings; ensuring the effective operation of the reception facilities; the immediate upgrading of the Reception and Identification and Service (RIS) with sufficient staff and resources, to enable RIS to undertake, as soon as possible, the full administration and overall management of all hotspots from the army; the urgent adoption of standard operating procedures for all reception facilities; the implementation of alternatives to detention; and reforming the guardianship system for unaccompanied children. FRA also [renewed](#) its Memorandum of Understanding with the Greek Ministry of Migration Policy on the agency's presence in Greece.

A new governmental position was created in **Poland**, called "[Minister for humanitarian aid and refugee affairs](#)" (*minister ds. pomocy humanitarnej i spraw uchodźców*), which was supposed to reflect the importance of asylum matters for the government.

Responses by civil society, local and political actors

Ten **Finnish** civil society organisations, including Amnesty International and the Finnish Refugee Council, have signed an [appeal to stop deportations to Afghanistan](#). The Finnish Section of Amnesty International's open [online appeal against deportations to Afghanistan](#) is still ongoing and had gathered over 14,200 signatures as of 31 January 2018.

In **Greece**, mayors and residents from Lesbos, Chios and Samos [protested](#) in Athens, together with locals, against the increasingly precarious and overcrowded conditions in the hotspots. There was a push for the government to ease the migratory pressure on [local communities](#), including the discontinuation of building additional accommodation sites on the islands.

Hate speech and violent crime

A reception centre for unaccompanied migrant children in Spinetoli (Marche), **Italy** was set on fire, according to [media reports](#). The facility was still empty but was to host 37 children.

According to [media reports](#), Krypteia, a far right group in **Greece**, has repeatedly threatened by phone several civil society organisations supporting asylum seekers and other migrants. The Muslim Association of Greece has also [received](#) a call from Krypteia threatening its members.

A 14-year-old girl of Turkish origin was attacked in Warsaw (**Poland**) due to the colour of her skin, the Ombudsman for Children's Rights [reported](#). The police was investigating the case and the Ministry of the Interior and Administration asked the Police Chief Commander to supervise the criminal proceedings.

In **Germany**, attacks against refugees have increased again since July 2017, according to the Federal Criminal Police Office. From 1 December 2017 to 21 January 2018, [Pro Asyl and the Amadeu Antonio Foundation](#) recorded 13 violent attacks (e.g. with knives, stones, fists, blank cartridge pistol, slingshot) directed against asylum seekers, with at least eight injured refugees. A [study of the University of Warwick](#) detected a close connection between the number of anti-refugee and other hate speech posts on Facebook of the party *Alternative für Deutschland* (AfD) and the number of physical attacks against refugees and their accommodation.

In Rotterdam, the **Netherlands**, a [demonstration](#) against so called 'Islamisation' was held by Geert Wilders, leader of the political party PVV (*Partij voor de Vrijheid*) and attended by certain extreme right organisations. Messages against asylum seekers were shown and one man was arrested for yelling a racist slogan.

In **Sweden**, activities of right-wing extremist groups, e.g. the Nordic Resistance Movement (*Nordisk motståndsrörelse*), with strong anti-migrant messages were increasing, the police stated.

Stakeholders interviewed in January 2018

Country	Stakeholders interviewed
Austria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Ministry of the Interior, Department III/9 (<i>Bundesministerium für Inneres, Abteilung III/9 Grundversorgung und Bundesbetreuung</i>); • Austrian Ombudsman Board (<i>Volksanwaltschaft</i>); • Federal Ministry of the Interior, Department III/5 (<i>Bundesministerium für Inneres, Abteilung III/5 Asyl und Fremdenwesen</i>); • Federal Ministry of the Interior, Criminal Intelligence Service, Competence Centre for Missing Children (<i>Bundesministerium für Inneres, Bundeskriminalamt, Kompetenzzentrum für Abgängige Personen</i>); • Federal Agency for State Protection and Counter Terrorism (<i>Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz und Terrorismusbekämpfung, BVT</i>); • Antidiscrimination Office Styria (<i>Antidiskriminierungsstelle Steiermark</i>); • Caritas Vienna (<i>Caritas Wien</i>); • Caritas Styria (<i>Caritas Steiermark</i>); • Austrian Red Cross (<i>Österreichisches Rotes Kreuz</i>).
Bulgaria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of the Interior, Directorate General Border Police (MoI – DGBP) (<i>Министерство на вътрешните работи, Главна дирекция „Гранична полиция“, МВР – ГДГП</i>); • State Agency for Refugees (SAR) (<i>Държавна агенция за бежанците, ДАБ</i>); • Ombudsman of the Republic of Bulgaria (<i>Омбудсман на Република България</i>); • State Agency for Child Protection (SACP) (<i>Държавна агенция за закрила на детето, ДАЗД</i>); • Ministry of the Interior, Directorate General Criminal Police (MoI – DGCP) (<i>Министерство на вътрешните работи, Главна дирекция „Криминална полиция“, МВР – ГДКП</i>); • UNHCR Bulgaria; • Caritas Bulgaria (<i>Каритас България</i>); • Council of Refugee Women in Bulgaria (CRWB) (<i>Съвет на жените бежанки в България, СЖББ</i>).
Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Demography, Family, Youth and Social Policy (<i>Ministarstvo za demografiju, obitelj, mlade i socijalnu politiku</i>); • Ombudspersons Office (<i>Pučka pravobraniteljica</i>); • The Governmental Office for Human Rights and Rights of National Minority (<i>Ured za ljudska prava i prava nacionalnih manjina Vlade RH</i>); • The Society for Psychological Assistance (<i>Društvo za psihološku pomoć</i>); • The Croatian Law Center (<i>Hrvatski pravni centar</i>); • Centre for Peace Studies (<i>Centar za mirovne studije</i>); • Jesuit Refugee Service (<i>Isusovačka služba za izbjeglice</i>); • Welcome Initiative (<i>Inicijativa Dobrodošli</i>); • Croatian Red Cross (<i>Hrvatski crveni križ</i>); • Rehabilitation Centre for Stress and Trauma (<i>Rehabilitacijski centar za stres i traum</i>).

Country	Stakeholders interviewed
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danish Ministry of Justice (<i>Justitsministeriet</i>), including the Danish National Police (<i>Rigspolitiet</i>); • Danish Immigration Service (<i>Udlændingestyrelsen</i>), including the Statistical Unit, the Office for Finances and Accommodation, the Centre for Asylum and the Office for Accommodation Conditions; • Danish Refugee Council (<i>Dansk Flygtningehjælp</i>); • Danish Red Cross (<i>Røde Kors</i>); • United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); • SOS against Racisme (<i>SOS mod Racisme</i>).
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amnesty International Finnish Section (Amnesty International Suomen osasto/Amnesty International Finländska sektionen); • Finnish Immigration Service (Maahanmuuttovirasto/Migrationsverket); • Finnish Red Cross (Suomen Punainen Risti/Finlands Röda Kors); • International Organization for Migration (IOM) Finland; • Ministry for Health and Social Affairs (Sosiaali- ja terveystieteiden ministeriö (Social- och Hälsovårdsministeriet)); • National Police Board (Poliisihallitus/Polisstyrelsen); • Non-Discrimination Ombudsman (Yhdenvertaisuusvaltuutettu/Diskrimineringsombudsmannen); • Ombudsman for Children (Lapsiasiavaltuutettu/Barnombudsmannen); • Parliamentary Ombudsman (Eduskunnan oikeusasiamies/Riksdagens Justitieombudsman).
France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of the Interior (<i>Ministère de l'Intérieur</i>); • French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons (<i>Office français de protection des réfugiés et apatrides – OFPRA</i>); • Public Defender of Rights (<i>Le Défenseur des droits - DDD</i>); • National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (<i>Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme – CNCDH</i>); • National Association of Border Assistance for Foreigners (ANAFÉ) (<i>Association nationale d'assistance aux frontières pour les étrangers</i>); • La Cimade (<i>Inter-Movement Committee for evacuees - Comité inter mouvements auprès des évacués</i>); • Doctors of the world - France (<i>Médecins du Monde</i>); • Service centre for migrants in Calais (<i>Plateforme de service aux migrants à Calais</i>); • The Immigrant Information and Support Group (<i>Groupe d'information et de soutien des immigrés - GISTI</i>).
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (<i>Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend</i>); • Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (<i>Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, BAMF</i>); • Jesuit Refugee Service (<i>Jesuiten Flüchtlingsdienst, JRS</i>); • German Red Cross (<i>Deutsches Rotes Kreuz</i>); • German Caritas Association (<i>Deutscher Caritasverband</i>); • Federal Association for Unaccompanied Minor Refugees (<i>Bundesfachverband Unbegleitete Minderjährige Flüchtlinge</i>); • International Organization for Migration Germany (IOM);

Country	Stakeholders interviewed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National working group psychosocial centres for refugees and victims of torture (<i>Bundesweite Arbeitsgemeinschaft Psychosozialer Zentren für Flüchtlinge und Folteropfer, BAFF</i>).
Greece	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry for Migration Policy (<i>Υπουργείο Μεταναστευτικής Πολιτικής</i>); Greek Asylum Service (<i>Υπηρεσία Ασύλου</i>); The Greek Ombudsman (<i>Συνήγορος του Πολίτη</i>); National Commission for Human Rights (<i>Εθνική Επιτροπή για τα Δικαιώματα του Ανθρώπου</i>); Hellenic Police Headquarters (<i>Αρχηγείο Ελληνικής Αστυνομίας</i>); National Centre for Social Solidarity (<i>Εθνικό Κέντρο Κοινωνικής Αλληλεγγύης</i>); Racist Violence Recording Network (<i>Δίκτυο Καταγραφής Ρατσιστικής Βίας</i>); United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Greece (<i>Υπατη Αρμοστεία του ΟΗΕ για τους Πρόσφυγες - Ελληνικό Τμήμα</i>); Doctors Without Borders Greece (<i>Γιατροί του Κόσμου - Ελληνικό Τμήμα</i>); Greek Council for Refugees (<i>Ελληνικό Συμβούλιο για τους Πρόσφυγες</i>); ARSIS NGO (<i>ΜΚΟ ΑΡΣΙΣ</i>); Ecumenical Refugee Program (KSPM) of the Church of Greece (<i>Οικουμενικό Πρόγραμμα Προσφύγων της Εκκλησίας της Ελλάδος</i>).
Hungary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of the Interior (<i>Belügyminisztérium</i>); Ministry of Human Capacities (<i>Emberi Erőforrások Minisztériuma</i>); National Headquarters of the Police (<i>Országos Rendőrfőkapitányság</i>); Immigration and Asylum Office (<i>Bevándorlási és Menekültügyi Hivatal</i>); Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights (<i>Alapvető Jogok Biztosának Hivatala</i>); UNHCR Hungary; MigSzol; Hungarian Association for Migrants (<i>Menedék Migránsokat Segítő Egyesület</i>).
Italy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of the Interior; Authority for the Protection of People who are Detained or Deprived of their Personal Freedom (<i>Garantenazionale per I diritti delle persone detenute o private della libertà personale</i>); Association for Legal Studies on Immigration (<i>Associazione per gli studi giuridici sull'immigrazione, ASGI</i>); Italian Refugees Council (<i>Consiglio Italiano per i Rifugiati, CIR</i>); NGO 'Doctors for Human Rights' (<i>Medici per I diritti umani, MEDU</i>); Save the Children Italia Onlus; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); Italian Red Cross (IRC); Jesuit Refugee Service 'Centro Astalli'; Community of Sant'Egidio (<i>Comunità di Sant'Egidio</i>); 'Melting Pot Europa' project; NGO 'Borderline Sicilia'; NGO 'Naga'.
Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry for Security and Justice: central information point, providing information on behalf of: Immigration and Naturalisation Service,

Country	Stakeholders interviewed
	<p>Aliens Police, Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers (all members of the so-called 'Alien Chain');</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistics Netherlands (<i>Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek</i>); • Defence for Children the Netherlands; • Dutch Council for Refugees (<i>Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland</i>); • Amnesty International the Netherlands; • NIDOS; • Stichting LOS; • UNICEF the Netherlands; • Pharos, Dutch Centre of Expertise on Health Disparities; • MiND-the Dutch Reporting Point for Discrimination.
Poland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Association for Legal Intervention (<i>Stowarzyszenie Interwencji Prawnej, SIP</i>); • Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights (<i>Helsińska Fundacja Praw Człowieka, HFPC</i>); • UNHCR Poland; • Ombudsman (<i>Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich, RPO</i>); • Head of the Office for Foreigners (<i>Szef Urzędu do spraw Cudzoziemców, UDSC</i>); • Open Republic Association Against Anti-Semitism and Xenophobia (<i>Otwarta Rzeczpospolita, OR</i>); • Border Guard (<i>Straż Graniczna, SG</i>); • The Rule of Law Institute Foundation (<i>Fundacja Instytut na rzecz Państwa i Prawa, FIPP</i>).
Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-directorate for Immigrant Integration of the Spanish Ministry of Employment and Social Security (<i>Subdirección General de Integración de los Inmigrantes del Ministerio de Empleo y Seguridad Social</i>); • Spanish Ombudsman (<i>Defensor del Pueblo</i>); • Spanish Committee of UNHCR (<i>Comité español de la Agencia de la ONU para los Refugiados, ACNUR</i> in its Spanish acronym); • Spanish Committee of UNICEF (<i>Comité español de UNICEF</i>); • Jesuit Migrant Service (<i>Servicio Jesuita Migrantes, SJM</i>); • Spanish Refugee Aid Commission (<i>Comisión Española de Ayuda al Refugiado, CEAR</i>); • NGO La Merced Migraciones; • NGO SOS Racismo; • Chair of Refugees and Forced Migrants of Comillas ICAI-ICADE, INDITEX (<i>Cátedra de Refugiados y Migrantes Forzados de Comillas ICAI-ICADE, INDITEX</i>).
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swedish Migration Agency (<i>Migrationsverket</i>); • Swedish Police Authority (<i>Polismyndigheten</i>); • National Board of Health and Welfare (<i>Socialstyrelsen</i>); • Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (<i>Sveriges kommuner och landsting, SKL</i>); • Save the Children Sweden (<i>Rädda Barnen</i>); • Swedish Red Cross (<i>Röda Korset</i>); • Amnesty Sweden.