

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs

Draft Report of the Committee on Civil liberties, Justice and Home Affairs on the delegation to Denmark

RAPPORTEUR: Mrs Martine Roure

Introduction - Context of the visit

A delegation of six MEPs travelled to Denmark, where they were joined by two Danish MEPs who were already there (see list of participants - Annex 1). The mission was chaired by Mr Panayiotis Demetriou (EPP-ED) and the rapporteur was Mrs Martine Roure (PSE). The visit took place on 10 and 11 April 2008.

The visit to Denmark was one of a whole series of visits by members of the LIBE Committee to see at first hand the conditions in which immigrants and asylum seekers are held in various EU Member States. This visit to Denmark follows similar delegations to Italy (Lampedusa), Spain (Ceuta and Melilla, Canary Islands), France (Paris), Malta, Greece (Samos and Athens), Belgium, United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Poland.

The purpose of all the past visits was to gather information, to ascertain directly the situation regarding the reception of migrants and asylum seekers and to understand how several European directives and regulations are implemented:

- Council Directive 2003/9/EC of 27 January 2003 laying down minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers¹ (Reception Directive)
- Council Directive 2005/85/EC of 1 December 2005 on minimum standards on procedures in Member States for granting and withdrawing refugee status² (Procedures Directive)
- Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003 of 18 February 2003 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national³ (Dublin II Regulation).

Another purpose of the visits was also to exchange views with government authorities and

¹ *Official Journal L 031, 06/02/2003 P. 0018 – 0025*

² *Official Journal L 326, 13/12/2005 P. 0013 – 0034*

³ *Official Journal L 050, 25/02/2003 P. 0001 - 0010*

representatives of the civil society.

The members of the LIBE Committee wished to send a delegation to Denmark, in order better to understand the situation regarding the reception of migrants and asylum seekers in Denmark. However, the delegates were **aware that the situation in Denmark differs from that in the other EU Member States, as concerns migration and asylum matters.**

Pursuant to the Protocol on Denmark which is appended to the Amsterdam Treaty, Denmark does not take part in measures based on Title IV of the EC Treaty other than those relating to visa policy¹.

In accordance with Articles 1 and 2 of the Protocol on the position of Denmark, annexed to the Treaty on European Union and to the Treaty establishing the European Community, **Denmark is not taking part** in the adoption and the application of the following instruments:

- ✚ Council Directive 2003/9/EC of 27 January 2003 laying down minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers² (**Reception Directive**)
- ✚ Council Directive 2005/85/EC of 1 December 2005 on minimum standards on procedures in Member States for granting and withdrawing refugee status³ (**Procedures Directive**)

As concerns the Eurodac⁴ and the Dublin II⁵ regulations - in order to enable Denmark to participate, an international agreement between the Community and Denmark⁶ had to be drawn up, together with a Protocol to the Agreement between the Community, Iceland and Norway⁷ ⁸. Since 2006, **Denmark has been bound by the Dublin II and Eurodac regulations** in its relations with the Community on the one hand and with Iceland and Norway on the other but it does not take part in any other measure adopted at European level in respect of the common asylum policy.

Programme of the delegation:

The visit focused on three centres:

¹ According to Article 7 of the Protocol, Denmark can at any time renounce to the Protocol on Denmark which is appended to the Amsterdam Treaty and take part in all measures under Title IV of the EC Treaty

² *Official Journal L 031* , 06/02/2003 P. 0018 – 0025

³ *Official Journal L 326* , 13/12/2005 P. 0013 – 0034

⁴ Council Regulation (EC) No 2725/2000 of 11 December 2000.

⁵ Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003 of 18 February 2003. - Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003 of 18 February 2003 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national ⁵ Dublin II Regulation)

⁶ COM(2004)594 final.

⁷ COM(2005)131 final.

⁸ The European Parliament had to give its opinion on the Council Decision 2006/188/EC on the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Community and the Kingdom of Denmark extending to Denmark the provisions of Council Regulation 343/2003/EC establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national and Council Regulation 2725/2000/EC concerning the establishment of 'Eurodac' for the comparison of fingerprints for the effective application of the Dublin Convention.

The Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs Committee was responsible for the opinion. The committee adopted the report drafted by Martine Roure: approving the proposed agreement under the consultation procedure.

- Sandholm Centre for asylum seekers (open reception centre managed by the Danish Red Cross)
- Sandholm Foreigners' Detention Centre (the only detention centre operated in Denmark under the responsibility of the Ministry of Justice)
- Centre Kongelunden (open reception centre managed by the Danish Red Cross).

The agenda of the delegation also included, in chronological order:

- a meeting with organisations and NGOs active in the field of immigration and asylum in Denmark, some of which had sent an appeal to the LIBE Committee in 2006 (10 April 2008);
- a short visit to the Red Cross House in Copenhagen;
- a meeting with Mr Claes Nilas, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs.

Before travelling to Denmark, the delegation received substantial information from organisations such as SOS Against Racism – Denmark, Amnesty International – Danish Section, and Grandparents for Asylum, which the delegation would like warmly to thank.

The delegation was accompanied by the Audiovisual Service of the European Parliament working with a local TV crew and by a photographer. The idea was to present that European activity through ‘Europe by Satellite’ (EbS). The visit received very good press coverage. The journalists, the photographer and the TV crew were allowed to enter the open centres. The MEPs gave a press conference on the last day, on 3 April 2008.

Meeting with NGOs

On the first day, the delegation met representatives of NGOs that visited the centres regularly and/or are active in the areas of asylum and immigration (see Annex 3). The NGOs were extremely organised and had shared out the speaking time so that each of them could discuss a major aspect of Danish asylum and immigration policy that caused them concern. The presentation also included the testimony of a woman and of a minor living in Sandholm Centre.

The NGOs began by discussing their appeal to the LIBE Committee to come and visit the centres for Danish asylum seekers. These organisations said they did not feel the government was listening to them and hoped the government would listen to the comments of a European Parliament delegation. They regretted that Denmark did not take part in all the European directives on asylum and considered that certain aspects of Danish asylum law were incompatible with its international commitments to protect human rights and the principles of non-discrimination and respect for human dignity enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights.

The NGOs then raised the following issues:

- The number of applications for asylum was falling in Europe in general. Despite the similar traditions in two countries such as Denmark and Sweden, Denmark took in only 2% of refugees in comparison with Sweden. The NGOs explained this by the fact that Iraqis received no form of protection whatsoever in Denmark.

- Since 2002, the NGOs had observed a hardening of Danish asylum law, and in particular the **abolition of the status of ‘de facto’ refugee** (similar to subsidiary protection at European level). The NGOs were critical of the fact that Denmark interpreted the definition of a refugee in Article 1A of the 1951 Geneva Convention and Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights very restrictively. As a result, it was becoming increasingly difficult to obtain the status of refugee in Denmark. Most Iraqis were, for instance, refused refugee status. Some people found they were refused the status of refugee yet could not be deported to their country of origin either, under the international principles of non-refoulement and of protection against the risk of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment by ricochet. So they were ‘tolerated’ but had no legal status at all. Such individuals found themselves in a total legal vacuum and failing any legal status could not live outside the reception centres run by the Red Cross or work legally. They could spend many years, if not decades, in that situation of legal uncertainty. The very long period of waiting and the uncertainty as to both their legal status and their future was a major source of distress. The NGOs considered that this practice was aimed at dissuading potential asylum seekers from coming to Denmark.
- ‘**Accompanying measures**’ were applied to those whose application for asylum was rejected and who refused to leave voluntarily, in order to encourage them to return voluntarily to their country of origin. The measures included withdrawing their pocket money; only giving them money for food and obliging them to present themselves to the police twice a week. As a last resort, those individuals were put into deportation centres. In the past, the accompanying measures had included not being allowed to cook their own meals and having to eat in the reception centres’ canteens, but that was no longer the case. The NGOs were concerned about this transfer to the asylum seeker of the decision to return from the Member State. They found it unacceptable that because the state itself could not deport those individuals pursuant to international law, it put them in a precarious situation in order to induce them to return voluntarily to a country in which they were at risk.
- The Refugee Board responsible for examining asylum applications did not have the same powers as an ordinary court. It could only take administrative decisions, against which there was no appeal to an ordinary court; this situation was similar to military tribunals. That led to the **problem of guaranteeing effective access to justice** for asylum seekers. In any case, the Refugee Board had only three members (as against eight in the past): a judge, a lawyers’ union representative and a representative of the responsible ministry. It was impossible to appeal to the ombudsman because he had no powers in the area of asylum.
- A substantial number of **psychiatric illnesses** had been observed among asylum seekers in Denmark, as a result of the very long time they spent in reception centres and the many years of legal uncertainty to which they were subject with no form whatsoever of protection. Short-term residence permits were granted only in the event of severe depression and had, moreover, to be renewed at regular intervals. Children were in a particularly difficult situation, as they had a double cross to bear: their development was influenced by their parents’ psychiatric troubles and they themselves developed psychiatric illnesses that affected their education. For instance, two asylum-seekers’ children in Denmark were said to have made suicide attempts. In fact, few children would be able to see psychiatrists and some were too seriously ill to be able to leave the reception centre. The only solution to this situation would be to introduce

a large-scale rehabilitation programme, which was possible only if those individuals were permitted to reside in Denmark permanently.

- **Access to normal education:** the education of the children living in the reception centres was delegated to the Red Cross and the local authority. Of 200 children, only 85 received a normal education in Danish schools, while 115 were in special schools. In those schools, the children were divided into groups of 12, with a maximum age difference of three years. It was difficult to guarantee normal standards of education and academic progress because the children changed classes regularly, six times on average. Moreover, the children were not allowed to sit a leaving exam at the end of their schooling and therefore had no school-leaving certificate. That meant that if they returned to their country of origin they would have no certificate, and if they remained in Denmark they would have no access to higher education. They could only obtain access to normal education in a Danish school following case-by-case negotiations with the local authority, which could refuse it. The case of one young girl living in Sandholm showed the adverse effect this had had on her education; while she found it hard to remember her mother tongue, she also found it difficult to learn Danish and English.
- Asylum seekers were **moved between different centres on a regular basis** (reception centre, residential centre, deportation centre and special centres for vulnerable persons), because the number of centres processing asylum requests had been reduced in order to save costs. That raised problems of integration and proper follow-up of cases, and was also detrimental to children's education. The NGOs believed the government was using this practice in order to create a stressful situation that would encourage the asylum seekers concerned to return to their own country voluntarily.
- **Detention:** 83 individuals were in detention at the time of the visit, of whom 22 were asylum seekers, for two reasons: refusal to cooperate as regards identification, and risk of fleeing for fear of deportation. One quarter of detainees were subject to the Dublin transfer procedure and half were subject to a deportation order. The NGOs deplored the practice the authorities applied in some cases, of detaining only the head of family in order to block the entire family.
- **Access to work:** in the absence of any legal status, asylum seekers and tolerated persons were unable to work. Some might be asked to work within the reception centre. Some worked illegally, because social security was inadequate. They ran the risk of immediate deportation and a one-year ban on readmission for working illegally.
- **Access to translation and interpretation** was not always guaranteed, because interviews were not translated. Moreover, interpreters were not required to have a minimum knowledge of the language concerned.
- **Disappearance of child victims of trafficking:** some of the children transferred under the Dublin II regulation were sent back to Member States where the traffickers operated, and disappeared. The organisations tried to keep track of children and had referred this situation to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, but the number of disappearances continued to rise. The organisations were calling for the regulation's solidarity clause to be applied for these children in order to protect the best interests of the child.

- There was a lack of **statistics** on unaccompanied minors in detention and the number of refugees in detention.
- Denmark had **readmission agreements** with many countries of origin, except Iraq and Somalia.

Visits to the centres

Sandholm Centre for asylum seekers¹

On its arrival at the centre, the delegation was met by the Grandparents for Asylum organisation, dressed as the chorus of a Greek tragedy. That organisation has been holding the same demonstration at the entrance to the Sandholm Centre every Sunday morning for more than six months, in protest at the uncertainty in which the Sandholm families lived.

Sandholm Centre for asylum seekers is the largest asylum centre in Denmark, and this is also where all asylum seekers go when they first arrive in Denmark.

A spontaneous asylum seeker who applies in writing will be referred to the Sandholm accommodation centre, where he or she will be registered and offered accommodation.

Also, applicants not rejected at the border will be housed in the Sandholm accommodation centre, where the police will interview them, and photograph and fingerprint them in order to determine their identity, nationality and travel route.

The centre is managed by the Danish Red Cross, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs.

The Red Cross has been responsible for running the open centres since 1994. The centre is located 25 kilometres north of Copenhagen, in former military barracks.

On arrival, asylum seekers attend an information session and receive a health screening. On average, new arrivals stay in Sandholm for two months before being moved to other centres once their application has been processed. The decision on the application for asylum is taken within nine months on average. Asylum seekers may live in the centres while their application is being processed. Adults receive basic tuition in Danish.

Sandholm also includes a deportation centre for asylum seekers whose application has been rejected and who are subject to accompanying measures.

The centre has a health centre/clinic, a shop selling clothes, an employment centre, a second-hand shop, a laundrette, a day nursery, a sewing room and an activities room

Inmates may come and go as they please within and outside the centre. The centre is open to visitors provided they were invited by a resident. The organisations have free and regular access to the centre. The NGOs maintain good relations with the residents.

¹ Dansk Røde Kors Center Sandholm

The families live in very small, prefabricated bungalows. Each bungalow has its own entrance and approximately three small rooms per family. Single men are housed in smaller rooms and may have to share with several others. Conditions are good overall, provided residents only have to stay for a limited time – however, the centre is not designed for stays of several years.

Children have access to education in Red Cross schools. The Centre has a crèche and nursery school; otherwise the school is 5 km from the Centre and the children get to it by bus. Some children attend the local municipal school as they have been living in Sandholm for many years.

The families the delegation met during its visit have lived in Sandholm for many years, on average five or six. They have ‘tolerated’ status. They all expressed frustration at staying in the centre for so long and complained of having to live in such uncertainty. The delegation met a family whose young daughter was disabled and traumatised and, according to her parents and the organisations, was not receiving the appropriate care.

Sandholm Foreigners Detention Centre

Sandholm Foreigners’ Detention Centre is the only detention centre operated in Denmark. The delegation was only able to visit parts of the centre because the authorities had been informed of its visit very belatedly. The Council of Europe visited the centre in February 2008.

The Detention Centre has a capacity of 118 and is managed by the Ministry of Justice. On the day of the visit, the centre accommodated 55 detainees of 25 nationalities. Migrants and asylum seekers may not be detained in prisons.

The detainees are rejected asylum seekers who are subject to a deportation order and who present a significant risk of attempting to avoid deportation procedures. They are detained for the time it takes to organise their return. There is no maximum duration for detention. The current average duration is 42 days¹. During the visit, the authorities running the centre pointed out that the length of detention varies widely and can range from several days to several months; they said the average duration was three days. Twenty-five individuals had arrived since January 2008 and were being detained because of doubts as to their identity or because they had not complied with their obligation to register.

Conditions are fairly acceptable on the whole. Detainees are not locked in their rooms and have access to a small central courtyard for a few hours a day.

There is a doctor available in the centre 15 hours a week and there are two full-time nurses.

Men and women are housed in separate wings. The women’s wing has a capacity of 20; six women were present during the visit. Women are not locked in their rooms and may use a kind of sitting room. They can go outside for a few hours a day. Two women talked to the delegation during the visit. The first was pregnant and was subject to a deportation order despite the fact that the father of her child, who was of a different nationality, would be remaining in Denmark. The second woman, who was Ukrainian and had lived in Denmark illegally for several years, was being held in detention despite the fact that her son and

¹ Study commissioned by the European Parliament Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, Policy Department C, December 2007.

grandson held Danish nationality.

Detainees have access to a gym. The authorities pointed to the benefits of that room, where detainees could give vent to their frustration (about their deportation procedure and their uncertain future) by practising a sport.

Centre Kongelunden

Centre Kongelunden is an open centre managed by the Danish Red Cross. It is a special care centre for asylum seekers who are in need of care beyond the care provided for all asylum seekers. For the last month, the centre had been taking in single mothers and their young children. Formerly, there had been a special centre for women in Copenhagen, but it had had to close.

The centre has 150 special care places and 100 regular places.

The centre is located near Copenhagen airport.

Single women with children are housed in separate bungalows comprising individual rooms for each mother and her children and a shared kitchen. The delegation visited new bungalows in which conditions were very good. Families (with two parents) live in two rooms with their own bathroom.

The centre has a school for adults, a games centre, a day-care nursery, a café, a garage for bicycles and a carpentry workshop. It also has a special care centre staffed by full-time doctors and psychiatrists. The Danish Immigration Service can send the following people to the special care centre:

- parents suffering from a mental illness that makes it impossible for them to look after their children;
- families at imminent risk of neglecting their children;
- young people (aged between 18 and 24) with psychiatric illnesses;
- people with physical disabilities who need regular and specific care or rehabilitation that cannot be provided in another centre;
- people with mental problems who are not able to follow a course of treatment, look after their personal hygiene or take care of themselves;
- people with a mental illness and serious disability;
- seriously disabled survivors of torture.

The main groups held in Kongelunden are families and individuals with mental illnesses requiring treatment. The average length of stay is three years. The centre focuses on the welfare of children.

5. Meeting with Mr Claes Nilas, Permanent Secretary at the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs

The delegation regrets that it was unable to meet the minister, Birthe Rønn Hornbech, in person. We wish to emphasise that this is the first time a delegation of this kind from the LIBE Committee has not met the minister responsible for asylum and immigration or a secretary of state.

Mr Nilas pointed out that Denmark was in a special situation, given that it was not covered by Title IV of the Treaty establishing the European Community (TEC) and did not, therefore, apply the directives on reception conditions and procedures. Pursuant to an international agreement concluded with the European Union, Denmark was covered by the Dublin II regulation and Eurodac.

He said the number of asylum seekers in Denmark was falling. Asylum seekers were held in the Sandholm centre when they first arrived in Denmark and then sent to accommodation centres. There were several types of centre in Denmark, including special centres for children, single women and persons with health problems.

The immigration services were responsible for examining applications for asylum. If an application was rejected, it was forwarded to the Refugee Board, made up of a judge and two other members, who could review the application. The system was independent. Processing applications took about seven or eight months.

Living conditions had been improved substantially in recent years. Families who had been in Denmark for a long time could now live in apartments outside the reception centres.

The delegation members found the material reception conditions in the centres generally satisfactory. They nevertheless had some concerns: regarding the length of residence in the reception centres, the failure to award any legal status even though certain people could not be returned to their country of origin under international law, the question of minors who had disappeared following a transfer pursuant to the Dublin II regulation, the benefits Denmark saw in maintaining its opt-out from Title IV TEC even though it was part of Schengen, the reasons why the Refugee Board had only three members, the possibility for families to live outside the centres, the effectiveness of the accompanying measures, and the possible conflict between parents and children if children did not understand their mother tongue because they had spent so long in Denmark.

In reply, Mr Nilas gave the following explanations:

- the service decided whether or not to grant a residence permit in accordance with Danish law. Individuals were free to leave Denmark voluntarily, but refused to leave of their own accord; that was why they had been in Denmark for many years. There was no majority in the Danish Parliament in favour of changing the law to put an end to this situation. That was why the focus was on reception and living conditions;
- the decision to adhere to the opt-out was a political decision which was up to the government;
- readmission agreements concluded with the countries of origin allowed individuals to return under acceptable conditions; that was the case for Afghanistan, for example. The Danish Government was sorry it had not yet managed to conclude similar agreements with Iraq and Somalia. Some individuals had, however, been sent back to northern Iraq;
- residence permits could be granted for humanitarian reasons, e.g. serious illness;
- as regards implementation of the Dublin II regulation, in 2007 Denmark had accepted 78% of the transfer requests it had received. Denmark endeavoured to reunite unaccompanied minors with their family under Dublin II but each case had to be assessed on its own merits;
- membership of the Refugee Board had been reduced to three by a majority decision of the Danish Parliament in order to speed up decision-making;
- Denmark understood the dilemma of asylum seekers' children, which was why it

- intended to teach them in their mother tongue so as to enable them to return to their parents' country;
- EUR 1.9 million per year was allocated to housing families outside the centres;
 - education in the Red Cross schools was of good quality and the government imposed quality requirements on education programmes.

6. Your rapporteur's conclusions

Your rapporteur finds reception conditions in the Danish centres good on the whole, thanks to the activities of the Danish Red Cross. The government's efforts to improve living conditions in the centres have had tangible results. Your rapporteur emphasises, however, that reception conditions can be regarded as good only if residence in the centres is for a limited time. The delegation was most concerned to find that some families have been living in the centres for many years, in some cases decades. When people have lived in the centres for a very long time, reception conditions cannot be regarded as acceptable. The policy is not, therefore, adequate in terms of protecting the dignity of the persons concerned.

Your rapporteur emphasises that the use of detention seems limited to specific cases, under conditions that appear to be reasonable. She is most concerned, however, at the fact that there is no maximum length of detention and that a pregnant young woman can be detained pending deportation.

'Tolerated' status raises important issues as, in the absence of any clear legal status, such people are forced into a legal vacuum that precludes any form of social integration. Moreover, the legal uncertainty about their future is a cause of serious stress for the individuals concerned, who fear they might at any moment be deported to a country where they will be at risk. Your rapporteur is most concerned to find that asylum seekers who apply for international protection are personally responsible for deciding whether or not to return while the government itself cannot take that decision pursuant to international law. It seems paradoxical to urge people to return voluntarily to a country to which Denmark itself cannot send them back under international law and because of the prohibition on all forms of inhuman or degrading treatment by ricochet. Your rapporteur calls on the Danish Government to create a clear legal status for those persons, along the lines of subsidiary protection, with a view to their integration.

Your rapporteur is also very concerned about the situation of many Iraqis living in Danish reception centres after their request for asylum has been rejected. These Iraqis have been living in Denmark for many years with no recognition whatsoever of their status and with no form of protection whatsoever. She urges the Danish Government to broaden its current policy of reviewing cases of Iraqi asylum seekers whose application has been rejected to include all Iraqi asylum seekers, in view of the current unstable situation in Iraq and with a view to granting them some form of international protection.

In view of those factors, your rapporteur is of the opinion that in future Denmark should consider rescinding the Protocol on the position of Denmark annexed to the Treaty of Amsterdam and therefore taking part in all measures under Title IV TEC¹. In fact, given that Denmark forms part of the Schengen area and already takes part in two existing directives concerning asylum, it would be advisable for it to be able to take part in all the European

¹ Under Article 7 of the Protocol, Denmark has that right at any time.

instruments in the area of asylum in order to ensure an equivalent level of protection throughout the European Union.

Annex 1



ЕВРОПЕЙСКИ ПАРЛАМЕНТ PARLAMENTO EUROPEO EVROPSKÝ PARLAMENT EUROPA-PARLAMENTET
EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT EUROOPA PARLAMENT ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΒΟΥΛΙΟ EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN PARLAIMINT NA HEORPA PARLAMENTO EUROPEO EIROPAS PARLAMENTS
EUROPOS PARLAMENTAS EURÓPAI PARLAMENT IL-PARLAMENT EWROPEW EUROPEES PARLEMENT
PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI PARLAMENTO EUROPEU PARLAMENTUL EUROPEAN
EURÓPSKY PARLAMENT EVROPSKI PARLAMENT EUROOPAN PARLAMENTTI EUROPAPARLAMENTET

European Parliament Committee on civil liberties, justice and home affairs Delegation to Denmark 10 - 11 April 2008

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Version 08.04.2008

MEMBERS OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Panayiotis DEMETRIOU (EPP-ED) (Head of delegation)
Martine ROURE (PSE) (Rapporteur)

Edit BAUER (EPP-ED)
Frieda BREPOELS (EPP-ED)
Jeanine HENNIS-PLASSCHAERT (ALDE)
Metin KAZAK (ALDE)

Søren Bo SØNDERGAARD (GUE/NGL) (*hors quota*)
Britta THOMSEN (PSE) (*hors quota*)

ASSISTANTS TO MEMBERS

Pauline CHAIGNE (assistant to Martine ROURE)

STAFF OF THE POLITICAL GROUPS

Annie LEMARCHAL (PES)
Anders RASMUSSEN (ALDE)
Christine SIDENIUS (Greens/EFA)
Michael SPEISER (EPP-ED)
Mette TONSBORG (GUE/NGL)

STAFF OF THE SECRETARIAT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL LIBERTIES, JUSTICE AND HOME AFFAIRS

Ana DUMITRACHE (administrator)
Vita GRIFITA (assistant)

STAFF OF THE WEB COMMUNICATION UNIT OF THE EUROPEAN

PARLIAMENT

Olav GADE

STAFF OF EUROPE BY SATELLITE

Maria Teresa CONESA ALCAZAR
Casper THORSØEJR (cameraman)
Leif MØLLER (soundman)

INTERPRETERS

FR

Maurizio GASTALDI (IT - EN - ES - PT)
Joseph LEROY (DE - IT - NL - DA)

EN

Aoife KENNEDY (FR - DE - NL)
Aase PEERLESS (DE - IT - DA - SV - NO)

NL

Kristel SIMONS (FR - IT - EN - DA - PT)
Petra LAMBRECHTS (FR - EN - DA - MT)

DA

Line ANDERSSEN (DE - EN - HU)
Suzanne LARSSON (FR - NL - EN - SV) - TEAM LEADER

HU

Gyorgy MAJZIK (EN)
Eva VIGILD (DA - EN)

For further information, please contact

Ana DUMITRACHE
European Parliament
Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs
Tel: 0032 (0)2/28 41416
Fax: 00 32 (0)2/28 44941
E-mail ana.dumitrache@europarl.europa.eu

Annex 2



ЕВРОПЕЙСКИ ПАРЛАМЕНТ PARLAMENTO EUROPEO EVROPSKÝ PARLAMENT EUROPA-PARLAMENTET
EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT EUROOPA PARLAMENT ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΒΟΥΛΙΟ EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN PARLAIMINT NA HEORPA PARLAMENTO EUROPEO EIROPAS PARLAMENTS
EUROPOS PARLAMENTAS EURÓPAI PARLAMENT IL-PARLAMENT EWROPEW EUROPEES PARLEMENT
PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI PARLAMENTO EUROPEU PARLAMENTUL EUROPEAN
EURÓPSKY PARLAMENT EVROPSKI PARLAMENT EUROOPAN PARLAMENTTI EUROPAPARLAMENTET

European Parliament Committee on civil liberties, justice and home affairs Delegation to Denmark 10 and 11 April 2008

Draft programme

Version 08.04.2008

Thursday, 10 April 2008

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 14:50 – 16:30 | flight <i>SN 2259</i> to Copenhagen |
| 16:30 – 17:30 | transfer by bus to the European Parliament office in Copenhagen ¹ |
| 17:30 – 19:15 | meeting with NGOs who sent an appeal to the LIBE Committee in 2006
(location: European Parliament office ²) |
| 19:15 – 19:30 | transfer by bus to the Kong Frederik Copenhagen hotel ³ and registration at the hotel |

Free dinner

Friday, 11 April 2008

¹ Europa-Parlamentet, Informationskontoret i Danmark, Europa-Huset, Gothersgade 115, DK-1123 København K, tel +45 / 33 14 33 77, fax +45 / 33 15 08 05

² Europa-Parlamentet, Informationskontoret i Danmark, Europa-Huset, Gothersgade 115, DK-1123 København K, tel +45 / 33 14 33 77, fax +45 / 33 15 08 05

³ 25 Vester Voldgade, 1552 Copenhagen, Denmark, Phone: (+45) 3321 5902,
<http://www.nphotels.dk/kongfrederik/index.htm>

08:30 – 9:10	travel by bus to Sandholm (approx. 25 km from Copenhagen)
9:10 – 11:30	visit of the Sandholm centres ¹ (Sandholm Camp for asylum seekers and Sandholm Foreigners' Detention Centre) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sandholm Camp for asylum seekers is the biggest asylum centre in Denmark, and this is also where all asylum seekers go when they first arrive in Denmark. It is managed by the Danish Red Cross, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs.</i> • <i>Sandholm Foreigners Detention Centre is the only closed detention centre operated in Denmark. It is managed by the Ministry of Justice. The Detention Centre has a capacity of 118.</i> <p>The delegates will first receive general information on the asylum work. A tour of the centre will follow, as well as a visit in the Detention Centre.</p>
11:30 – 12:10	travel by bus to the Red Cross House in Copenhagen,
12:10 – 13:20	lunch hosted by Red Cross (location: Red Cross House ²)
13:20 – 13:40	transfer by bus to the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs ³
13:40 – 14:00	registration at the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs
14:00 – 15:00	meeting with Mr. Claes NILAS , Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs
15:00 – 15:45	travel to the Centre Kongelunden near Copenhagen airport (<i>open centre managed by the Danish Red Cross</i>)
15:45 – 17:45	visit of the Centre Kongelunden, including a meeting with the Red Cross
17:45 – 18:15	bus to the airport, proposed flight: SN flight nr. 2264 Copenhagen-Brussels, 19:30 - 21:05

For further information, please contact :
Ana DUMITRACHE
Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs
E-mail ana.dumitrache@europarl.europa.eu

¹ Center Sandholm, Dansk Røde Kors Center Sandholm, Sandholmgårdsvej, 3460 Birkerød, Denmark, Tel +45 48 10 77 00

² H.C. Ørstedesvej 47, Frederiksberg

³ Holbergsgade 6, 1057 Copenhagen K

Annex 3

List of organisations present at the meeting with the LIBE delegation on 10 April 2008

<p>SOS Against Racism, Denmark SOS mod Racisme, Medborgerhuset, Nørre Allé 7, 2200 København N. Denmark.</p>	<p>Anne Nielsen Chairman</p>
<p>Lawyers' Association for Asylum and Immigration Law Advokatkontoret, Falkoner Allé 7, 1. sal. 2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark</p>	<p>Helge Nørrung Spokesperson</p>
<p>Asylum Now Asyl-Nu</p>	<p>Gerd Gottlieb Spokesperson</p>
<p>Grandparents for asylum Bedsteforældre for asyl</p>	<p>Inga Axelsen Spokesperson Najeb Haddar Emine Haddar Kis Kapel</p>
<p>Danish Refugee Council Dansk Flygtningehjælp Borgergade 10 1300 København K. Denmark.</p>	<p>Nina Lassen Senior Asylum & Legal Advisor Repatriation</p>
<p>The Refugees Underground Committee Flygtninge Under Jorden</p>	<p>Michala Clante Bendixen Contact person</p>
<p>The Friends of Nura Nuras venner The Rights of All Children Alle børns rettigheder</p>	<p>Mogens Fischermann Chairman Spokesperson</p>
<p>Bente Rich Specialist in Child Psychiatry</p>	
<p>Save the Children Denmark Red Barnet Rosenørns Allé 12 1634 København V. Denmark</p>	<p>Inger Neufeld Project coordinator</p>

Citizens for a Decent Denmark Borgere for et Anstændigt Danmark	Amila Jasarevic Member of the Coordination Group
The Parsons' initiative Præsteinitiativet c/o Bodil Hindsholm Hansen Udbynedervej 16, 8970 Havndal, Denmark	Niels Nymann Eriksen Parson
Amnesty Dansk Gammeltorv 1457 Afdeling/Danish 8, København International Section 5 K. Denmark	Lisa Blinkenberg International Coordinator
The Danish Immigrant Counselling Indvanderrådgivningen Vesterbrogade 14 DK-8000 Århus C butikken	Leif Randeris Chairman
Network of ethnic minority women, Henna Kvindenetværket Henna	Uzma Andresen Chairwoman
Documentation and Advisory Center On Racial Discrimination Dokumentations- og Rådgivningscentret om Racediskrimination Medborgerhuset, Nørre Allé 7, 2. sal. 2200 København N. Denmark	Kirsten Schalburg Member of the board
Committee for Ethnic Equality Foreningen for Etnisk Ligestilling	Joakim Wange Larsson Member, substitute for the chairman, Halima El Abassi
Institute for Human Rights Institut for menneskerettigheder Strandgade 56 1401 Copenhagen K	Lisbeth Garly Andersen Kim Kjær Researchers
Voice for asylum	Sameer Algamal