

Trafficking in Human Beings in Europe

Towards a Sourcebook on Data and Statistical Recording Methods

(*TrafStat* Project)

Claudia Campistol
Marcelo F. Aebi
Jan J.M. van Dijk
Leontien M. van der Knaap



*With the financial support of the
Prevention of and Fight against Crime
Programme
European Commission – Directorate-
General Home Affairs*

UAB
Universitat Autònoma
de Barcelona

Trafficking in human beings in Europe
Toward a sourcebook on data and statistical recording methods (TrafStat project)

Claudia Campistol
Marcelo F. Aebi
Jan J. M. van Dijk
Leontien M. van der Knaap

ISBN: 978-94-6167-204-9

Coverphoto: Steve Buissinne on www.pixabay.com

This report was published by:
PrismaPrint

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (contract HOME/2011/ISEC/AG/THB/4000001960). This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher. Whilst the authors, editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of this publication, the publisher, authors and editors cannot accept responsibility for any errors, omissions, misstatements, or mistakes and accept no responsibility for the use of the information presented in this work.

© INTERVICT/Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona 2014

The data presented in this document is one of the outcomes of the research project *Tools for the validation and utilization of EU statistics on human trafficking* (TrafStat). This project is supported by a grant of the European Commission and its goal is to improve the comparability of European statistics on trafficking in human beings. The research team consists of professor Jan van Dijk (INTERVICT, Tilburg University), professor Marcelo F. Aebi (Autonomous University of Barcelona and University of Lausanne), Claudia Campistol MSc (Autonomous University of Barcelona and University of Lausanne), and dr. Leontien M. van der Knaap (INTERVICT, Tilburg University).

One of the goals of the project is to assess the current state of European THB statistics through a system of validation by experts in THB data collection from each of the EU Member States. Applying the methodology of the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics (www.unil.ch/europeansourcebook), a questionnaire was sent to that network of national experts. The questionnaire included a series of operational definitions for a small set of THB statistics, and experts were asked to find or reconstruct statistics that fit the definitions to the largest possible degree and to explain in what respects full compliance could not be fully achieved. The main interest of the answers to the questionnaire is in the extent to which countries collect data that fit the definitions and, if that is not the case, in the explanation of the reasons why compliance could not be fully achieved. Therefore, even when the national experts did not have access to the data required, they were asked to answer the questions regarding the way in which these data are collected (i.e. metadata).

This publication is a complement to the Final Report of the TrafStat study¹. Thus, it only contains brief comments on the data presented. For further information, readers are kindly asked to consult that Final Report.

France, Italy, Malta, and the United Kingdom were unable to assign correspondents for the TrafStat study. As a consequence, these countries do not figure in this sourcebook.

For each chapter of this publication that includes empirical data we have followed a structure that provides first some general comments on the chapter, followed by an overview of the quality of the data received. We then present the main results suggested by the figures received. The latter is shown in the fourth section, under the heading Tables. The fifth section includes the sources of the data. The last section includes technical information (comments, limitations, deviations from the data required in the sourcebook, etc.) sent by the countries, which helps understand the concepts to which the data refer.

This publication is structured as follows:

¹ Van Dijk, J., van der Knaap, L.M., Aebi, M.F., & Campistol, C. (2014). *Counting what counts; Tools for the validation and utilization of EU statistics on human trafficking: Final report of the TrafStat project*. Tilburg: University of Tilburg and Autonomous University of Barcelona

PART 1 DEFINITION OF TRAFFICKING IN HUMAN BEINGS

1.1. GENERAL COMMENTS

PART 2 VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING IN HUMAN BEINGS

PART 2.1. IDENTIFIED VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING IN HUMAN BEINGS

- 2.1.1. GENERAL COMMENTS
- 2.1.2. QUALITY OF THE DATA
- 2.1.3. RESULTS
- 2.1.4. TABLES
- 2.1.5. SOURCES
- 2.1.6. TECHNICAL INFORMATION

PART 2.2. IDENTIFIED VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING IN HUMAN BEINGS

- 2.2.1. GENERAL COMMENTS
- 2.2.2. QUALITY OF THE DATA
- 2.2.3. RESULTS
- 2.2.4. TABLES
- 2.2.5. SOURCES
- 2.2.6. TECHNICAL INFORMATION

PART 3 DATA ON THB OFFENDERS

PART 3.1. SUSPECTED THB OFFENDERS KNOWN TO THE POLICE

- 3.1.1. GENERAL COMMENTS
- 3.1.2. QUALITY OF THE DATA
- 3.1.3. RESULTS
- 3.1.4. TABLES
- 3.1.5. SOURCES
- 3.1.6. TECHNICAL INFORMATION

PART 3.2. SUSPECTED THB OFFENDERS PROSECUTED BY THE PROSECUTION AUTHORITY

- 3.2.1. GENERAL COMMENTS
- 3.2.2. QUALITY OF THE DATA
- 3.2.3. RESULTS
- 3.2.4. TABLES
- 3.2.5. SOURCES
- 3.2.6. TECHNICAL INFORMATION

PART 3.3. SUSPECTED THB OFFENDERS PROSECUTED BY THE PROSECUTION AUTHORITY

- 3.3.1. GENERAL COMMENTS
- 3.3.2. QUALITY OF THE DATA

- 3.3.3. RESULTS
- 3.3.4. TABLES
- 3.3.5. SOURCES
- 3.3.6. TECHNICAL INFORMATION

PART 4 NEW TRENDS IN THB

- 4.1. GENERAL COMMENTS
- 4.2. QUALITY OF THE DATA
- 4.3. RESULTS
- 4.4. TABLES

The following abbreviations and signs are used throughout the document:

- Three **asterisks (***)** indicates that the statistical **information is not (yet) available**.
- The abbreviation N.A. (NOT APPLICABLE) means that the **question / concept does not apply**.
- Three points (...) mean that the information was not provided by the country.
- **Zero means the cases are null** (e.g. no residence permits during that year).

PART 1

**Definitions of Trafficking in
Human Beings (THB)**

1.1. General comments

The TrafStat research team defined Trafficking in Human Beings (THB) as:

THB means (a) the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation includes, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs;

(b) The consent of a victim of trafficking in persons to the intended exploitation set forth in subparagraph (a) is irrelevant where any of the means set forth in subparagraph (a) have been used;

(c) The recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of a child for the purpose of exploitation shall be considered "trafficking in persons" even if this does not involve any of the means set forth in subparagraph (a).

National experts were asked whether their national definitions were similar to that one.

Table 1.1 present their answers to that question. It can be seen that ten countries applied a similar definition –although seven of them included comments on minor differences between such definitions– and twelve a different one.

Table 1. 1. Are there any differences between the definitions used in this questionnaire and the ones used in your country?

Austria

The country uses the same definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Belgium

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Since 2005, THB consists of two constitutive elements namely the existence of an act (recruiting, harbouring, transporting) and the presence of the finality of exploitation irrespective if it is effective or not. The modus operandi are not included as constitutive elements of the crime, but are instead among the aggravating circumstances.

The Belgian legislation also criminalizes forced begging and forced illegal activities.

In Belgium a victim who is identified receive an order to leave the territory within 45 days which correspond to the beginning of the reflection period. So at this time the victim already receives support and assistance.

Therefore for us the distinction between the first and second table is not very clear as it seems to refer to similar aspects of the procedure in Belgium.

Bulgaria

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Anti-trafficking legislation in Bulgaria is fully harmonized with EU legislation. According to the Bulgarian Combating Trafficking in Human Beings Act (CTHBA) "Trafficking in human beings" means the recruitment, transportation, transfer, concealment or acceptance of human beings, regardless of their own will, by means of coercion, abduction, deprivation of liberty, fraud, abuse of power, abuse of a state of dependence, or by means of giving, receiving or promising benefits to obtain the consent of a person who has control over another person, when it is carried out for the purpose of exploitation; 2. "Exploitation" means the illegal use of human beings for debauchery, removal of physical organs, forced labour, slavery or servitude; 3. The recruitment, transportation, transfer, concealment or acceptance of children for the purpose of exploitation shall be considered an act of trafficking in human beings, regardless of whether they have been carried out by the means in § 1 above. 4. "Child" means any individual who is less than 18 years of age; 5. "Victim" means any person who has become a subject of trafficking in human beings; 6. "Risk group" means a group of individuals who due to their age, sex, social status or the geographical location of the region where they reside pose potential victims of the acts in § 1 above. 7. "Risk region" means a region inhabited by groups as in § 6 above.

In relation to identification of victims in Bulgaria, a trafficked person can be identified in a formal and informal way.

According to the National Mechanism for Referral and Support of Trafficked Persons in Bulgaria (NRM), adopted in 2010, an informal identification is performed by officers and employees of different institutions and organizations which have the first contact with the victim. It allows for immediate access of the trafficked person to the support programs and services included in the NRM. A formal identification is performed by the pre-trial proceedings bodies and aims at starting the investigation. Identification is necessary during the first contact with the person (for example, during police raids, field work, when the person calls a Helpline, etc.), as well as when the person is referred to another organization.

Identification is performed on the basis of: - Initial informal conversation with the trafficked person. -Observations of the person's behaviour and appearance. -Information provided by the referring person. -Observation and analysis of the circumstances in which the person was found. -Self-identification.

Regarding the duration of "reflection period" in Bulgaria it is thirty days. Identified victims of trafficking are granted a 30-day reflection period under which they can decide whether to cooperate with authorities. Victims who are not nationals of the European Union and who cooperate in criminal proceedings are provided with a residence permit for either six months or the duration of the criminal proceedings. If they choose not to cooperate, they receive a short-term stay residence permit for the reflection period.

Croatia

The country uses a similar definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat, with some slight differences.

Definition of THB in Croatian criminal legislation (art. 106 CC) is similar to the definition used in this questionnaire. Means and actions are exactly the same, and in addition to the types of exploitation listed above, criminal law definition of THB in the CC includes pornography (as a form of sexual exploitation), contracting an illicit or forced marriage, using the person in armed conflicts or of committing an unlawful act as well as illegal adoption that concerns children as victims. The consent of a victim of trafficking in persons to the intended exploitation is irrelevant where any of the means set forth in subparagraph have been used (art. 106 par 7 CC). Trafficking in children would exist even if no criminal means have not been used (art. 106 par 2). Child is any person below 18 years of age (art. 87 par 7 CC).

According to the reply given by the Government's Office for Human Rights and the Rights of National Minorities, the Foreigner's Act and the Protocol for the Identification, Assistance and Protection of Victims of THB provide that victim status is formally granted by the Operative Team of the National Committee for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings. Government's Office for Human Rights and the Rights of National Minorities has also pointed out that victim status does not depend on the willingness of the victim to participate in the criminal proceedings. Thus, the person decides whether she/he will accept the assistance and protection Program offered to her/him. However, even if the person should not accept the Program offered to her/him, she/he will still be regarded as a victim of THB in the "identified victim statistics".

The definition given above is from the new Criminal Code (applicable as of 01.01.2013), but the definition related to the period covered by the questionnaire is the following one: Trafficking in Human Beings and Slavery.

Article 175: (1) Whoever, in violation of the rules of international law, uses force or threatens to use force or by fraud, kidnapping, abuse of position or authority solicits purchases, sells, hands over, transports, transfers, encourages or mediates in the buying, selling or handing over of another person or who conceals or receives a person in order to

establish slavery or a similar relationship, forced labour or servitude, sexual abuse or illegal transplantation of parts of a human body, or who keeps a person in slavery or in a similar relationship shall be punished by imprisonment for one to ten years. (2) If the criminal offense referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article is committed against a child or a juvenile, the perpetrator shall be punished by imprisonment for three to fifteen years. (3) If the criminal offense referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article is committed while the perpetrator is a member of a group or a criminal organization, if it is committed against a larger number of persons or has caused the death of one or more persons, the perpetrator shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than five years or by a life sentence. (4) Whoever procures or makes functional the means, removes obstacles, creates a plan or makes arrangements with others, or undertakes some other action in order to create the conditions enabling the direct perpetration of the criminal offense referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article shall be punished by imprisonment for one to five years. (5) Whoever seizes or destroys an identification card, a passport or some other document of identification in the perpetration of a criminal offense referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article shall be punished by imprisonment for three months to five years. (6) Whoever takes advantage of or enables another person to take advantage of the sexual services of a person that he knows to be a victim of trafficking in human beings or who for some other unlawful purpose takes advantage of this person shall be punished by imprisonment for one to five years. (7) Whether or not a person has acceded to forced labour or servitude, sexual abuse, slavery, to a relationship similar to slavery or to unlawful transplantation of the parts of his or her body is of no relevance for the existence of the criminal offense referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article.

Cyprus

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Czech Republic

The country uses a similar definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat, with some slight differences.

Definition is more or less the same, nevertheless it is worth to mention regarding the national specifics (divided in two paragraphs, first dealing with children, second with adults): Section 168 Trafficking in Human Beings of Czech Criminal Code: (1) Whoever forces, procures, hires, incites, entices, transports, conceals, detains, or consigns a child to be used by another for: a) sexual intercourse or other forms of sexual abuse or harassment, or for production of pornographic works, b) extraction of tissue, cell, or organs from his/her body, c) service in the armed forces, d) slavery or servitude, or e) forced labour or other forms of exploitation, or who profits on such a conduct, shall be sentenced to imprisonment for two to ten years. (2) The same sentence shall be imposed to anyone who forces, procures, hires, incites, entices, transports, hides, detains, or consigns a person other than referred to in Sub-section (1) by using violence, threat of violence or other grievous harm or deceit, or by

abusing his/her error, distress, or addiction in order to use him/her for: a) sexual intercourse or other forms of sexual abuse or harassment, or for the production of pornographic works, b) extraction of tissue, cell, or organs from their body, c) service in the armed forces, d) slavery or servitude, or e) forced labour or other forms of exploitation, or who profits on such conduct. (3) An offender shall be sentenced to imprisonment for five to twelve years or to confiscation of property if he/she: a) commits then act referred to in Sub-section (1) or (2) as a member of an organised group, b) exposes another person to a risk of grievous bodily harm or death by such an act, c) commits such an act with the intention to gain a substantial profit for him-/herself or for another, or d) commits such an act with the intention to use another person for prostitution. (4) An offender shall be sentenced to imprisonment for eight to fifteen years or to confiscation of property if he/she: a) causes grievous bodily harm by the act referred to in Sub-section (1) or (2), b) commits such an act with the intention to gain extensive profit for him-/herself or for another, or c) commits such an act in connection to an organised group operating in several states. (5) An offender shall be sentenced to imprisonment for ten to eighteen years or to confiscation of property, if he/she causes death by the act referred to in Sub-section (1) or (2). (6) Preparation is criminal.

Denmark

The country uses the same definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Estonia

The country uses a similar definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat, with some slight differences.

Trafficking is a crime by the Penal Code since April 2012 and therefore statistics described below show, that persons who are identified as victims, are in the sense of this questionnaire “presumed victims” identified by the non-governmental organizations helping THB victims. These NGOs are not authorized to give the formal status to the victims.

Finland

The country uses the same definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Germany

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Definition of *Trafficking in human beings (THB)*:

The country provided a definition in German, presented as a footnote². The following translation is presented under the responsibility of the authors of this publication:

Under the current German law, human trafficking for the purpose of organ removal is only a crime after the transplantation. The German Bundestag has, however, approved the draft of a law on combating human trafficking and prostitution in June 2013 which will allow the full implementation of the Directive 2011/36/EU. According to this law, human trafficking for the purpose of organ removal becomes punishable. The Federal Council will treat the law on second reading in 20 September 2013. If the Bundesrat does not create a Mediation Committee, it can be assumed that the law will be announced shortly thereafter. The law will enter into force on the day following its promulgation.

Definition of *Assistance*, additional comment:

Identified victims of THB are foreigners who normally stay in Germany only temporarily and whose residence title is not turned into a more permanent one. Therefore they are beneficiaries under the Asylum Seekers Benefits Act. The basic benefits they receive are more limited, compared to the usual social assistance rates, and generally granted as benefits in kind. The period of entitlement to the reduced basic benefits is four years. After this term has expired, benefits are paid corresponding to the SGB XII. In the following, only the most important benefits of the Asylum Seekers Benefits Act are described. Beneficiaries under the Asylum Seekers (Benefits) Act are housed - after their compulsory stay in initial reception facilities (during the first three months) - in communal dwellings or on a decentralized basis. After the first three months competent authorities decide at their own discretion, whether they shall live in shared or in individual accommodation. The authorities bear the appropriate costs of heating and rent of accommodation. Cash contributions towards living expenses under the Asylum Seekers Act: The benefits can be granted in the form of vouchers or cash. According to the actual transitional regulation implemented by the German Supreme Court cash benefits amount to 217 € for the single head of household/or 195 € for each member of an adult couple, 130 € for household members up to the age of seven, 154 € for household members over the age of seven and up to 14 years, 193 € for household members over the age of 15 and up to 18 years. Added to this is pocket money (137 € for the single head of household/ alternative: 123 € for each parent, and 80-88 € for household members under the age of 18) plus benefits for housing, heating and household goods. Health care for asylum seekers in the event of sickness, pregnancy and birth. By comparison with the benefits for accorded pursuant to the SGB XII, those accorded under

² Menschenhandel zum Zwecke der Organentnahme ist derzeit nach dem deutschen Recht lediglich als Beihilfe zu Straftaten nach dem Transplantationsgesetz strafbar ist. Der Deutsche Bundestag hat jedoch am 27. Juni 2013 dem Entwurf eines Gesetzes zur Bekämpfung des Menschenhandels und Überwachung von Prostitutionsstätten vom 4. Juni 2013 zugestimmt, mit dem Richtlinie 2011/36/EU vollständig umgesetzt werden soll. Dazu sieht der Gesetzentwurf unter anderem auch vor, dass Menschenhandel zum Zwecke der Organentnahme ausdrücklich in § 233 Absatz 1 Satz 1 Nummer 4 StGB unter Strafe gestellt werden. Der Bundesrat wird sich nun in zweiter Lesung am 20. September 2013 mit dem Gesetz befassen. Sofern der Bundesrat nicht von der Möglichkeit nach Artikel 77 Absatz 2 des Grundgesetzes (GG) Gebrauch macht und den Vermittlungsausschuss anruft, ist davon auszugehen, dass das Gesetz kurze Zeit später verkündet wird. Das Gesetz tritt am Tag nach der Verkündung in Kraft.

the Asylum Seekers (Benefits) Act are limited insofar as they are usually accorded only in the event of acute illness and pain. In addition to this, other benefits essential to maintain health may be accorded in special individual cases. The Health care pursuant to the SGB XII correspond to those provided under statutory health insurance.

Greece

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

The definitions are the ones which are defined in our legal framework. See Law 3064/2002, Presidential Degree 233/2003, Law 3386/2005, Law 3875/2010.

Hungary

The country uses a similar definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat, with some slight differences.

In 1999, the crime of trafficking in human beings was specifically introduced into the Hungarian Criminal Code. The definition of trafficking in human beings was modified in 2001 to harmonize with the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crimes.

According to Section 175/B of Act IV of 1978 on the Hungarian Criminal Code: (1) Any person who sells, purchases, conveys or receives another person or exchanges a person for another person, also the person who recruits, transports, houses, hides or appropriates people for such purposes for another party, is guilty of a felony punishable by imprisonment for up to three years. (2) The punishment shall be imprisonment between one to five years if the criminal act is committed: a) to the detriment of a person under eighteen years of age; b) to the detriment of a person kept in captivity; c) to subject the victim to forced labour; d) for the purpose of sodomy or sexual intercourse; e) for the unlawful use of the human body; f) in criminal conspiracy; or g) in a pattern of business operation. (3) The punishment shall be imprisonment between two to eight years, if the act of crime is committed: a) to the detriment of a person who is in the care, custody, supervision or treatment of the perpetrator; or b) for the purposes specified in Paragraphs c)-e) of Subsection (2): 1) by force or by threat of force; 2) by deception; 3) by tormenting the injured person. (4) The punishment shall be imprisonment between five to ten years if the criminal act is committed: a) to the detriment of a person referred to in Paragraphs a)-b) of Subsection (2) and in Paragraph a) of Subsection (3), for any of the purposes defined under Paragraphs c)-e) of Subsection (2), and/or in the manner defined under Points 1-3 of Paragraph b) of Subsection (3); or b) for the purpose of making illegal pornographic material. (5) The punishment shall be imprisonment between five to twenty years or life imprisonment if the criminal act is committed to the detriment of a person less than twelve years of age: a) for any of the purposes defined under Paragraphs c)-e) of Subsection (2); b) in the manner defined under Points 1-3 of Paragraph b) of Subsection (3); or c) for the purpose of making illegal pornographic material. (6) Any person who engages in preparations for trafficking in human beings is guilty of misdemeanour punishable by imprisonment for up to two years.

On 25 June 2012 the New Criminal Code was passed by the Hungarian Parliament and entered into force on 1 July 2013. The New Criminal Code incorporates the criminal offence of trafficking in human beings which was harmonized with the Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA and with the legal provisions of the Palermo Protocol to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially woman and children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. The new Criminal Code contains a new provision on forced labour. The aim of the new provision is to punish the trafficking in persons committed for the purpose of exploitation. According to the provision of this new crime, any person who coerces another person to carry out work by abusing his/her vulnerable situation or by using violence or threat, is guilty of a felony punishable by imprisonment of one to five years. The crime is punished stricter (by imprisonment of two to eight years) if the crime is committed with the torment of the aggrieved party; causing substantial injury to interests; or against a person under the age of 18. The new Act also explains the concept of exploitation. Since it is impossible to make an exhausting list of the exploitation acts, the new Criminal Code determines this concept generally, according to which exploitation shall mean an intention to obtain advantages from the situation of a person brought into or kept in a vulnerable situation. With this abstract concept, the new Criminal Code makes it possible to punish the most typical forms of exploitation, as well as every other form of acts appearing as exploitation in practice (including sexual exploitation). The qualified cases of the effective provision of trafficking in persons are rather difficult to be interpreted and looked over it. The new Criminal Code thus disregards the multiple references, but leaves the system of qualified cases as it is, what is more widens them in respect of aggrieved persons not reached the age of 14 and the age of 18. On the 1st of January 2012, a new crime was inserted into the Criminal Code, which is kept by the new Criminal Code as well. This crime is the illegal employment of third country citizens (non EU citizen). Pursuant to one of its regulation, it is also punishable if the perpetrator employs a third country citizen **who does not have a permit for gainful employment and who has been the victim of trafficking in persons.**

Section 192 of the new Criminal Code (Trafficking in human beings): (1) Any person who: a) sells, purchases, exchanges another person, conveys or receives another person as consideration; and/or b) transports, houses, hides or appropriates people for another person for the purpose of carrying out the act defined in Point a) is guilty of a felony punishable by imprisonment of up to three years. (2) Any person who sells, purchases, exchanges, conveys, receives, recruits, transports, houses, hides or appropriates people for another person for the purposes of exploitation shall be punishable by imprisonment between one to five years. (3) The punishment shall be imprisonment between two to eight years if TIP is committed: a) to the detriment of a person deprived of his/her personal liberty; b) by force or by threat of force; c) by deception; d) by the torment of the injured party; e) against a person under the education, supervision, care or medical treatment of the perpetrator, and/or by abusing any other relationship of power or influence over the injured party; f) for the purpose of the unlawful use of the human body; g) as a public official, using such an official capacity; h) in a criminal conspiracy; or i) in the manner of a business operation. (4) The punishment shall be imprisonment between five to ten years, if a) the crime defined in Paragraph (2) is

committed against a person under the age of eighteen; b) the crime defined in paragraph (2) and committed against a person deprived of his/her personal liberty is carried out as set forth in one of the points of paragraph (3) b)-i); or c) the crime defined in Paragraph (2) causes particularly serious damage or danger to life.

(5) The punishment shall be imprisonment between five to fifteen years, if a) the crime defined in Paragraph (2) is committed against a person under the age of fourteen; b) the crime defined in Paragraph (2) and committed against a person under the age of eighteen is carried out as set forth in one of the points of Paragraph (3); c) the crime defined in Paragraph (2) and committed against a person under the age of eighteen caused particularly serious damage or danger to life; or d) the crime defined in paragraph (2) is committed against a person under the age of eighteen for the purpose of child pornography. (6) The punishment shall be imprisonment between five to twenty years or life imprisonment, if: a) the crime defined in Paragraph (2) and committed against a person under the age of fourteen is carried out as set forth in one of the points of Paragraph (3); b) the crime defined in Paragraph (2) and committed against a person under the age of fourteen caused particularly serious damage or danger to life; or c) the crime defined in Paragraph (2) is committed against a person under the age of fourteen for the purpose of child pornography. (7) Any person who commits the preparation of TIP is guilty of a misdemeanour punishable by imprisonment of up to two years. (8) For the purposes of this Section, exploitation shall mean an intention to obtain advantages from the situation of a person brought into or kept in a vulnerable situation.

Section 193 of the new Criminal Code (Forced labour): (1) Any person who coerces another person to carry out work by abusing his/her vulnerable situation or by using violence or threats is guilty of a felony punishable by imprisonment between one to five years. (2) The punishment shall be imprisonment between two to eight years, if the forced labour is committed: a) with the torment of the injured party; b) causing substantial injury to interests; or c) against a person under the age of eighteen.

Definition of victim corresponds to the legal definitions of trafficking in human beings and forced labour of the Hungarian Criminal Code, but based on the number of permanent or provisional residence permits, reflection period, special assistance authorities might provide data on victims.

The Hungarian Government passed on 27 September 2012 the amendment of Act CXXXV of 2005 on Crime Victim Support and State Compensation. It aims to introduce the concept shelter, as a victim support service and authorizes the Government to develop detailed regulation for the identification of human trafficking victims. On this basis was developed the government regulation 354/2012 (XII. 13.) on the identification system for victims of trafficking. These entered into force on 1 January 2013. Pursuant to the Act on Crime Victim Support and State Compensation. the Hungarian Victim Support Service provides the following services to victims: -complete information, -providing help for assertion of interests, -legal aid, -instant monetary aid, -state compensation. Victims of trafficking in human beings are entitled to services independently from their cooperation in criminal proceedings.

Ireland

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

In addition to the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons the Criminal Law (Human Trafficking) Act 2008 also includes the action of providing the person with accommodation or employment within the trafficking definition.

Latvia

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Identified victim: The relevant formal authority granting the status is the investigative institution (Police) or performer of procedures (prosecutor) or the Commission led by the NGO eligible to provide the state funded social rehabilitation services which is chosen according to the public procurement procedure (Commission consists of a social worker, a psychologist, a lawyer, an official of the State Police, as well as, where necessary, other specialists). In practice we have no victim of human trafficking identified by prosecutor.

Presumed victim: a person who is identified as a victim of human trafficking by any relevant authority (e.g., by border guards, labour inspectors, consular officials), municipalities (social workers, orphan courts) and NGOs, but these victims usually refuse to be formally recognized as victims of human trafficking and to receive state funded social rehabilitation services; they can receive informative support by public institutions and assistance provided by NGOs own resources.

National: A person who has the citizenship of the Republic of Latvia as well as a person who is a non-citizen of the Republic of Latvia and a stateless person having a Latvian personal identification document. (In parallel to the status of Latvian citizen, the status of a non-citizen was created in 1995, as a special temporary status for former USSR citizens and their descendants living in the Republic of Latvia who do not have Latvian or any other state's citizenship. Latvia's non-citizens are not considered as stateless persons within the meaning of the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, given the much wider scope of non-citizens' rights; in relation to such individuals Latvia has undertaken particular obligations – it guarantees ex lege residence in Latvia, consular protection abroad, as well as the right to return to Latvia and the right not to be expelled from Latvia. Non-citizens enjoy most of the rights guaranteed to Latvian citizens. Every non-citizen has the right to acquire Latvian citizenship through naturalization.)

Luxembourg

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Poland

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

There is no official definition, but the following purposes of exploitation are considered: in the prostitution, pornography or other forms of sexual exploitation, in work or in forced services, in begging, in slavery or other forms of exploitation that humiliate a dignity of the human being or with the aim of obtaining cells, tissues and organs by violation of the act.

Portugal

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

On the 23rd of August 2013, Portugal altered the THB article on the Penal Code (160.º), transposing the *DIRECTIVE 2011/36/EU OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA.*

Beside the above mentioned forms of exploitation, we now also considered as THB: forced begging and the exploitation of criminal activities. Presently, the definition of Trafficking in Persons considers the: - Offer, deliver, recruitment, entices, accepts, harbors or receipt of persons for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation includes sexual exploitation, labour exploitation, forced begging, slavery, removal of organs or the exploitation of criminal activities; - By means of: a) violence, abduction or serious threat; b) fraudulent ruse or manipulation; c) With abuse of authority resulting from a relationship of hierarchical, economic, work or family dependence; d) By taking advantage of the psychic incapacity or situation of special vulnerability of the victim; or e) Through obtaining consent from the person who has control over the victim; Will be punished with a prison term of from three to ten years. The same penalty is applied in case of a minor. - In the case set forth in the previous number, if the agent uses any of the means set forth in the subsections of no. 1 or acts professionally or with the intention of monetary gain, he/she will be punished with a prison term of from three to twelve years. - The above penalties are aggravated in 1/3 (in their minimum and maximum) if the conduct mentioned has: - Endangered the victim's life; - Been committed with violence or has caused particularly serious harm to the victim;- Been committed by an employee in the exercise of their duties; -Been committed by an association criminal, or - As a result of the suicide victim. - Whoever, having knowledge of the practice of the crime set forth in nos. 1 and 2, to use the services or organs of the victim, will be punished with a prison term of from one to five years, if a longer term is not suitable because of another legal provision. - Whoever retains conceals damages or destroys the identification or travel documents of a person who is a victim of the crime set forth in nos. 1 and 2 will be punished with a prison term of up to three years, if a longer term is not suitable because of another legal provision. - The victims consent is irrelevant.

Romania

The country uses a similar definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat, with some slight differences.

Reflection period, according to the Romanian law, is a right granted, irrespective of the nationality of the victims.

Slovakia

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Internal regulation of Minister of Interior of the Slovak Republic No. 47/2008 on Assurance of the Program of Support and Protection of Victims of THB gives the following definition of victim of THB: "Victim of THB is understood to be: a) national of the Slovak Republic where there is a reasonable suspicion that he/she became of victim of THB committed in the territory of the Slovak Republic or abroad, b) foreigner or a person without nationality where there is a reasonable suspicion that he/she became of victim of THB committed in the territory of the Slovak Republic or abroad."

Slovenia

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

Spain

The country uses a similar definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat, with some slight differences.

Prosecutors don't lead the criminal investigation in Spain up to now. Therefore generally speaking when we talk about "Suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority" we're not referring to persons against whom legal proceedings have been initiated by the prosecuting authorities but persons against whom legal proceedings have been initiated by police officers and evaluated by the Prosecution Service.

Sweden

The country uses a different definition of Trafficking in Human Beings, than the one proposed by TrafStat.

The Netherlands

The country uses a similar definition of Trafficking in Human Beings than the one proposed by TrafStat, with some slight differences.

The difference applies to the definition of 'identified victim': In the Netherlands no formally identified victims exist in the statistics on victims. The Coordination Centre for Human Trafficking (CoMensha) is the central reporting agency of (possible) victims of human trafficking in the Netherlands. Every (possible) victim of human trafficking in the Netherlands should be reported to CoMensha by the individual or organization that has identified that person (or by the victim personally). No formal identification exists. At present, only the police, the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee and the Inspectorate of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment have a duty to report (possible) victims to CoMensha. Nevertheless, notifications of victims by organizations other than the police, the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee and the Inspectorate of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment remain a significant part of the total reported (possible) victims. The task of registering (possible) victims for the purposes of the National Rapporteur's reporting has been delegated to CoMensha. The National Rapporteur is responsible for analysing the quantitative data on the basis of which policy can be formulated.

PART 2 Victims of THB

PART 2.1. Identified Victims of THB

2.1.1. General comments

This chapter provides information on *the total number of identified victims by any relevant formal authority* in 2010, 2011 and 2012. Formal authorities are classified into the following categories: police, border police, formally mandated NGO, immigration agency, labour inspectorate or other (to be specified). Data are also breakdown by gender, age, type of exploitation and five main nationalities of the victims. Finally, the chapter includes technical information on the data recording methods.

Regarding identified victims, the following data were requested:

- *Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority on 2010, 2011 and 2012, and breakdown into the following sub-categories: police, border police, formally mandated NGO, immigration agency, labour inspectorate or other (to be specified) (see Table 2.1.1).*
- *Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority on 2010, 2011 and 2012 breakdown by gender: males, females and unknown (specifying in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender) (see Table 2.1.2); by type of exploitation: sexual exploitation, labour exploitation and other (to be specified in the comments) (see Table 2.1.3); by adults and minors (see Table 2.1.4); by nationals, foreigners from other EU countries and foreigners from non-EU countries (see Table 2.1.5); the 5 nationalities with the highest number of identified victims (see Table 2.1.6).*
- *Description of data recording methods for Tables on identified victims: Do countries include data on victims of smuggling of migrants? (see Table 2.1.7); How is a victim identified more than once during the same year counted? (see Table 2.1.8); Do countries have specific mechanisms to avoid double counting of victims? (see Table 2.1.9); How is a victim identified by more than one relevant formal authority of the country counted? (see Table 2.1.10); How is a victim of transnational THB counted in Tables 2.1.1.-2.1.6? (see Table 2.1.11). When is the age of a victim registered for Tables 2.1.1.-2.1.6? (see Table 2.1.12); (see Table 2.1.13).; General comments on Tables 2.1.7-2.1.14 concerning the data recording methods (see Table 2.1.14).*

2.1.2. Quality of the data

- *Eighteen countries out of the twenty-four that participated in the questionnaire provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority. The following countries also reported (for at least two of the three years) the number of identified victims registered by each relevant formal authority: fifteen countries by the Police, six countries by the Border police, eight countries by the Formally Mandated NGOs, six countries by the Immigration Agency, five countries by the Labour Inspectorate and ten countries by other formal authorities (see Table 2.1.1).*

- Regarding the breakdown by gender of the *total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority*, twenty-one countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the category of *males*, and twenty-one for the category *females* and ten for the category *unknown* (see Table 2.1.2).
- Sixteen countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the *total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority* to the breakdown *sexual exploitation*, fifteen countries for *labour exploitation* and twelve countries for other types of *exploitation* (see Table 2.1.3).
- Twenty countries were able to provide data (for at least two of the three years) for the *total number of adult identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority*, and 21 countries provided data for the *total number of minor identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority* (see Table 2.1.4).
- Sixteen countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for *the national identified victims*, the same number of countries provided data for the category *foreigners from other EU countries*, and seventeen provided data for the category of *foreigners from non-EU countries* (see Table 2.1.5).
- Data provided to the *five nationalities with the highest number of identified victims* was understood in different ways by the countries. Therefore results need to be interpreted cautiously. Overall, sixteen countries could provide some data (see Table 2.1.6).
- All countries provided most of the information required for the *Technical information* section. (See Table 2.1.7-2.1.14).

2.1.3. Results

Among countries providing data on victims, three main groups can be distinguished: (a) countries where recording is largely in the hands of the police, (b) countries where it is run by mandated NGOs, and (c) countries where there are parallel systems (i.e. more than one authority collects data). Some examples of countries where the police exclusively collect statistics on victims of THB are Cyprus, Greece, and Luxembourg. In Sweden the police and the prosecutor's office are in charge of collecting these statistics. In Germany, the only available statistics on victims of human trafficking are those on victims identified by the police, which are collected by the Federal Police (BKA). These statistics are known to be an undercount since not all victims receiving services from state funded institutions are identified by the police. NGOs rendering services to victims may publish data on their clients in their annual reports but do not share these data with any federal agency, although there are plans of the Federal Government of Germany to establish a National Rapporteur with a mandate to collect comprehensive statistics on victims. In Belgium, statistics on identified victims are collected by three mandated NGOs rendering services mainly to third-country nationals who have been identified by the police. In Estonia the only available statistics on victims seem those collected since 2011 by a network of mandated NGOs under the supervision of the Ministry of Social Affairs. In other countries victims are counted by more than one organization, usually the police and mandated NGOs parallel to each other. This is the case in Austria where the Criminal Intelligence Service collects such data as well as mandated NGOs. In Italy, Malta and Slovenia two parallel statistical systems on victims of the police and of mandated NGOs seem to exist next to each other. The totals of these systems cannot be added up because no formal system to avoid double counting is in place.

However, as mentioned in the data recording methods, some countries have introduced techniques to avoid double counting by different organizations while adhering to data protection standards. In many countries data protection has been a contentious issue but apparently satisfactory technical and/or organizational solutions have been put in place.

There are considerable differences between the countries regarding *the total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority*. These differences do not seem to reflect differences in the *real* number of victims, but on the way in which statistics are collected. For instance, in 2012, the total number of victims ranged from 1 in Czech Republic to 1711 in The Netherlands, while the European average was 257 victims *identified by a relevant formal authority*. In the same year, the relevant formal authority identifying more victims was the *police* with an average of 155 victims, followed by *other authorities* (73 victims on average). The *Labour Inspectorate* was the authority identifying fewer victims (only The Netherlands reported victims identified by it). The number of *women identified victims* was in average higher (115) than *men* (33) in 2012. When focusing on the *type of exploitation*, *sexual exploitation* was the highest type of THB with an average of 132 identified victims, followed by *labour exploitation* it with an average of 39 victims. The number of *adult identified victims* was in average higher (139) than *minors* (36), in 2012. The country showing the higher number of *minor victims* was Romania (370) followed by the Netherlands (223). Concerning the origin of the victim, in average in 2012, the highest number corresponded to *nationals* (85) followed by *foreigners from other EU countries* (49). The country showing the highest number of *national* between their victims was Romania with 1037 victims.

2.1.4. Tables

Table 2.1.1- Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	62	70	103
Belgium
Bulgaria	432	541	580
Croatia	7	4	11
Cyprus	52	40	37
Czech Republic	7	10	1
Denmark	53	60	66
Estonia	57	56	22
Finland	1	24	49
Germany	651	672	626
Greece	92	97	94
Hungary	7	18	122
Ireland	78	57	48
Latvia	3	0	3
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland
Portugal	18	33	10
Romania	1154	1048	1041
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	33	21	15
Spain
Sweden	96	127	88
The Netherlands	993	1222	1711

Table 2.1.1-. Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Police			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Belgium
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	7	4	11
Cyprus	52	40	37
Czech Republic	1	7	...
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1	24	49
Germany	651	672	626
Greece	92	97	94
Hungary
Ireland	78	57	48
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	7	8	4
Poland	25	166	18
	N.A	N.A	153
Portugal	9	29	6
Romania	1125	1015	1020
Slovakia	5 + 4 groups	13 + 6 groups	18 + 5 groups
Slovenia	...	18	14
Spain
Sweden	96	127	88
The Netherlands	731	960	976

Table 2.1.1. Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Border police			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Belgium
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany
Greece
Hungary	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Ireland
Latvia	16	14	30
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	11	30
	N.A	N.A	28
Portugal	9	4	4
Romania	1	1	2
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	***	0	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	43	24	445

Table 2.1.1- Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Formally Mandated NGOs			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Belgium
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic	1	2	1
Denmark
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany
Greece
Hungary	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Ireland
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	253	133	198
Portugal	0	0	0
Romania	0	5	5
Slovakia	28	31	40
Slovenia	***	3	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

Table 2.1.1- Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Immigration Agency			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Belgium
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic	2	1	...
Denmark	33	51	45
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany
Greece
Hungary	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Ireland
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland
Portugal	0	0	0
Romania
Slovakia	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Slovenia	***	0	1
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

Table 2.1.1- Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Labour Inspectorate			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Belgium
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany
Greece
Hungary	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Ireland
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland
Portugal	0	0	0
Romania
Slovakia	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Slovenia	***	0	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	39	34	98

Table 2.1.1- Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Other please specify			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Belgium
Bulgaria	432	541	580
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic	3
Denmark	20	9	21
Estonia	57	56	22
Finland	***	***	***
Germany
Greece
Hungary	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Ireland
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	34	25	57
	...	NA	181
Portugal	0	0	0
Romania	28	27	14
Slovakia	28	31	40
Slovenia	***	0	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	246	252	245

Table 2.1.2- Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Males			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	4	7	11
Belgium
Bulgaria	38	93	73
Croatia	1	1	4
Cyprus	5	5	11
Czech Republic	4	2	...
Denmark	1	...	10
Estonia	***	39	14
Finland	0	13	37
Germany	48	42	24
Greece	9	28	18
Hungary	1	0	4
Ireland	17	9	17
Latvia	0	2	5
Lithuania
Luxembourg	1	0	2
Poland	12	6	23
	N.A	N.A	48
Portugal	8	23	5
Romania	504	384	366
Slovakia	1	5	5
Slovenia	1	1	2
Spain
Sweden	5	10	6
The Netherlands	113	226	199

Table 2.1.2- Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Females			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	58	63	92
Belgium
Bulgaria	394	448	507
Croatia	6	13	7
Cyprus	47	35	26
Czech Republic	3	8	1
Denmark	51	58	56
Estonia	***	17	8
Finland	1	11	12
Germany	596	624	597
Greece	66	56	76
Hungary	6	18	118
Ireland	61	48	31
Latvia	19	12	28
Lithuania
Luxembourg	6	8	2
Poland	12	16	30
	N.A.	N.A.	133
Portugal	10	10	5
Romania	650	664	675
Slovakia	4	8	13
Slovenia	32	20	13
Spain
Sweden	5	13	8
The Netherlands	879	996	1509

Table 2.1.2- Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Unknown (please specify in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender)			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium
Bulgaria	0	0	0
Croatia	0	0	0
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic
Denmark	1	2	
Estonia	***	0	0
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	7	6	5
Greece
Hungary	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Ireland
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	0	0	0
Portugal	0	0	0
Romania			
Slovakia	4 groups	6 groups	5 groups
Slovenia	0	0	0
Spain
Sweden	86	104	74
The Netherlands	1	0	3

Table 2.1.3 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Sexual exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium
Bulgaria	357	404	574
Croatia	1	11	7
Cyprus	24	26	16
Czech Republic	3	7	...
Denmark	50	55	46
Estonia	***	36	9
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	610	640	612
Greece	N.A	N.A	69
Hungary	***	***	120
Ireland	56	37	39
Latvia	7	4	10
Lithuania
Luxembourg	6	6	2
Poland	14	12	9
	N.A	N.A	100
Portugal	9	4	4
Romania	488	517	557
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	31	20	13
Spain
Sweden	32	47	25
The Netherlands	749	781	1216

Table 2.1.3 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Labour exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium
Bulgaria	36	91	71
Croatia	4	2	4
Cyprus	17	9	19
Czech Republic	4	3	1
Denmark	2	3	17
Estonia	***	22	14
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	41	32	14
Greece	N.A	N.A	16
Hungary	***	***	2
Ireland	19	13	6
Latvia	2	2	7
Lithuania
Luxembourg	1	...	2
Poland	14	8	42
	N.A	N.A	50
Portugal	8	27	6
Romania	503	408	410
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	1	1	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	128	250	257

	2010	2011	2012
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria	18	46	39
Croatia	2	1	0
Cyprus	12	5	2
Czech Republic
Denmark	1	2	3
Estonia	***	6	0
Finland	***	***	***
Germany
Greece	9
Hungary	N.A	N.A	N.A
Ireland	3	7	3
Latvia	11	8	16
Lithuania
Luxembourg	...	2	...
Poland	7	4	4
Portugal	0
Romania	163	123	74
Slovakia
Slovenia	0	0	2
Spain
Sweden	64	80	63
The Netherlands	116	191	238

	2010	2011	2012
Austria	60	70	97
Belgium
Bulgaria	362	471	619
Croatia	5	10	11
Cyprus	50	39	37
Czech Republic	7
Denmark	51	58	66
Estonia	***	42	21
Finland	1	20	39
Germany	546	568	514
Greece	75	84	79
Hungary	7	15	***
Ireland	59	44	25
Latvia	18	14	33
Lithuania
Luxembourg	7	7	3
Poland	32	22	53
Portugal	14	30	101
Romania	847	729	671
Slovakia	9	12	12
Slovenia	31	20	15
Spain
Sweden	67	96	66
The Netherlands	841	1027	1488

Table 2.1.4 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Minors			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	2	0	6
Belgium
Bulgaria	67	60	53
Croatia	2	4	0
Cyprus	2	1	0
Czech Republic	0	0	0
Denmark	2	2	...
Estonia	***	5	1
Finland	0	4	10
Germany	95	90	100
Greece	17	13	15
Hungary	0	3	***
Ireland	19	13	23
Latvia	1	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	0	1	1
Poland	2	3	4
Portugal	4	3	0
Romania	307	319	370
Slovakia	0	1	6
Slovenia	1	1	0
Spain
Sweden	29	31	22
The Netherlands	152	195	223

Table 2.1.5 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Nationals			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	2	2
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia	4	13	8
Cyprus	0	0	1
Czech Republic	3	2	...
Denmark	1
Estonia	***	39	16
Finland	0	3	2
Germany	121	139	129
Greece	0	1	3
Hungary	N.A	N.A	17
Ireland	6	6	19
Latvia	19	14	33
Lithuania
Luxembourg	0	0	0
Poland	0	0	0
Portugal	8	28	3
Romania	1152	1041	1037
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	2	8	2
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	315	337	428

Table 2.1.5 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Foreigners from other EU countries			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	47	85
Belgium
Bulgaria	0	0	...
Croatia	1	...	2
Cyprus	18	11	13
Czech Republic	0	1	...
Denmark	12	8	17
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	0	0	3
Germany	362	417	390
Greece	57	83	67
Hungary	N.A	N.A	5
Ireland	17	9	10
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	1	1	1
Poland	17	19	36
Portugal	4	3	3
Romania	2	0	0
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	19	4	3
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	243	369	777

Table 2.1.5 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Foreigners from non-EU countries			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	21	16
Belgium
Bulgaria	0	0	0
Croatia	2	1	1
Cyprus	34	29	23
Czech Republic	4	6	1
Denmark	40	52	49
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	1	21	44
Germany	148	96	91
Greece	35	13	24
Hungary	N.A	N.A	N.A
Ireland	55	42	19
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	6	7	3
Poland	17	6	21
Portugal	6	...	4
Romania	0	7	4
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	12	7	10
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	419	509	506

Table 2.1.6 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Please specify the 5 nationalities with the highest number of identified victims (1/5)				
	Nationality	2010	2011	2012
Austria	Romania	***	14	12
Belgium
Bulgaria	Bulgarian
Croatia
Cyprus	Romanian	7	8	8
Czech Republic	Czech Republic	3	2	
Denmark	Nigeria	13	18	22
Estonia
Finland	Kyrgyzstan	0	0	26
Germany	Bulgaria	115	99	155
Greece	Romania	29	53	44
Hungary	Slovakian	N.A	N.A	3
Ireland	Nigeria	26	19	8
Latvia	...	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	China
Poland	Romania	7	12	30
	Poland (Citizenship-MOI's questionnaire)	N.A.	N.A.	90
	Vietnam (Citizenship-Border Police)	N.A.	0	13
Portugal	Brazil	5	0	3
Romania	Republic of Moldova	...	1	4
Slovakia
Slovenia	Ukraine	4	3	7
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***	***
The Netherlands	Dutch	315	337	428

Table 2.1.6 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Please specify the 5 nationalities with the highest number of identified victims (2/5)				
	Nationality	2010	2011	2012
Austria	Bulgaria	***	12	50
Belgium
Bulgaria	Czech Republic
Croatia
Cyprus	Vietnamese	12	7	2
Czech Republic	Nigeria	1	2	...
Denmark	Thailand	5	11	7
Estonia
Finland	China	0	3	6
Germany	Romania	125	175	134
Greece	Bulgaria	25	29	21
Hungary	Romanian	N.A	N.A	2
Ireland	Ireland	6	6	19
Latvia	...	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	Romania
Poland	Bulgaria	10	7	6
	Ukraine (Citizenship-MOI's questionnaire)	N.A	N.A	30
	Ukraine (Citizenship-Border Police)	N.A	0	12
Portugal	Romania	4	3	3
Romania	Bangladesh	...	5	...
Slovakia
Slovenia	Dominican Republic	6	3	2
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***	***
The Netherlands	Nigerian	130	134	95

Table 2.1.6 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Please specify the 5 nationalities with the highest number of identified victims (3/5)				
	Nationality	2010	2011	2012
Austria	Hungary	***	8	12
Belgium
Bulgaria	Germany
Croatia
Cyprus	Indian	0	6	15
Czech Republic	Honduras	2
Denmark	Romania	5	5	13
Estonia
Finland	Vietnam	0	2	8
Germany	Germany	121	139	129
Greece	Russia	13	7	8
Hungary	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A
Ireland	Romania	11	6	2
Latvia	...	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	Burkina Faso
Poland	Bangladesh	7	0	0
	Romania (Citizenship-MOI's questionnaire)	N.A	N.A	30
	Bulgaria (Citizenship-Border Police)	N.A	3	0
Portugal	China	0	...	0
Romania	Serbia	...	1	...
Slovakia
Slovenia	Slovakia	3	1	2
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***	***
The Netherlands	Hungarian	56	121	217

Table 2.1.6 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Please specify the 5 nationalities with the highest number of identified victims (4/5)				
	Nationality	2010	2011	2012
Austria	Nigeria	***	2	3
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus	Bulgarian	11	1	3
Czech Republic	Vietnam	1	1	
Denmark	Uganda	2	8	2
Estonia
Finland	Nigeria	0	4	1
Germany	Hungary	53	31	47
Greece	Nigeria	10	0	5
Hungary	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A
Ireland	Albania	2	2	3
Latvia	...	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	Nigeria
Poland	Nepal	5	0	0
	Bulgaria(Citizenship-MOI's questionnaire)	N.A	N.A	13
	Bulgaria (Citizenship-Border Police)	N.A	3	0
Portugal	Senegal	0	...	0
Romania	Republic of Greece	1
Slovakia
Slovenia	Czech	3	1	1
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***	***
The Netherlands	Romanian/Polish	49 Romanian victims	104 Polish victims	129 Romanian victims; 67 Polish victims***

Table 2.1.6 - Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Please specify the 5 nationalities with the highest number of identified victims (5/5)				
	Nationality	2010	2011	2012
Austria	Slovakia	***	1	7
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus	Chinese	1	7	0
Czech Republic	Sri Lanka	...	1	...
	Moldova	...	1	...
	Philippines	1
	Ukraine	...	1	...
	Bulgaria	...	1	...
Denmark	Brazil	5	4	...
Estonia
Finland	Bangladesh	0	4	1
Germany	Poland	31	37	24
Greece	Albania	6	2	8
Hungary	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A
Ireland
Latvia	...	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	Zimbabwe	3	1	1
Poland	Ukraine	3	2	8
	Vietnam	0	0	12
	Vietnam (Citizenship-MOI's questionnaire)	N.A.	N.A.	12
	Kenia (Citizenship-Border Police)	N.A.	0	0
Portugal	Ukraine	0	...	0
Romania	Hungary	1
Slovakia
Slovenia	Hungary	9	0	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***	***
The Netherlands	Bulgarian	46	73	302

Comments on Table 2.1.1-2.1.6	
Austria	Table 2.1.2: Transgender figures are already included in either males or females. Table 2.1.3: Sexual exploitation is not available, included in the total. Labour exploitation is not available, included in the total.
Belgium	The available figures, provided by NGO's, as the other departments cannot deliver statistical information concerning the victims, so we cannot data to Tables 2.1.1-2.1.6, on identified victims. The available figures on victims answer to the following conditions: "Only those victims are taken into account for whom a follow up started in the year of reference, by one of the three specialized centres and for whom an identity document was delivered by the immigration services, upon a decision of the public prosecutor". So our figures on victims will all be provided in PART 3.
Bulgaria	Other forms of exploitation (of Bulgarians abroad): are trafficking of pregnant women for the purpose of baby selling and THB for the purpose of organ removal (for 2010: 6 cases). Bulgaria is mainly a country of origin and to a lesser extent, a destination for victims of trafficking and above numbers of identified victims are only Bulgarians. Table 2.1.5: Foreigners from other EU Countries, 2012: Czech Republic and Germany.
Croatia	Other forms of exploitation: forced begging (2 persons in 2010) and forced marriage (1 person in 2010 and 1 person in 2012).
Cyprus	Other form of exploitation: forced marriage
Czech Republic	<p>Also other stakeholders could participate in the identification, in that case it is then mostly in cooperation with the Police – Police would be mentioned as identifying body.</p> <p>Victims of trafficking, are registered by different entities in CZ: 1) In the special Program for Support and Protection of victims of trafficking (assistance provided by NGOs supported by the Ministry of the Interior) – these are the data in tables 2.1.1-2.1.6.</p> <p>Statistical data available: number of victims, forms of exploitation, citizenship, gender, age (18-23, 24-30, 31-40, 50+), number of voluntary returns.</p> <p>2) by the 3 main NGOs (aimed at victims of trafficking) providing assistance to victims of trafficking s outside the Framework of the Program (supported by Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs) – for those who do not want to enter the Program</p> <p>Data available: (the 3 NGOs also use different data collection system and provide data to a different extend) number of supported clients (different range of assistance received (hotline/street work advisory vs. complex support with shelter); citizenships, forms of exploitation, means of recruitment, gender, age)</p> <p>3) +there are currently registered about 115 NGOs which are also focused on victims of trafficking as a marginal group of clients – among other target groups (thus we do not involve this kind of the data in the data collection system)</p> <p>4) The victims of trafficking statistically registered by the Police.</p> <p>Statistical data available: number of victims (also regional differences), registered in groups or individually (more information available: age, social background)</p> <p>Under the term "Identified Victims" used in this questionnaire could be also subordinated victims of trafficking, who did not want to enter the Program, but cooperated with LEA, who did not need the residence permit etc. but who were granted with the same assistance (group 2); however it is difficult to distinguish the data and unify in one table.</p> <p>Table 2.1.1: Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Immigration Agency: Refugee/Foreigners Facility Administration. Data from IOM Praha.</p>
Denmark	According to total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority; registered by other: the Danish Centre against Human Trafficking. It should be noted, that the Danish Immigration Service and the Danish Centre against Human Trafficking are the only actors responsible for verifying the status of victims of trafficking. The numbers above encompass the total number of victims of human trafficking verified by the Danish Immigration Service and the Danish Centre against Human Trafficking
Estonia	All the data given below is not totally comparable by the years, because of legislative changes. Since 2011 we have a specific questionnaire/data collection system. Before that data disaggregated that is the reason why we did not fulfil 2010. Data about exploitation is different of the total number of victims because there is different exploitation cases happened to one person. So that, in total number of the exploitation types the statistics are collected by the number of persons, but counting one person who had different exploitation cases can be counted twice. Data about citizenship is collected on the different bases, as asked. So therefore we are unable to give information as asked. As we don't have formally mandated NGOs, then seems to be that N.A is better explanation.
Finland	These victim figures only refer to victims of trafficking identified by the police. The quality of data is questionable, especially regarding the year 2010. For better victim data, please see table 2

	<p>which is based on data provided by the official assistance system to victims of trafficking. It is unclear how many victims identified by the police are also assisted within the system, since victims may refuse to enter the system, for example.</p> <p>The statistical system in use does not allow separating between sexual exploitation and labour exploitation when it comes to trafficking criminality.</p>
Germany	<p>Number of victims with unknown age: 2010: 10; 2011: 14; 2012: 12</p> <p>Number of victims with unknown nationality: 2010: 20; 2011: 20; 2012: 16</p> <p>The Law enforcement statistics data (Tables from Part 3.3) is not entirely comparable to the Police Data (Tables from Parts 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2). Unlike the data on Part 3.3, which relates to the number of convictions, the data in Parts 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2 relates to the number of police investigations completed.</p>
Hungary	<p>Comments on Table 2.1.1-2.1.6 of data of year 2010 and 2011: unfortunately we cannot provide more information about the gender of the victims, about the form of exploitation and about their nationality. In 2010 8 cases, 7 victims and 14 offenders, in 2011 18 cases, 18 victims and 32 offenders were registered. In 2012 members of the National Coordination Mechanism (Victim Support Service, Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Court, Prosecutors Office, Police Offices, National Bureau of Investigation, Office of Immigration and Nationality, National Crisis Telephone Information Service etc.) provided data too.</p> <p>The framework for combating trafficking in human beings was laid down by the Government Resolution 1018/2008 on the National Strategy against trafficking in human beings which established a National Coordination Mechanism and appointed a national coordinator. In order to ensure regular data collection and to establish reliable fact based and detailed picture of trafficking in human beings a national data collection mechanism has been developed through which anonym data collection has started.</p> <p>National Crisis Telephone Information Service is a telephone helpline which aim is to provide assistance for victims of human trafficking as well. The operators collect information about the victims during the telephone call and have available information about the forms of exploitation, transportation of victims, living circumstances, working conditions etc. The collected data are kept strictly confidential. Victim Support Services are collecting data on a similar way too. The consular services of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs collect information about the victims of human trafficking too although they only provide information yearly. A special data collection template was prepared for the consular services which consist of 3 parts.</p>
Ireland	<p>'Other' forms of exploitation: figures for 2010, 2011 and 2012 included 3, 5 and 3 persons respectively who were potential victims of THB where the form of exploitation was not identified or categorized during the investigation and the 2011 figure also included 2 persons who were victims of both sexual and labour exploitation.</p> <p>2012: In 13 cases, involving 19 Irish victims, investigations into child sexual abuse, child sexual assault and child pornography were determined at a later stage in the investigation/prosecution to involve all the necessary constituent elements of trafficking for sexual exploitation of a minor and charges were brought under anti-human trafficking legislation, namely, the Child Trafficking and Pornography Act 1998 as amended by Section 3 of the Criminal Law (Human Trafficking) Act 2008</p>
Latvia	<p>Formally mandated NGO provides data on identified victims of human trafficking who received state funded social rehabilitation services and this number might include number of victims identified by the Police within the criminal proceeding.</p> <p>"Others" types of THB: marriages of convenience (sham marriages). Latvia has recognized the marriages of convenience (definition given by Council Resolution of 4 December 1997 on measures to be adopted on the combating of marriages of convenience) as the potential risk of human trafficking.</p> <p>In 2010 one female in table regarding exploitation is counted twice, because she was exploited both – sexual and labour exploitation.</p>
Luxembourg	<p>We don't have the data about the nationalities for the years 2010 and 2011 so we can't tell the exact number of victims belonging to a certain nationality.</p>
Poland	<p>Data on the lines below comes from: MOI's questionnaire – not published data (!) – MOI introduced questionnaire fulfilled by the LEAs including all potential victims of THB , supported as victims of THB but also those who refused support (they were not interested in receiving support).</p> <p>Formally Mandated NGOs means KCIK. Numbers of KCIK and POLICE cannot be added. Till 2006, only foreigners formally identified by law enforcement agencies could be assisted within the special Program. In 2010 a significant progress has been made for the protection of victims. When the National Consulting and Intervention Centre for Victims of Human Trafficking (KCIK) was created as a public task financed from the governmental budget and the Program became only a part of KCIK. Within KCIK the assistance is provided to foreigners and Polish citizens both identified and not identified as victims of THB by law enforcement agencies. The decision whether to provide assistance to the person is undertaken by an experienced employee working for KCIK who is convinced that a person might be a victim of THB. This solution enables to provide assistance to the victims of THB even in the situation when victims do not want to</p>

	<p>contact with LEAs. Therefore, currently the support of victims is possible for a much bigger number of victims. Moreover, since 2013 as a result of a public tender, two NGOs: La Strada Foundation and Po MoC- Mary Immaculate Association for Women and Children were assigned the task of running the KCIK. Because of the fact, that both NGOs run their own shelter, KCIK has two shelters for its disposal.</p> <p>Data presented referred only to the Program for foreigners (!).</p> <p>Table 2.1.1- Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: registered by: Formally Mandated NGOs: 2010: 253 (KCIK data), 2011:133(KCIK data), 2012:198 (KCIK data). Total number of identified victims of THB registered by a relevant formal authority: Other in 2010: 7(begging)/ N.A (MOI's questionnaire)/0 (slavery practices)/N.A(MOI's questionnaire)/N.A (trafficking committing crimes)(MOI's questionnaire), in 2011: 4(begging)/N.A(MOI's questionnaire)/1 (slavery practices)/N.A(MOI's questionnaire)/N.A (trafficking committing crimes)(MOI's questionnaire), in 2012: 4(begging)/5(MOI's questionnaire)/3 (slavery practices)/5(MOI's questionnaire)/21 (trafficking committing crimes)(MOI's questionnaire)</p> <p>Table 2.1.5- Nationals: (2010, 2011, 2012) There are 0 a national, as program is only for foreigners.</p> <p>According to Citizenship-Border Police in 2012: 1. According to KCIK data in 2012: 83, in 2011: 28, in 2012: 89.</p> <p>Foreigners from other EU countries: Citizenship (MOI's questionnaire): 2012: 33 Citizenship (MOI's questionnaire) 2012: 3 Citizenship- Border Police.</p> <p>Foreigners from other non- EU countries: 2012: 42 Citizenship (MOI's questionnaire). 2011: 11 Citizenship- Border Police, 2012: 42 Citizenship- Border Police. KCIK data foreigners: 2010: 170, 2011: 52, 2012: 109</p>
Portugal	<p>Table 2.1.2: 2 registers (2010 and 2012), the age is unknown</p> <p>Table 2.1.3, Table 2.1.5 and Table 2.1.6: When using... Null data or protected under statistical secrecy.</p>
Romania	<p>Other relevant formal authority: National Agency against Trafficking in persons, DIICOT, International Organization for Migration, General Direction for Social Assistance and Child Rights Protection, Romanian Diplomatic Mission</p> <p>Other type of exploitation: (2010, 2011, 2012 mainly forced begging, victims obliged for committing thefts and victims of a tentative of trafficking in persons crime. In Table 2.1.6- We didn't include nationals in the top 5 since a reference was made just before.</p>
Slovakia	<p>Data on "identified victims" might be of two kinds – either all victims of THB or only "third countries nationals" being victims of THB and having certain rights and entitlements in accordance with the European Council Directive 2004/81/EC. If the second case occurs, the recorded numbers are very low, as follows: 2010: 0, 2011: 1, 2012: 1. Both victims were women, registered and identified by NGOs as well as registered by IC, both were supposed to be misused for sexual exploitation, one of the cases was not confirmed to happen, both victims were adults and foreigners from non-EU countries (Moldavia and Cameroon). If the first case occurs, then it is very complicated to find out the total number of victims.</p> <p>Two different information sources – statistics of Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic (police statistics) and statistics kept by Information Centre for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings and Prevention of Crime of Minister of Interior's Office of Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic (hereinafter referred to as "IC") on those victims who entered the Program of support and protection of victims of THB, no matter whether they are a part of criminal proceedings or not and as of 2012 both on victims who entered the Program of support and protection of victims of THB and those who did not.</p> <p>Police statistics contains data inserted by both "police" and "border police". Data on a total number of all victims of THB registered in statistical systems of various authorities are not kept on a central level. The problematic area relates to the kind of data which are kept by respective authorities. The total number of all victims is theoretically possible to count only after comparing concrete cases and victims from police statistics and from statistics kept by IC. Police statistics registers two kinds of victims – individuals and groups. So far requested detailed information from the police statistics has not been provided and so the figures related to groups might not contain personal data or a total number of victims registered within a group of victims might be missing. After we obtain the complete and complex output of the police statistics, we will be able to inform you whether the total number of victims of THB is possible to obtain for years 2010 – 2012. In 2013 this is prevented by the existence of information system "Trafficking in Human Beings" which is in detail described in the technical information (see 2.2.6). The police statistics does not register the purpose of THB. The nationality of the victims registered in the police statistics will be available only after the detailed output is provided.</p> <p>The numbers which for Tables on gender, purpose of THB, age and nationality relate only to so far available brief police statistical data.</p> <p>Victims of THB are identified by NGOs and IC keeps statistical data on them. The detailed information on gender, purpose of THB, age and nationality of such victims is available in Part</p>

	<p>2.2 Please, be informed that Immigration Office and Labour Inspectorate do not register or identify any victims of THB. If they have any information on a potential victim of THB, they submit it to IC or to a specialized police unit of combating THB.</p> <p>Table 2.1.2: (2010) 4 groups – unknown gender of its members, (2011) 6 groups – out of them 2 members were women, other members of unknown gender, (2012) 5 groups - out of them 2 members were women, other members of unknown gender.</p>
Slovenia	<p>-Other forms of exploitation: Two victims of begging in 2012</p> <p>- Table 2.1.6: Origin of the victims: At least 3 victims from Dominican Republic in 2011</p>
Sweden	<p>*** means included in total figure.</p> <p>The statistics on victims provided to Eurostat for the 2013 report were based on trafficking cases registered by the police and/ or Prosecution Authority. Breakdown to gender are not systematically available in the police registration. The National Rapporteur publishes annual reports. Data on victims in these reports are not comprehensive either. Statistics provided for the GRETA evaluation report, collected by the National Rapporteur referred to victims recognized as aggrieved parties in human trafficking cases ending in a conviction.</p> <p>Identified victims = Number of victims registered in trafficking offences reported to the police. (same sources were used when providing victim of THB statistics to Eurostat).</p> <p>Registration on victims' gender is not mandatory in the systems and missing in many of the cases.</p> <p>Registration on forms of exploitation is based on a classifications system (4-digit code) which offers a separation between a) sexual exploitation and b) other forms of exploitation (which is all forms of exploitation <i>except sexual exploitation</i> i.e. forced labour, domestic servitude, forced begging, organ removal, criminal activities etc.) Future data, starting 2013, will offer a separation between forced labour, forced begging and organ removal.</p> <p>Data on victims' age (adult/minor) is based on codes for classification of trafficking offences. The classification codes offers separation between adults and minors.</p> <p>Data from official registration systems on identified victims' citizenship is currently not available.</p>
The Netherlands	<p>Comment on identified victims: The numbers in Tables 2.1.1-2.1.6 refer to the registered (possible) victims: those who are reported to CoMensha. In the Netherlands no formally identified victims are registered.</p> <p>Comments on 'notifiers': The total number of notifications per year is higher than the total number of victims per year because notifications about some victims were made by more than one institution or person.</p> <p>Comment: The category 'border police' is interpreted as the Netherlands Royal Marechaussee and therefore does not refer to the alien police.</p> <p>Comment: The category 'Formally Mandated NGOs' does not apply, since in the statistics on (possible) victims no formally identified victims exist. Therefore there are no NGOs formally mandated to identify victims. However, there are NGOs who notify (possible) victims to CoMensha. The numbers of (possible) victims, who are notified by NGOs, are included in the Category 'other'.</p> <p>Comment: The category 'Immigration agency' does not apply. All foreign (possible) victims that are in contact with the Immigration and Naturalisation Service (IND) in the Netherlands are those victims that have been referred to the IND by the police or the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee because of their right on the reflection period and the temporary residence permit for victims of trafficking in human beings. The police and the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee have the duty to report (possible) victims to CoMensha. These victims that are in contact with the IND should, in theory, have been referred to CoMensha by the police.</p> <p>Comment: The category 'Labour inspectorate' is for the years 2010 and 2011 interpreted as the Social Intelligence and Investigation Service (SIOD). With effect from 1 January 2012, the Labour Inspectorate, the Work and Income Inspectorate and the Social Intelligence and Investigation Service were merged into the Inspectorate of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (Inspectorate SZW).</p> <p>Comment: The category other includes the following: Care agencies; youth care agencies; legal and social services; human trafficking networks (established by CoMensha to integrate efforts with regard to assistance to victims); shelters; religious institutions; refugee and asylum organizations (not the Immigration and Naturalisation Service); the victim him or herself and other individuals (not necessarily related to an organization); and a few other organizations that were not specified in the received statistics.</p> <p>Comment on 'gender': In 2010 the gender of one registered (possible) victims was unknown (the gender was not registered).</p> <p>Comments on 'exploitation': It is possible that a (possible) victim is exploited in more than one sector. However, a category 'sexual AND labour exploitation' is not included. Furthermore, the category 'human trafficking for the purpose of organ trafficking' is not included in Table 1, while this is part of the definition of trafficking in human beings in the UN Palermo Protocol. Also, the category 'not worked yet' is lacking.</p> <p>Additionally, it would be relevant to clarify that the national expert filling in this form would really need to specify the category 'other', with regard to the up-coming forms (now or in the near</p>

	<p>future) in some countries, such as forced commercial surrogacy, human trafficking linked to benefit fraud, etcetera.</p> <p>Comment: The category 'other' includes 'not worked yet' and 'unknown'.</p> <p>Comment: In 2010, 8 persons who were sexually exploited were also exploited in the labour industry. In 2011, 6 persons who were sexually exploited were also exploited in the labour industry.</p> <p>Comment on 'adults/minors': The category 'unknown' is registered in the CoMensha database. There are 10 registered (possible) victims in 2010, 14 registered (possible) victims in 2011, and 9 registered (possible) victims in 2012 whose age was unknown.</p> <p>Comments on 'nationality': Comment: The statistics refer to citizenship and not the country of birth or country of origin (in contrast to the Dutch statistics on suspected and convicted offenders).</p> <p>Comment: The categories 'unknown' and 'stateless' are not included in Table 2.1.1. There were 16 registered (possible) victims in 2010, 7 registered (possible) victims in 2011, and 19 registered (possible) victims in 2012 whose nationality was unknown. When these numbers are included, the total number will add up for the total registered (possible) victims.</p> <p>Comment: Interpretation on EU – countries: EU member states since 1995: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, Sweden. EU member states since 2004/2007: in 2004: Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia; in 2007: Bulgaria and Romania.</p>
--	---

2.1.5. Sources

Austria	Criminal Intelligence Service, not published
Bulgaria	Supreme Cassation Prosecutor's Office http://www.prb.bg/main/en/pages/Structure_and_Organization/ ; National Commission for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings http://antitraffic.government.bg/en/
Croatia	Ministry of Internal Affairs
Cyprus	Office of Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, Cyprus Police
Czech Republic	Crime Prevention Unit, Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic.
Denmark	Danish Centre against Human Trafficking
Estonia	Statistics about victims are collected by the NGOs using the special format for data collection worked out by the Ministry of Social Affairs and other partners.
Finland	Statistics Finland 2013. Personal communication.
Germany	Data from State police forces and federal criminal Police.
Greece	Hellenic Police Headquarters/ Public Security Division.
Hungary	Source of the data of years 2010 and 2011: Unified Statistical System of Investigations and Prosecutions. The data is collected, aggregated, analysed by the prosecutor and police offices, both having internal databases systems. The internal police database (Robotzsaru) used by police officers across Hungary gives local investigators the ability to flag for other authorities any crime they believe could have a trafficking in human beings connection.
Ireland	Anti-Human Trafficking Unit Annual Report of Trafficking in Human Beings in Ireland 2010, 2011, 2012 at www.blueblindfold.gov.ie . This report provides regions rather than nationalities of victims. Nationalities for 2010 and 2011 published in Parliamentary Question 31614/12 for written answer on 3 July 2012 at www.oireachtas.ie . Nationalities for 2012 from An Garda Síochána (Irish police) report, not published.
Latvia	State Police. Society (NGO) "Shelter "Safe House""
Luxembourg	Police
Portugal	Law Enforcement Agencies (Judiciary Police and Boarder and Migration

Service).

- Romania** National Agency against Trafficking in Persons, Monitoring, Evaluation and Coordination Unit through SIMEV (National Integrated System to Monitor and Assess Trafficking in Persons).
SIMEV was developed by the National Agency Against Human Trafficking (ANITP) and became fully operational in January 2007. Technically, the national system is based on multi-level software, which uses a central database, a data interrogation application and a web-type user interface. The access to this system is only permitted to users within ANITP, the Monitoring, Evaluation and Coordination Office, ANITP Regional Centres, as well as to certain users within the Offices to Combat Organised Crime and within the General Inspectorate of the Romanian Border Police. The data may also originate from other partner institutions besides the Ministry of Internal Affairs, for example NGOs, DGASPC (General Direction for Social Assistance and Child Rights Protection), School Inspectorate etc. Officers of ANITP Regional Centres collect the data.
- Slovakia** Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic and Information Centre for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings and Prevention of Crime of Minister of Interior's Office of Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic, published on website http://www.minv.sk/?statistika_obchodovanie_s_ludmi
- Slovenia** Annual Reports confirmed by Government
http://www.vlada.si/en/projects/fight_against_trafficking_in_persons/
- Sweden** Data from official registration systems – offences recorded by the police.
- The Netherlands** Source: CoMensha database provided to the Dutch Rapporteur. Published in: National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings and Sexual Violence against Children (2012). Visible and Invisible Human Trafficking. Statistical Data 2007-2011. The Hague: BNRM Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl). Complete overview of the statistics is included in the Dutch version: 'Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2012). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld. Cijfermatige rapportage 2007-2011. Den Haag: BNRM Nationaal Rapporteur; and the new report: Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2014). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld II. Cijfermatige rapportage 2008-2012. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl).

2.1.6. Technical information

Rules of statistical recording applied for Tables 2.1.1-2.1.6:

Table 2.1.7-: Do your data include victims of smuggling of migrants (i.e. the procurement, in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit, of the illegal entry of a person to a State the person is not a national or a permanent resident)	
Countries not including victims of smuggling of migrants:	
Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, The Netherlands	
Countries including victims of smuggling of migrants:	
Czech Republic	They are included, if they are victims of trafficking at the same time; but there are still 2 other special programs for migrants regarding the law on foreign nationals (number not reported).
Slovakia	Information about possible smuggling of migrants is included in the questionnaire accompanying the data on a victim of THB who was provided with special assistance within the Program of support and protection of victims of THB. In 2011, 1 victim of THB was illegally migrated into the Schengen area and in 2012 also 1 victim of THB was illegally migrated into the Schengen area. This fact is also kept by Immigration Bureau.

Table 2.1.8- How is a victim identified more than once during the same year counted?	
As one identified victim	As two or more identified victims
Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, The Netherlands	Bulgaria, Germany, Latvia, Sweden

Table 2.1.9- How is a victim identified more than once during the same year counted?	
As one identified victim	As two or more identified victims
Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, The Netherlands	Bulgaria, Germany, Latvia, Sweden

Table 2.1.10- Does your country have a specific mechanism to avoid double counting of victims?	
Countries not having specific mechanism to avoid double counting of victims	
Austria, Bulgaria, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Poland, Sweden	
Countries having specific mechanism to avoid double counting of victims	
Croatia	In case the same person gets identified two or more times, then she/he is treated as a victim in the situation of re-trafficking, for which case individual special assistance and protection programs are foreseen.
Czech Republic	In the case of the Program for Support and Protection of Victim of Trafficking, but regarding other groups of victims – as mentioned above – the data could overlap (one victim could be mentioned in all 4 “groups”).
Denmark	All are registered by name, nationality and date of birth and the Danish Immigration Service and the Danish Centre against Human Trafficking coordinates on the number of victims on a quarterly basis.
Estonia	Since 2013 data collection changes and at the moment police is the only authority that identifies victims, this will also avoid double counting of victims.
Ireland	Data from NGOs and police collated by the Anti-Human Trafficking Unit is anonymous but the referral path and overlapping data is checked with the data providing bodies to establish if it is the same person.
Portugal	The OTSH monitoring system does not collect personal data. This issue is controlled by the Observatory on Trafficking in Human Beings (OTSH) team (treatment of information). When necessary the OTSH contacts the data providers to clarify the doubts. With the implementation of the new data base (<i>Dynamic Application</i>) there is a technological device based on an algorithm that automatically compares all registers. This device is based on the percentage given to some variables (such as age, nationality...). Through a process of probability, when a case is inserted, the system crosses the data and informs the OTSH on the percentage (if any) of that victim being already in the system. The warning e-mail was set at 80% - probability of double counting. Afterwards the OTSH

	proceeds with the analysis of the identified registers.
Romania	When entering personal data, the system announces the presence of the same coin already entered. If personal data such as name, surname or ID number are not completed because the victim does not want this, then they are protecting this information by transforming in anonymous data. Even in this situation the method of protection adjoining announce the date of birth of the victim, announces the presence of same victim in system. In this way we avoid duplication of cases. If it is a case of re-trafficking and the operator must enter the new situation of victimization, because of emerging traffic, will insert this data by selecting initial indicator "re-trafficking case"
Slovakia	Since 1st May 2013 Information Centre for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings and Prevention of Crime of Minister of Interior's Office of Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic has been the administrator of information system "Trafficking in Human Beings" where data (also personal) about all victims, perpetrators and cases of THB are stored. The system enables to connect victims and perpetrators within cases, searches of victims, perpetrators and cases and serves for making analysis, statistics and evaluation of data. The existence and operation of the system assures that information about all victims of THB are included in the system, regardless whether they are a part of criminal proceedings or not and so to avoid double counting. Before the information system existed, no official statistical system was in place to give a general overview of all victims. The operation of the system is defined by internal regulation (Regulation of Minister of Interior of the Slovak Republic No. 28/2013 dated 22 April 2013 on the use of information system "Trafficking in Human Beings"). Nevertheless, information on personal data of victims who were registered by NGOs and did not receive special assistance or did not become a part of criminal proceedings is still missing. IC keeps only data on number of such victims. IC makes efforts to resolve it soon and to include into the information system also identified victims who are not a part of criminal proceedings and did not enter the Program of support and protection of victims of THB .
Slovenia	Analysing case by case.

Table 2.1.11- How is a victim identified by more than one relevant formal authority of the country counted?	
<i>Countries identifying victims as one identified victim only (i.e. only one formal authority counts the victim)</i>	<i>Countries identifying victims as two or more identified victims (i.e. each relevant authority counts the victim)</i>
Austria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ireland, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, The Netherlands	Bulgaria, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Slovakia
Comments	
<p>Croatia: The official victim identification is carried out by the Ministry of Internal Affairs in line with the provisions of the Protocol for the Identification, Assistance and Protection of Victims of THB. Should there be doubts regarding a specific case, it will get presented and decided upon at the meeting of the Operative Team, which is chaired by the national THB coordinator.</p> <p>Latvia: A victim of human trafficking might be counted twice in those cases where there is a victim identified by the State Police within the criminal proceeding and the mandated NGO registers this victim as identified victim who has received the state funded social rehabilitation services, but sometimes a victim might refuse receiving of the state funded social rehabilitation services and in such case a persons is an "identified victim" with certain rights and entitlements (as according the project's definition) by the State Police.</p> <p>Slovakia: As one identified victims, IC counts the victim only once. For two or more identified victims before 2013 this situation might have occurred.</p> <p>The Netherlands: Each relevant authority counts the victim, but double counting of victims is avoided by CoMensha. Therefore the total number of notifiers of (possible) victims is higher than the total number of (possible) victims.</p>	

Table 2.1.12- THB is often a transnational offence. For example, a victim with the citizenship of one country can be exploited in another country and the relevant authorities of both countries may collaborate in the investigation or in the assistance provided to the victim. In these cases, the victim could be counted twice (once in each country). How is a victim of transnational THB counted in Tables 2.1.1-2.1.6?	
<i>A victim is always counted in the statistics (independently of the fact that he/she is being counted in the statistics of another country or that the victimisation took place in another country)</i>	<i>A victim is not counted in the statistics if he/she is being counted in the statistics of another country or if the victimisation took place in another country</i>
Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, The Netherlands.	Ireland
Comments	
<p>Czech Republic: If the victim entered the Czech Program for Support and Protection of Victim of Trafficking, he/she will be counted in the Program regardless his/her involvement in other programs of cooperating states.</p> <p>Latvia: A victim of human trafficking might be counted twice by Latvia and a foreign country where a person was exploited. The Latvian mandated NGO provides the state funded social rehabilitation to a victim referred by the diplomatic mission of Latvia abroad or foreign law enforcement agency or foreign NGO. If a person refuses to receive state funded social rehabilitation services or to participate in a criminal proceeding in Latvia she/he is not counted in Latvia's official statistics.</p>	

Table 2.1.13- When is the age of a victim registered for Tables 2.1.1-2.1.6??	
<i>At the moment of identification by the relevant formal authority</i>	<i>At the moment of recruitment for THB</i>
Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden.	Ireland, Romania, Slovakia
Comments	
<p>Estonia: Up to 2012 victims have been identified at the moment of getting into contact with the organizations offering assistance to them, but from now on, the identification is made at the moment they get in contact with the relevant formal authority – police.</p> <p>Hungary: The age of the victim is registered at the moment of identification but in case it is possible and the victim remembers the date will be registered too when the exploitation has begun.</p> <p>Portugal: Variable is collected at the moment in which the monitoring system starts the data collection at the moment of flagging (presumed victims).</p> <p>Sweden: Data on victims' age (adult/minor) is based on codes for classification of trafficking offences. The classification codes offer separation between adults and minors.</p> <p>The Netherlands: At the moment of registration by CoMensha.</p>	

Table 2.1.14- Have the data recording methods described above been modified between 2010 and 2012?	
Countries that have not modified them:	
Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, The Netherlands.	
Countries that have modified them:	
Czech Republic	The data collection system has not changed; however, the t Program has been transformed a little in 2012, which has an impact in the figures.
Hungary	Source of information is the Unified Statistical System of Investigations and Prosecutions but since 2012 we try to collect more information with the help of the members of the National Coordination Mechanism (Victim Support Service, Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Court, Prosecutors Office, Police Offices, and National Crisis Telephone Information Service etc.) Members of the Mechanism are all authorities who are taking part in the fight against human trafficking, they are asked to provide available information quarterly about victims/offenders of human trafficking cases.
Poland	The MOI's questionnaire was created; the data are available since 2012. The questionnaire for statistical analyses changed in 2011 in order to receive more comprehensive data. The questionnaire will be used by the Border Police for the first time in reference to the year 2013. The police data obtained from the questionnaire are not presented here: presentation two indicators together – form of exploitation plus a number of victims is possible only in reference to the ended investigations. Unfortunately they do not present the nationality / citizenship of victims (only the information: citizen of Poland / foreigner). The same comment stands for prosecutor's data – not presented here.

Portugal	<p>We are progressively introducing the new data base the Dynamic Application (explained above in Table 2.1.10). The system has two main modules of data collection and analysis:</p> <p><u>1. Central module:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Victim dataset</i> – information about presumed and identified victim of trafficking. Collects socio-demographic and routes information. This is mainly intended as a tool for understanding victim's profiles. - <i>Traffickers/Criminal justice set</i> (in development) - information about presumed/convicted perpetrators of the crime of human trafficking and tracks their cases through full legal and judicial process. This is intended as a tool for understanding the necessary criminal and judicial side of the phenomena. The type of information being collected is that which can potentially be helpful in understanding who is involved in trafficking and related crimes, their role in this process, as well as the work of legal and judicial actors in the area of investigation and prosecution. <p><u>2. Geographic Information Module</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Web mapping application</i> – This tool allows viewing the distribution of THB at regional, national and international levels, by building territorial statistics and detecting spatial patterns of the phenomena. An important consideration in the development of the database is that we do not collect personal data and that all indicators/variables were selected in consultation with the main national governmental and non-governmental organizations.
-----------------	--

Table 2.1.15- Comments on questions 2.1.7- 2.1.14

Bulgaria	Some of the non-governmental organizations in Bulgaria have internal rules which do not allow them to share personal data of the victims. This makes the prevention of double counting of identified victims extremely difficult.
Cyprus	According to the Combating of Trafficking and Exploitation of Persons and Protection of Victims Law, Law No. 87(I) of 2007, the Cyprus Police is the only competent authority to identify victims of trafficking in human beings. Therefore, victims cannot be double counted.
Estonia	Victims can be counted on different statistics. If there is evidence that this has happened, then it has to be decided where the criminal proceeding will be held and where it should be terminated. If we have started criminal proceeding in Estonia and there are foreign victims of THB, then in the beginning it might not be clear, if there is a case started about the same victims somewhere else. If the case has been terminated in Estonia, then in our statistical databases information stays about different procedural activities done with the victims of THB, while the proceeding lasted (i.e giving evidence, video hearing, act of the termination of the criminal case, etc).
Finland	There is no centralized system for collecting data on the number of victims. Different authorities and NGOs may identify victims, but if they do not wish to enter the official assistance system, they do not show in that statistics (Part 2.2).
Latvia	Usually the State Police does not initiate criminal proceeding on human trafficking if this has been initiated and performed by foreign law enforcement agency of a country where a person was exploited. The State Police cooperates with foreign law enforcement agencies providing information, searching recruiters and participants of offence, their interrogation and providing extradition of participants of offence for conviction in a country of destination. Sometimes both countries (Latvia as a country of origin of a victim of human trafficking and a country of destination where a person was exploited) initiate criminal proceedings, but for different offence, e.g., there was a case when UK initiated a criminal proceeding for rape of Latvian citizen, but Latvian State Police initiated a human trafficking case against recruiters in Latvia who organized transportation of a victim to UK.
Poland	Data on gender, age, exploitation, nationality could be provided by KCIK data. In consequence it does not reflect the total number of supported victims because KCIK does not collect detailed information. They are not presented in the questionnaire as these data refers to the years 2009-2011 in total. MOI received 306 questionnaires, from which 105 questionnaires referred to the victims not identified by LEAs /prosecutor but only by the experienced workers on the KCIK. Thus these persons received support as victims of THB. Thus, the data presented above stands only for the special Program for support and Protection for Victim/Witness of trafficking in human beings – Program for foreigners implemented by NGOs. The Program is a part of KCIK and financed from the ministerial budget (MOI). Within the Programme only foreigners officially identified by Police / Border Guards officer or prosecutor can be supported and receive a residence permit during so called reflection period (3 months).
Slovenia	Further information about the situation in the Republic of Slovenia via Action Plans and Annual Reports on THB, which can be found at: http://www.vlada.si/en/proiects/fight_against_trafficking_in_persons/

The Netherlands	<p>In her 2012 report 'Trafficking in human beings: Visible and Invisible', the Dutch Rapporteur has made a number of recommendations with regard to the registration of, amongst others, possible victims of trafficking in human beings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- All victims known to agencies must be reported to CoMensha. Agencies with a duty to report must comply consistently with their obligation; agencies that do not have such a duty should nevertheless report all victims known to them.- Because it is not known how old persons are when they become victims, the proportion of underage victims may be underestimated. CoMensha should therefore also register the age of victims at the time they first became victims. <p>The key message of the mentioned report is as follows: 'To tackle human trafficking effectively, it must be made visible. Human trafficking that is hidden must be revealed – and once revealed, it must be better registered.'</p>
------------------------	--

PART 2.2.
**Victims of THB who received
assistance**

2.2.1. General comments

This chapter provides information on the *total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection* in 2010, 2011 and 2012. Data are breakdown by gender, age, and origin of the victims, and by type of exploitation. The chapter also includes information on the number of victims who were awarded reflection periods, (temporary) residence permits, or whose right to receive compensation from the offender was recognised by a criminal or civil Court. Finally, the chapter includes technical information on the data recording methods.

Regarding victims of THB who received assistance and protection, the following data were requested:

- *Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection for 2010, 2011, 2012 (see Table 2.2.1) and breakdown into the following sub-categories: males, females and unknown (specifying in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender) (see Table 2.2.2); by type of exploitation: sexual exploitation, labour exploitation and other (to be specified in the comments) (see Table 2.2.3); by age: adults and minors (see Table 2.2.4); by origin of the victims: nationals, foreigners from other EU countries and foreigners from non-EU countries (see Table 2.2.5).*
- *Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection, breakdown by total number of victims of THB who were awarded a reflection period (see Table 2.2.6), total number of victims of THB who were awarded a (temporary) residence permit (see Table 2.2.7); total number of victims of THB whose right to receive compensation from the offender was recognised by a criminal or civil Court (see Tables 2.2.8).*
- *Description of data recording methods for Tables on victims of THB who received assistance and protection: How is a victim who received assistance and protection from one agency more than once during the same year counted? (see Table 2.2.9); how is a victim who received assistance and protection from more than one agency counted? (see Table 2.2.10); have the data recording methods described above been modified between 2010 and 2012? (see Table 2.2.11); general comments on the description of the data recording methods (see Table 2.2.12).*

2.2.2. Quality of the data

- *Nineteen countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection (see table 2.2.1). Most of the countries were able to provide at least partial data on the breakdown for gender, age, origin, and type of exploitation:*
- *Fifteen countries could provide the breakdown for males, sixteen for females, and in eleven countries there were no cases in the category unknown (see table 2.2.2).*

- Regarding the type of exploitation, fifteen countries provided data (at least for two of the three years) for the category *sexual exploitation*, fifteen countries for *labour exploitation* and thirteen countries for the category *other* (see table 2.2.3).
- Fifteen countries could provide data (for at least two of the three years) on the breakdown for *adults*, and 16 countries for *minors* (see table 2.2.4).
- Thirteen countries provided data (at least for two of the years) for the *national* identified victims, fourteen countries provided data for the category *foreigners from other EU countries*, and fourteen provided data for the category of *foreigners from non-EU countries* (see table 2.2.5).
- Concerning the *total number of victims of THB who were awarded a reflection period*, seventeen countries could provide data (at least for two of the three years) (see table 2.2.6). Fifteen countries provided data for the *total number of victims of THB who were awarded a (temporary) residence permit* (at least for two of the three years) (see table 2.2.7). Only six countries (4 of which reported 0 cases) provided data for the *total number of victims of THB whose right to receive compensation from the offender was recognised by a criminal or civil Court* (see table 2.2.8).
- All countries provided most of the information required for the *Technical information* section. (see Table 2.2.9-2.2.12).

2.2.3. Results

Although no deviations from the operational definitions were reported, the information provided on the recording methods suggest that there a number of differences in the meaning of the available data (See table 1.1).

First of all, data might not always reflect an accurate estimate of the total number of victims who received assistance and protection. The problem of double counting of victims must be seriously taken into account. Some countries referred double counting within a single year, other reported possible double counting due to the lack of information shared with NGO's. Some correspondents warned that data might contain a measure of double counting.

Another important issue regards the type of assistance that is represented by the data. Some countries refer to differences in the needs of victims and the services delivered which do not show up in the data. This is also reflected in the variety of different sources of data on assistance. In many countries data on assistance and protection are collected by NGOs that offer comprehensive assistance to victims of THB, while in other cases data are reported by the police, by the immigration services or by the Ministry of Interior.

Moreover, one must take into account the type of victims that are included in the data of Part 2.2. In some countries, the number of identified and assisted victims is identical in each reporting year (e.g., Cyprus, 2011: 40 identified victims, 40 assisted victims, Estonia, 2011: 56 identified victims, 56 assisted victims). Several countries reported that fewer victims received assistance than were identified by the authorities (e.g. Germany in 2011, 672 identified victims and 209 assisted victims, Netherlands in 2011, 1222 identified victims and 280 assisted victims). Registration of assistance may, in these countries, refer to specific groups, like in the Netherlands where data refer to victims who needed shelter³. Or some countries reported in the opposite way: fewer identified victims than assisted victims (e.g. Austria in 2011, 70 identified victims, 251 assisted victims, Germany in 2011, 209 assisted victims). In addition, some countries mainly deal with nationals (e.g., Bulgaria, in 2011, 541 identified victims and 64 assisted victims; Romania in 2011, 1048 identified victims and 453 assisted victims) whereas others only reported assistance offered to foreigners (e.g. Poland in 2011, 25 assisted victims). On a related note, some destination countries also reported assistance offered to nationals (Germany in 2012, 33 nationals assisted against 102 foreigners from other EU countries, and 42 Foreigners form Non-EU countries; the Netherlands in 2012, 27 nationals assisted against 42 foreigners from other EU countries, and 204 foreigners from non-EU countries) whereas others did not (in 2012, Belgium reported 39 foreigners from other EU countries, 118 foreigners from non-EU countries, and no data on national; in 2012, Ireland mentioned 0 nationals, 3 foreigners from other EU countries, and 15 foreigners from non-EU countries) (See table 2.2.5).

³ The reporting organization, CoMensha, differentiates in its own records between victims receiving assistance including shelter and victims only receiving advice and information. Among the latter category are relatively many victims of labour exploitation and EU nationals.

Another methodological issue that needs to be considered concerns the counting system used. Some organizations providing data on victims receiving assistance count the number of victims they assist every year, independently of the year when the victimization took place. Such figures combine stock data and flow data. As assistance can last for more than one year, the number of assisted victims in a given year can be higher than the number of identified victims. Data for most of the rest of the countries are flow data on persons receiving assistance: they refer to the number of persons receiving assistance that were victimized during the year of data collection (i.e. number of persons that started receiving assistance during the year of reference).

Leaving aside the previous methodological issues, the following results can be highlighted: In 2012, the average number of assisted victims was 102, with Romania as the country reporting the highest number of assisted victims (342) and Latvia the country reporting the lowest (3) (See table 2.2.1). Concerning the gender of the assisted victims, in 2012, there were three times more women (68) than men (22) assisted (See table 2.2.2). There were also two times more victims of sexual exploitation (42) than victims of labour exploitation (19) assisted (See table 2.2.3). More adult victims were assisted in 2012 (72 in average) than minors (21) (See table 2.2.4).

An issue that needs to be considered when analyzing data on the reflection period concerns the category of victims eligible for a reflection period. According to the 2004 Council Directive (2004/81/EC), a reflection period must be granted to third-country nationals. Consequently, most countries do not award reflection periods to nationals, but countries like Bulgaria and Romania⁴ also provide reflection periods to nationals, while other countries only provide reflection periods to third-country nationals who have no other legal right to reside in the country (e.g., Ireland, Cyprus). Denmark also grants a reflection period (of 30 days) to EU nationals if they want to try to stay in the country. Hence conditions to award a reflection period differ between countries and this affects the comparability of the numbers. Therefore, one must interpret cautiously the fact that in 2012, the country showing the highest number of awarded reflection periods was Romania with 1041, followed by The Netherlands with 257 and Belgium with 157 (see Table 2.2.6).

When comparing the figures provided for residence permits, the type of victims identified needs to be considered. Countries with a tradition of being *source THB countries* are not likely to award many residence permits. On the other hand, *destination countries* will issue more residence permits (in 2012 The Netherlands issued 388 residence permits) than source countries (in 2012 Bulgaria issued 65 residence permits) (see Table 2.2.7).

⁴ The Romanian correspondent explicitly mentioned in the completed questionnaire that, according to Romanian law, a reflection period is a right that is granted irrespective of the nationality of a victim.

2.2.4. Tables

Table 2.2.1- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	242	251	242
Belgium	137	149	157
Bulgaria	78	64	65
Croatia	6	20	11
Cyprus	52	40	37
Czech Republic	237	195	148
Denmark	51	55	61
Estonia	57	56	22
Finland	44	52	48
Germany	216	209	177
Greece	64	51	39
Hungary	***	***	91
Ireland	47	57	48
Latvia	16	14	3
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	34	25	57
Portugal	4	9	...
Romania	544	453	342
Slovakia	28	31	22
Slovenia	15	18	15
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	225	280	274

Table 2.2.2- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Males			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	79	83	84
Bulgaria	16	3	0
Croatia	1	1	3
Cyprus	5	5	11
Czech Republic
Denmark	1	...	10
Estonia	***	39	14
Finland	13	23	22
Germany	1	4	...
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	1	4	2
Latvia	0	2	5
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	12	6	23
Portugal	0	...	0
Romania	186	68	68
Slovakia	14	13	6
Slovenia	1	1	2
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	41	70	57

Table 2.2.2- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Females			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	58	66	73
Bulgaria	62	61	61
Croatia	5	13	2
Cyprus	47	35	26
Czech Republic
Denmark	49	53	51
Estonia	***	17	8
Finland	31	29	26
Germany	215	205	177
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	46	36	16
Latvia	16	12	25
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	20	16	30
Portugal	4	7	...
Romania	358	385	274
Slovakia	14	18	16
Slovenia	14	17	13
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	184	210	217

Table 2.2.2- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Unknown (please specify in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender)			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium
Bulgaria	0	0	0
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic
Denmark	1	2	...
Estonia	***	0	0
Finland	0	0	0
Germany
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	0	0
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	0	0	0
Portugal	0	0	0
Romania
Slovakia
Slovenia	0	0	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	0	0	0

Table 2.2.3- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Sexual exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	43	34	52
Bulgaria	54	52	62
Croatia	5	13	2
Cyprus	24	26	16
Czech Republic
Denmark	48	51	41
Estonia	***	36	9
Finland	18	14	13
Germany	214	202	177
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	38	24	12
Latvia	5	4	7
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	14	12	9
Portugal	4	3	...
Romania	NA	NA	***
Slovakia	11	12	15
Slovenia	14	17	13
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	165	186	202

Table 2.2.3- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Labour exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	72	81	65
Bulgaria	28	17	6
Croatia	1	1	3
Cyprus	17	9	19
Czech Republic
Denmark	2	4	17
Estonia	***	22	14
Finland	18	33	35
Germany	2	7	...
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	8	11	6
Latvia	2	2	7
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	14	8	42
Portugal	0	4	0
Romania	NA	NA	***
Slovakia	11	12	3
Slovenia	1	1	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	28	57	54

Table 2.2.3- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Other (please specify in the comments)			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	22	34	40
Bulgaria	2	1	2
Croatia
Cyprus	12	5	2
Czech Republic
Denmark	1	...	3
Estonia	***	6	0
Finland	8	5	0
Germany
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	1	5	0
Latvia	10	8	16
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	0	0	0
Portugal	0	...	0
Romania
Slovakia	2	8	8
Slovenia	0	0	2
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	32	37	18

Table 2.2.4 - Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Adults			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	128	129	138
Bulgaria	30	26	38
Croatia	5	11	5
Cyprus	50	39	37
Czech Republic
Denmark	49	53	61
Estonia	***	42	21
Finland	44	52	48
Germany	180	183	142
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	40	35	16
Latvia	15	14	30
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	32	22	53
Portugal	...	6	...
Romania	315	268	188
Slovakia	26	30	19
Slovenia	14	17	15
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	218	272	268

Table 2.2.4- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Minors			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	9	20	19
Bulgaria	48	38	27
Croatia	1	3	...
Cyprus	2	1	0
Czech Republic
Denmark	2	2	...
Estonia	***	5	1
Finland	4*	4*	2*
Germany	36	26	35
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	7	5	2
Latvia	1	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	2	3	4
Portugal	3	3	...
Romania	229	185	154
Slovakia	2	1	3
Slovenia	1	1	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	7	6	6

Table 2.2.5- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Nationals			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia	3	11	2
Cyprus	0	0	1
Czech Republic
Denmark	1
Estonia	***	39	16
Finland	1	0	0
Germany	36	24	33
Greece	0	0	0
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	0	0
Latvia	16	14	30
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	0	4	0
Romania	544	453	342
Slovakia	28	30	20
Slovenia	2	8	2
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	22	24	27

	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	45	45	39
Bulgaria	0	0	...
Croatia	2
Cyprus	18	11	13
Czech Republic
Denmark	12	6	14
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	1	5	8
Germany	117	149	102
Greece	37	50	31
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	13	7	3
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	17	19	36
Portugal	3	3	0
Romania
Slovakia	0	0	1
Slovenia	5	4	3
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	39	50	42

	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	92	104	118
Bulgaria	0	0	...
Croatia	3	3	1
Cyprus	34	29	23
Czech Republic
Denmark	39	49	47
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	44	47	40
Germany	63	36	42
Greece	27	1	8
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	34	33	15
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	17	6	21
Portugal
Romania
Slovakia	0	1	1
Slovenia	8	4	10
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	163	206	204

	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	137	149	157
Bulgaria	78	64	65
Croatia
Cyprus	0	4	1
Czech Republic	7	10	1
Denmark	53	60	66
Estonia	0	0	0
Finland	0	0	0
Germany	N.A	N.A	N.A
Greece	0	0	0
Hungary	***	***	0
Ireland	5	1	0
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	0	0	0
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	1154	1048	1041
Slovakia	0	1	1
Slovenia	2	2	7
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	256	357	257

	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	***	***	***
Bulgaria	78	64	65
Croatia	1	1	2
Cyprus	52	40	36
Czech Republic	4	6	1
Denmark	***	2	0
Estonia	0	0	0
Finland	1	0	3
Germany	N.A	N.A	N.A
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	0
Ireland	7	1	3
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	0	5	11
Portugal
Romania	NA	NA	NA
Slovakia	0	0	0
Slovenia	1	1	2
Spain	55
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	340	398	388

Table 2.2.8- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Total number of victims of THB whose right to receive compensation from the offender was recognised by a criminal or civil Court

	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	***	***	***
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic	***	***	***
Denmark	***	***	***
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Germany	N.A	N.A	N.A
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	0	0
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	73	56	53
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	0	0	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	18	21	21

Comments on Tables 2.2.1-2.2.8	
Austria	NGO LEFÖ/IBF operates on a national level on behalf of the Ministry of the Interior and the Woman's Directorate within the Federal Chancellery of Austria. The NGO offered in 2012 for 242 Women and their children support in form of psychological, social, health and life counselling. Other forms of exploitation: 13 % includes for example marriage. Data was only available in form of per cent. Table 2.2.3: 2012 Sexual exploitation:68%, Labour exploitation: 19%, Other : 13%Transgender is already included in either males or females.
Belgium	Figures provided refer to: "Only those victims are taken into account for whom a follow up started in the year of reference, by one of the three specialized centres and for whom an identity document was delivered by the immigration services, upon a decision of the public prosecutor". In tables Table 2.2.1- 2.2.8 also the victims of smuggling in migrants are included.
Bulgaria	Each year the NCCTHB sends a request for data (with questionnaire) to all governmental institution and NGOs which are working to assist victims. We do not foresee this data as complete and fully reliable, because some non-governmental organizations do not send all requested data and make double counting very possible. That is why, when we officially report the data we separate it by the source of information.
Croatia	Data provided are related to available data sent to the Government's Office by NGO's for the purpose of writing the Report about the implementation of measures foreseen by of the National plan for the prevention of THB. Since providing assistance and protection includes also the care about those victims that have not been located in the national shelter, the data may vary, especially taking into account that it is possible to have a situation where the victim is identified in 2011, but entered the Assistance and Protection Program in 2012. In 2011 and 2012 for 6 victims (total 12) that have not be located in shelters, but who did receive assistance and protection, there is no data about their gender and nationality. However, since in 2012 6 victims had been located in families, the assumption is that they are Croatian nationals. Table 2.2.5: 2012: Foreigners from other EU countries: Czech Republic,
Cyprus	Other form of exploitation: forced marriage
Denmark	Data on victims receiving assistance years 2010 and 2011 in section Part 2.2 are not finally coordinated with the Danish immigration Service. Please note that they should be taken with reservations and may encompass minor discrepancies. As for table 2.2.7, these numbers should be obtained from the Danish Immigration Service As for table 2.2.8, these numbers should be obtained from the Danish National Police.
Estonia	Table 2.2.8: No information available on compensation.
Finland	The figures refer to new clients accepted into the official assistance system for victims of trafficking which is coordinated by the Joutseno reception center. The total number of victims assisted in each year is higher, as victims may stay longer than a year in the system. The system helps victims of trafficking and trafficking-related crimes (extortionate work discrimination and aggravated pandering as well as aggravated arrangement of illegal immigration). Tables 2.2.1-2.2.5. The total number of victims, their gender, form of exploitation and nationality only refer to adult victims. Other forms of exploitation = e.g. forced marriage or combination of sexual and work-related exploitation. The number of new underaged clients assisted was 4 in 2010, 4 in 2011 and 2 in 2012. However, due to different statistical system used by Oulu reception centre which hosted these minors, no information on these new clients' gender, nationality or form of exploitation cannot be reported and thus minors are not included in the total figures presented in table 2.2.1. Such data is available for clients (minors) who applied access to system, but not all of them were accepted into the system. Therefore this data was not used. Victims assisted within the system may be identified by the police, NGOs or labour inspectors, for example. However, not all identified victims want to enter the system.
Germany	The Law enforcement statistics data (Tables from Part 3.3) is not entirely comparable to the Police Data (Tables from Parts 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2). Unlike the data on Part 3.3, which relates to the number of convictions, the data in Parts 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2 relates to the number of police investigations completed.
Greece	Table 2.2.7: The Ministry of Internal Affairs is responsible for the statistics of the number of victims who were awarded a residence permit.
Hungary	Unfortunately we cannot provide information for year 2010 and 2011. According to our statistical data victims received the following services during 2012: legal aid service was provided for 37 persons; accommodation or shelter for 24 persons, psychological assistance for 17 persons and financial support for 12 persons. In 2012 the methods used during the exploitation were physical violence in 44 cases, sexual abuse in 1 case, psychological abuse in 8 cases, victim's threat in 10 cases, threat of the victim's relatives in 3 cases, taking away the travel documents in 1 case, restriction of freedom of movement in 8 cases. The period of the exploitation in the most cases lasted for 6 months (29 persons), for 1 year (9 persons), for 1 between 3 years (9 persons), 3 between 6 years (2 persons) and for 6 to 10 years (10 persons).
Ireland	Health Service Executive (HSE) provide Care Plans and suite of services to minors in danger, including from THB, under Child Care Act 1991 rather than through specific human trafficking

	<p>mechanisms. All potential minor victims, (particularly Irish victims), receiving HSE assistance are not captured in THB statistics.</p> <p>Residence Permissions: 2010: In addition to the 5 persons who availed of 60 days Recovery & Reflection period, 2 persons who did not require R & R period were directly granted 6 months temporary residence and 11 other persons had their temporary residence permissions renewed.</p> <p>2011: in addition to the 1 person who availed of 60 days Recovery & Reflection period and was granted 6 months temporary residence, 17 persons had their temporary residence permissions renewed.</p> <p>2012: No recovery and reflection periods availed of, 3 persons who did not require R & R period were directly granted 6 months temporary residence. 18 persons had their temporary residency permissions renewed in 2012. 5 of the 18 were offered a change of status to a long term residency permission.</p>
Latvia	<p>In 2010, one female in table regarding exploitation is counted twice, because she was exploited both – sexual and labour exploitation.</p> <p>In 2010, two persons submitted applications to the State Legal Aid Administration applying for the state compensation. The Legal Aid Administration does not have information about the victims who have received the compensations through legal proceedings. Since the January 1, 2013 a Law on State compensation to Victims was amended providing a new case when the state ensured compensation should be paid, namely, if a person has suffered from human trafficking. Until now the compensation was paid: if death of the persons has occurred, if severe bodily injuries have been caused to the victim or sexual inviolability of the victim has been violated or the victim has been infected with the human immunodeficiency virus, Hepatitis B or C, or if moderate bodily injuries have been caused to the victim.</p>
Luxembourg	None statistics concerning this topic.
Poland	These data could be also presented in reference to the KCIK data, but they were analysed by the worker of the MOI altogether in relation to the years 2009-2011. They could be obtained but the process would be time consuming.
Portugal	N.A. – The OTSH do not collect this data. .. <i>Null data or protected under statistical secrecy</i>
Romania	The data regarding victims who receive assistance was not disaggregated by type of exploitation due to the fact that assistance is granted irrespective of the type of exploitation. Due to the several request from international side we took it into consideration and try for the next year to provide also these type of data. The data shown in the above tables represent the number of victims who received assistance out of the total identified victims in a year. The total number of victims who received assistance per year is higher than the figures shown here due to the length of time of the processes of assistance and the moment in which identification takes place. For example, a victim could be identified in 2010 and assisted in 2010 but also in 2011. Statistics regarding the assistance services that victims received could be also provided.
Slovakia	<p>Information Centre does not monitor and register compensations for victims of THB.</p> <p>Table 2.1.1-2.1.6 shows that in 2012 IC registered 40 victims of THB. Out of the number, Table 2 shows that 22 victims received assistance, 18 victims did not and were not included into the Program of support and protection of victims of THB.</p> <p>Table 2.2.1- Total number of victims of THB who received assistance and protection: Other (2010): Forced begging (2); (2011): Forced criminality (4), Forced marriage (2), Forced begging (2); (2012): Forced begging (5), Forced marriage (3)</p>
Slovenia	In 2012 during the investigation of a criminal offence of trafficking in human beings pursuant to Article 113 of KZ-1B against the legal entity, the police identified 52 presumed victims of trafficking in human beings from Ukraine and the Dominican Republic. These persons did not recognise themselves as victims of trafficking in human beings in police procedures in cooperation with a non-governmental organisation and they refused any kind assistance.
Spain	Table 2.2.7: Residence permits are given for five years not six months. They can be renewed. In 2012 a number of 55 victims of THB were issued provisional residence permit and 11 were issued definitive residence permit. There could have been a misunderstanding when I tried to explain this subject.
Sweden	The number of identified victims reported in the questionnaire refers to the number of victims in trafficking cases registered by the police and/or prosecution authority (same sources were used when providing victim of THB statistics to Eurostat). *** = Data from official registration systems regarding information on assistance or protection is currently not available.
The Netherlands	<p>Comment on assistance: The statistics in Table 2.1.2 refer to the registered (possible) victims who requested shelter after they were reported to CoMensha. CoMensha registers three categories of notification: -Notifications exclusively for the purpose of registration; -Notifications where information and advice is also sought about the options available to a possible victim; and -Notifications where there is also a request for shelter for the possible victims in the Netherlands . The statistics in Table 2.2.1 exclude the first two categories. The registered (possible) victims who did not requested shelter might have received shelter or other assistance by other means. Furthermore, the National Rapporteur obtains separate statistics on other forms of assistance such as compensation (either by court decision or outside a court decision) and voluntary return.</p>

	<p>These statistics are obtained by different sources than CoMensha and are not included in Table 2.2.1, in order to avoid double counting. The statistics in Table 2.2.1-2.2.5 do also not refer to the reflection period, temporary residencies for victims of trafficking in human beings or any other immigration procedures.</p> <p>The most recent statistics on the above-mentioned forms of assistance (other than shelter) can be found in the reports below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -http://www.dutchrapporteur.nl/about/news/archief/20130613-It-human-trafficking-in-the-netherlands-conviction-rate-rising-still-concerns-about-child-victims.aspx?cp=64&cs=16855 -http://www.dutchrapporteur.nl/about/news/archief/human-trafficking-in-the-netherlands-specialised-judges-on-human-trafficking-cases.aspx?cp=64&cs=16855 - http://www.nationaalrapporteur.nl/publicaties/mensenhandel-in-en-uit-beeld/ <p>- Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2014). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld II. Cijfermatige rapportage 2008-2012. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl). (English translation forthcoming)</p> <p>Comments on 'exploitation': It is possible that a (possible) victim is exploited in more than one sector. However, a category 'sexual AND labour exploitation' is not included. Furthermore, the category 'human trafficking for the purpose of organ trafficking' is not included in Part 2.1, while this is part of the definition of trafficking in human beings in the UN Palermo Protocol. Also, the category 'not worked yet' is lacking.</p> <p>Comment: Labour exploitation refers to exploitation outside the sex industry, not solely labour exploitation.</p> <p>Additionally, it would be relevant to clarify that the national expert filling in this form would really need to specify the category 'other', with regard to the up-coming forms (now or in the near future) in some countries, such as forced commercial surrogacy, human trafficking linked to benefit fraud, etcetera.</p> <p>Comment: The category 'other' includes 'not worked yet' and 'unknown'.</p> <p>Comment on 'adults/minors': The category 'unknown' is registered in the CoMensha database. There are 0 registered (possible) victims in 2010 and 2 registered (possible) victims in 2011, who requested shelter and whose age was unknown.</p> <p>Comments on 'nationality':</p> <p>Comment: The statistics refer to citizenship and not the country of birth or country of origin (in contrast to the Dutch statistics on suspected and convicted offenders).</p> <p>Comment: The categories 'unknown' and 'stateless' are not included in Table 1 (1 in 2010 and 0 in 2011)</p> <p>Comment: Interpretation on EU – countries: EU member states since 1995: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, Sweden. EU member states since 2004/2007: in 2004: Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia; in 2007: Bulgaria and Romania.</p> <p>Comments for Table 2.5: reference date for the data in Table 2.5 (total number of victims of THB whose right to receive compensation from the offender was recognized by a criminal or civil court): June 2012. It is possible that currently other figures exist.</p>
--	--

2.2.5. Sources

Austria	Based on data taken from NGO LEFÖ/IBF, Report 2012, published.
Belgium	Immigration Office. The other departments can't deliver statistical information concerning the victims.
Bulgaria	The statistic shared is gathered by the National Commission through questionnaires to all NGOs who work in assisting victims.
Croatia	NGOs and the Ministry of Interior Affairs.
Cyprus	Office of Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, Cyprus Police.
Czech Republic	Ad 2) data provided by 3 main cooperating NGOs (assistance provided during street work and hotline counselling not included) Regarding concrete data on gender, citizenship, age – these data are provided in different incomparable way. Ad 3) + 4) data provided by Crime Prevention Unit (Program for support and Protection of victims of trafficking).
Denmark	Danish Centre against Human Trafficking.
Estonia	Statistics about victims are collected by the NGOs using the special format for data collection worked out by the Ministry of Social Affairs and other partners.
Finland	2. Joutseno reception centre 2013, personal communication. Joutseno reception centre 2012. IHMISKAUPAN UHRIEN AUTTAMISJÄRJESTELMÄ 1.1.–31.12.2012. Tilastokatsaus. Available online: http://www.migri.fi/download/39357_ihmiskaupan_uhrien_auttamisjarjestelm_a_tilastokatsaus_2012.pdf?4b23e3363f4fd088 3. Personal communication with Finnish immigration service, Central bureau of Investigation and Joutseno reception centre 2013. 4. Finnish immigration service, vastaanottoyksikön tilastokatsaus 2012, page 6. Available online: http://www.migri.fi/download/40584_Voy_tilastokatsaus_2012.pdf?d198d2363f4fd088 Question 4. Finnish Immigration service, oleskelutilastot, 2012. Available online: http://www.migri.fi/download/40077_Ratkaisut_hakuperusteittain_1.1.-31.12.2012.pdf?41b126ca1f50d088 Finnish Immigration service, oleskelutilastot, 2011. Available online http://www.migri.fi/download/31503_Oleskelulupapaatokset_hakuperusteittain_Top-10_2011_netto_cognos.pdf?b72f2fca1f50d088 The Finnish National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings Report 2011, page 21. Online: http://www.vahemmistovaltuutettu.fi/download/31724_Ihmiskaupparaportti_englanti.pdf

Germany	Data from State police forces and federal criminal Police
Greece	Hellenic Police Headquarters/ Public Security Division.
Hungary	Sources of data of year 2012 are the Office of Immigration and Nationality and the Hungarian Victim Support Service.
Ireland	Anti-Human Trafficking Unit Annual Report of Trafficking in Human Beings in Ireland 2010, 2011, 2012 at www.blueblindfold.gov.ie . Breakdown of assistance in paragraph 2.2 provided by Agencies to National Referral Mechanism Working Group, (not published). Figures for renewal of residency permissions from report by Irish Naturalization and Immigration Service (INIS), (not published).
Latvia	Society "Shelter "Safe House".
Poland	All above listed data can be presented in reference to the following years only in reference to the victims of THB supported within the Program for foreigners.
Portugal	Law Enforcement Agencies and NGO's.
Romania	ANITP (National Agency against Trafficking in Persons) - formalized system of periodical gathering of data (biannual) from regional structures of ANITP.
Slovakia	Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic and Information Centre for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings and Prevention of Crime of Minister of Interior's Office of Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic, published on website http://www.minv.sk/?statistika_obchodovanie_s_ludmi
Slovenia	Annual Reports confirmed by Government http://www.vlada.si/en/projects/fight_against_trafficking_in_persons/
Spain	Patricia Fernandez, Deputy Prosecutor from the Foreigners Unit, Spanish General Prosecutors Office.
The Netherlands	CoMensha database provided to the Dutch Rapporteur. Published in: National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings (2012). Visible and Invisible Human Trafficking. Statistical Data 2007-2011. The Hague: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.dutchrapporteur.nl). Complete overview of the statistics is included in the Dutch version: 'Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel (2012). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld. Cijfermatige rapportage 2007-2011. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl). and in the latest report: Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2014). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld II. Cijfermatige rapportage 2008-2012. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl).

2.2.6. Technical information

Rules of statistical recording applied for Tables 2.2.1-2.2.8 for victims who received assistance and protection:

Table 2.2.9- How is a victim who received assistance and protection from one agency more than once during the same year counted?	
<i>As one identified victim</i>	<i>As two or more identified victims</i>
Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, The Netherlands.	Bulgaria.
Comments	
<p>Latvia: Only mandated NGO can count victims of human trafficking who have received the state funded social rehabilitation services (also includes safe accommodation). Until now the special procedural protection for a victim within a criminal proceeding was not applied. Victims of human trafficking who have received consultations or assistance by NGOs are counted as “presumed victims” (victims without formal status of a victim of human trafficking), and they do not appear in official statistics (2010: 46, 2011: 93, 2012: 110).</p> <p>Czech Republic: Depends on the NGOs that provides the data.</p>	

Table 2.2.10- How is a victim who received assistance and protection from more than one agency counted?	
<i>As one identified victim</i>	<i>As two or more identified victims</i>
Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, The Netherlands.	Bulgaria, Greece.
Comments	
The Netherlands: each relevant authority counts the victim but double counting is avoided.	

Table 2.2.11- Have the data recording methods described above been modified between 2010 and 2012?	
Countries that have not modified them:	
Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, The Netherlands.	
Countries that have modified them:	
Czech Republic	The system of data collection of one cooperating NGO has changed; also the provided services have been changed – by another NGO from 2011 to 2012.
Denmark	In the period, the coordination on numbers of victims of human trafficking and on services received has been strengthened.
Hungary	Source of information is the Unified Statistical System of Investigations and Prosecutions but since 2012 we try to collect more information with the help of the members of the National Coordination Mechanism (Victim Support Service, Court, Prosecutors Office, Police Offices, and National Crisis Telephone Information Service etc.). Members of the Mechanism are all the authorities taking part in the fight against human trafficking, they are asked to provide available information quarterly about victims/offenders of human trafficking cases.
Portugal	We are progressively introducing the new data base the Dynamic Application (explained in Table 2.1.14).
Romania	From 2012, the system of collecting data has been improved in order to not duplicate cases of victims who receive some type of assistance. Filters have been introduced on the moment of identifying victims. This supports the correct knowledge of the dimensions of victims identified and assisted in a certain period of time. Disaggregating the professional integration indicator (counselling, inclusion in reconversion programs / training and professional integration).

Table 2.2.12- Comments on questions 2.2.9–2.2.12

Bulgaria	Due to the fact that some organization refuse to provide data on victims of trafficking that they have attended, it is difficult to determine the number of cases.
Croatia	Victims in the system of assistance and protection always receive assistance from more than one institution, of which all are included in the same system of assistance and protection, so that it is the case of one victim. Similarly, it is not important whether the victim received psychosocial or medical assistance only once or several times – it is one victim and its individual assistance and protection program.
Poland	It could happen that a victim included in the Program for foreigners in one year stays for the next year. Then it could happen that s/he is double counted in the statistics. The same happens with the KCIK data.

PART 3

Data on THB Offenders

PART 3.1.
Suspected THB offenders
known to the police

3.1.1. General comments

This section provides information on the *suspected THB offenders known to the police* in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Regarding suspected THB offenders known to the police, the following data were requested:

- *Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police* in 2010, 2011 and 2012 (see Table 3.1.1), and breakdown into the following sub-categories: by gender: *males, females and unknown (specifying in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender)* (see Table 3.1.2); by type of exploitation: *sexual exploitation, labour exploitation and other (to be specified in the comments)* (see Table 3.1.3); by origin: *nationals, foreigners from other EU countries and foreigners from non-EU countries* (see Tables 3.1.4).
- Description of data recording methods for Tables on suspected THB offenders known to the police: *When are the data in Table 3 collected for the statistics?* (See Table 3.1.5); *what is the counting unit used in Table 3?* (See Table 3.1.6); *is a principal offence rule applied? (i.e. how is an offender suspected of multiple offences of different kinds counted?)(See Table 3.1.7); how is an offender suspected of multiple offences of the same kind (often called serial offences) counted?* (See Table 3.1.8); *do data in Tables 3.1.1-3.1.4 include minors?* (See Table 3.1.9); *have the data recording methods described above been modified between 2010 and 2012?* (see Table 3.1.10); *general comments to questions concerning the description of the data recording methods for tables on suspected THB offenders known to the police* (See Table 3.1.11).

3.1.2. Quality of the data

- Twenty countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the total *number of suspected THB offenders known to the police* (see Table 3.1.1). Most of the countries were able to provide the breakdowns by gender, as seventeen countries could provide the breakdown for *males* and seventeen for *females*. Eight countries provided data for the category *unknown* (although 6 of these countries reported 0) (see Table 3.1.2).
- Concerning the breakdown by types of exploitation, eleven countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the category *sexual exploitation*, nine countries provided data for the category *labour exploitation*, and seven countries reported *other* (see Table 3.1.3).
- Ten countries provided data (at least for two of the years) for the *national* identified victims, ten countries provided data for the category *foreigners from other EU countries*, and twelve provided data for the category of *Foreigners from non-EU countries* (see Table 3.1.4).

- All countries provided most of the information required for the *Technical information* section. (see Tables 3.1.5-3.1.11).

3.1.3. Results

Despite the general availability of data on the number of suspected offenders known to the police, between-country comparisons prove to be extremely difficult. Even though no deviations from the operational definitions were reported, the answers to the technical information regarding the statistical counting rules reveal a number of differences that limit the comparability of data between EU countries.

An important issue, having an impact in the figures that needs to be considered is the moment in which the data is registered. Eight countries reported that police data on suspected offenders are collected when the police first register a suspected offender (input data). While in three countries police data are collected somewhere midstream, that is sometime after the police registers a suspected offender but before the investigation is completed. The third refer to countries such as Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Slovenia, and Sweden in which police data are collected after the police finish their investigation (output data). In Hungary, data are collected at all three different moments, and in Poland both input and output data are available.

The counting unit it is also an essential issue that needs to be taken into account. While police data on the number of suspected offenders mainly refer to offenders (fifteen countries). For Czech Republic all data refer to offenders, with the exception of the breakdown for type of exploitation (that referred to the number of cases). In Denmark, data on suspected offenders refer to 'charged persons'. In Romania data refer to 'investigated persons'. Finnish police data refer to cases, equalling the report of an offence, committed by one or more offenders. Danish police data reflect the number of registered offences. Although data are also available on the number of offenders (albeit only regarding the number of offenders in cleared cases), the offence figures are considered to be much more reliable than the number of suspects.

About half of the countries reporting data to this section indicated that a principle offence rule is applied, while the other half mentioned that no rule is used in their countries.

Twelve correspondents indicated that offenders who are suspected of multiple offences of the same kind will, in their national police data, be counted only once within a single year, while the rest of the countries will count them differently (ex. Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, and Germany mentioned that individual offenders who are suspected of multiple offences, of the same kind, will be counted as two or more offenders).

Considering these major methodological differences between countries, some results can be analyzed. In 2012, the average in Europe of *suspected offenders known to the police* was 193, with the highest number in Romania (1342) and the minimum in Latvia (2) (See Table 3.1.1). Within the total offenders a mean of 264 were males and 53 females (See Table 3.1.2). The highest number of offenders were known to the police due to *sexual exploitation*

(148), followed by *labour exploitation* (22) and finally *other types of exploitation* (11). Some examples are in Belgium: THB with a view to exploitation of mendacity, THB with a view to commit forced crimes, THB with a view to trade in organs; or in Croatia: forced marriage and forced begging (See Table 3.1.3). Regarding the origin of the offenders an average of 74 were *nationals*, followed by *Foreigners from other EU countries* (72) and *Foreigners from non-EU countries* in a smaller proportion (38) (See Table 3.1.4).

3.1.4. Tables

Table 3.1.1- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	64	61	116
Belgium	1090	950	755
Bulgaria	163	138	138
Croatia	10	14	7
Cyprus	64	53	68
Czech Republic	35	29	22
Denmark	13	21	11
Estonia	78	87	112
Finland	13	30	25
Germany	767	778	787
Greece	246	220	171
Hungary	14	32	18
Ireland	40	24	22
Latvia	4	1	2
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	14	13	23
	29	52	N.A.
Portugal	23	21	13
Romania	1099	1296	1342
Slovakia	5	14	16
Slovenia	9	18	22
Spain
Sweden	21	25	29
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.1.2- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Males			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	46	46	85
Belgium	681	660	539
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	7	12	7
Cyprus	43	31	21
Czech Republic	27	20	15
Denmark	8	12	8
Estonia	66	81	96
Finland	1	8	48
Germany	553	589	613
Greece	163	75	122
Hungary	13	26	16
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	2	1	2
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	7	5	5
	27	36	N.A.
Portugal	17	11	11
Romania	961	1008	1034
Slovakia	3	12	12
Slovenia	***	14	17
Spain
Sweden	15	20	22
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.1.2- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Females			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	18	15	31
Belgium	377	251	183
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	3	2	0
Cyprus	21	22	47
Czech Republic	8	9	7
Denmark	5	9	3
Estonia	12	6	14
Finland	1	2	14
Germany	191	173	164
Greece	83	145	43
Hungary	1	6	2
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	2	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	2	1	2
	2	16	N.A.
Portugal	6	10	...
Romania	138	265	281
Slovakia	2	2	4
Slovenia	***	4	5
Spain
Sweden	6	5	7
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.1.2- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Unknown (please specify in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender)			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria
Belgium	32	39	33
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	1
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	23	16	10
Greece	6
Hungary	N.A	N.A	N.A
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	0	0	0
	0	0	N.A
Portugal	0	0	0
Romania	...	23	27
Slovakia
Slovenia	***	0	0
Spain
Sweden	0	0	0
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.1.3- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Sexual exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria
Belgium	622	488	354
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	1	5	...
Cyprus	41	44	67
Czech Republic	19	17	24
Denmark	13	21	9
Estonia	37	56	57
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	730	753	769
Greece	N.A	N.A	146
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	21	20
Latvia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
	21	44	N.A.
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	5	16	21
Spain
Sweden	13	11	11
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.1.3- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Labour exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A	N.A	N.A
Belgium	377	251	183
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	6	4	7
Cyprus	12	9	1
Czech Republic	5	2	0
Denmark	2
Estonia	0	0	0
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	37	25	18
Greece	N.A	N.A	7
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	3	2
Latvia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
	4	2	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	4	2	0
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.1.3- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Other (please specify in the comments)			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Belgium	32	39	33
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	3	5	...
Cyprus	11	0	0
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany
Greece	14
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	0	0
Latvia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
	4	1	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	0	0	1
Spain
Sweden	8	14	18
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.1.4- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Nationals			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A	N.A	N.A
Belgium	408	387	294
Bulgaria
Croatia	7	13	7
Cyprus	34	25	12
Czech Republic	21	22	19
Denmark
Estonia	54	72	87
Finland	0	4	36
Germany	204	225	250
Greece	78	83	38
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	4	1	2
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	***	***	***
Slovakia	5	8	16
Slovenia	***	***	18
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.1.4- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Foreigners from other EU countries			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Belgium	370	269	233
Bulgaria
Croatia	2		
Cyprus	14	18	33
Czech Republic	***	2	1
Denmark	9	8	6
Estonia	4	3	1
Finland	1	1	6
Germany	343	301	373
Greece	80	90	72
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Portugal	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Romania	***	***	***
Slovakia	0	4	0
Slovenia	***	***	1
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.1.4 - Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Foreigners from non-EU countries			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Belgium	212	216	158
Bulgaria
Croatia	1	1	
Cyprus	16	10	23
Czech Republic	***	5	2
Denmark	3	13	5
Estonia	20	12	23
Finland	1	5	20
Germany	164	180	112
Greece	88	45	60
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Portugal	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Romania	***	***	***
Slovakia	0	0	0
Slovenia	***	***	3
Spain
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Comments on Table 3.1.1-3.1.4	
Belgium	The download only takes in account the initial reports THB of police officers. The national police database is not updated with the intelligence in the reports of the further investigations THB based on these initial reports. The other forms of exploitation are the following:- THB with a view to exploitation of mendacity: (2010) 54, (2011) 53, (2011) 36. -THB with a view to commit forced crimes: (2010) 22, (2011) 8, (2011) 16. -THB with a view to trade in organs: (2010) 0 (2011) 0, (2011) 3 Table 3.1.4- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Foreigners from non-EU countries. 2010: 212 (Unknown)100, 2011, 216 (Unknown) 78, 158 (Unknown) 70.
Bulgaria	The data NCCTHB receives from Supreme Cassation Prosecutor's Office is not divided by gender, type of exploitation and the nationality of the offenders.
Croatia	Other forms of exploitation in 2010: 3, of which 2 forced marriage and 1forced begging.
Cyprus	The number of suspected THB offenders may increase as a number of cases are still under investigation.
Czech Republic	Further and more detailed information could have been provided. Police of the Czech Republic collects statistical information from all police forces –forms of exploitation (sexual exploitation; forced labour and other forms of exploitation – including begging; organs + cells etc.; service in armed force; slavery and serfdom), involvement in organised crime groups, age of the perpetrator (0-15, 15-18, 18- 30, 30 and more), gender, citizenship, recidivism, education, employment, family background and upbringing, marital status and other criminal characteristics.
Denmark	Table 3.1.4- 2010, Foreigners from other EU countries: 9 (+1) state less.
Estonia	As trafficking is criminalized since 14.04.2012, then statistics given above are not comparable thorough the years 2010-2012 as the crimes of trafficking up to 14.04.2012 were related crimes by to different other provisions, for example enslaving was one of crimes which was relevant in the meaning of trafficking. About legislation see more information here: http://www.eucpn.org/poldocs/EE_PT_Leg2013.pdf . Table above shows the number of suspects, but doesn't show how the criminal case was further proceeded, meaning whether it was terminated, sent to prosecutor, etc. Police has the possibility to refuse to commence the criminal proceeding, proceedings can be terminated by the prosecutor while pre-trial investigation. So if the case is terminated before court and some procedural activities are carried out throughout the criminal proceeding, then information stays in the databases about the suspects. Table 3.1.2: Offender unknown: 1 (legal person) Table 3.1.4: 2010, 11(Without citizenship), 2011, 9 (Without citizenship), 2012, 19 (Without citizenship)
Finland	The total numbers provided here refer to reports of offences registered by the police and border guard, not to total number of suspects. Therefore no statistical information is available on the gender or nationality of the offenders suspected in these offence reports. Table 3.1.2 and 3.1.4: Statistical information is however available on "suspected offenders of cleared offences" which include information on gender and nationality, but they differentiate greatly from the totals of reports of offences (=more reliable figures). We have provided figures on the gender and nationality of these "suspected offenders of cleared offences", but the accuracy of these data must be questioned, as one investigation may last longer than year etc. The total of suspected offenders of cleared offences was 2 in 2010, 10 in 2011 and 62 in 2012.
Germany	Number of offenders with unknown nationality: 2010: 56, 2011: 72, 2012: 52. The Law enforcement statistics data is not entirely comparable to the Police Data (Tables 1-3). Unlike the data on Part 3.3, which relates to the number of convictions, the data in Parts 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2 relates to the number of police investigations completed.
Greece	Data are recorded when the offence is reported to the police (input). In Table 3- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Other (please specify in the comments): 14 are cases of forced begging. In Table 3- Total number of suspected THB offenders known to the police: Foreigners from non-EU countries: In 2011 2 out of 45 are unknown. In 2012 1 out of 60 are unknown.
Hungary	According to the information provided by the police for the year 2012: 22 criminal offence have been committed and 30 criminal investigations have been initiated. In some cases the age of the victims was provided too: 27 years old in 1 case, 23 years old in 1 case, 21 years old in 4 cases, 20 years old in 2 cases, 19 years old in 4 cases, 18 years old in 5 cases, 17 years old in 1 case, 16 years old in 2 cases and 14 years old in 1 case. In 2010, 8 cases of trafficking in human beings were registered, 7 victims and 14 offenders were identified
Ireland	Breakdown by gender or nationality of suspects not available, breakdown by exploitation type not available for 2010. 2012 figures are provisional and may be subject to revision.
Latvia	The State Police initiates and performs criminal proceeding according the Criminal Law Section 154.1 "Human Trafficking" and does not specify a form of exploitation of a victim of human trafficking.
Luxembourg	No data available on suspected offenders known to the police.

Poland	Two types of data are provided: Figures on the line above figures refer to identified by the police. Figures on the line below refer to ended investigation. Other types of exploitation: Taking social benefits: 2010 0, 2011 5, 2012 N.A.
Portugal	N.A.–Disaggregated data not available .. <i>Null data or protected under statistical secrecy</i>
Romania	Data regarding THB suspects are collected, but, according to the official statement that we have received from the National Police, this category of data is for internal use only.
Slovakia	Indicators related to purpose of THB are not kept in the statistics.
Slovenia	The total number of the suspected offenders is not solely for the criminal offence of THB, but also for THB related crimes, such as exploitation of prostitution and enslavement. 2010: For the criminal offence of 'Trafficking in human beings', 5 persons were charged, in relation to trafficking in human beings for the 'Exploitation through prostitution' 11 persons were charged. 2011: For the criminal offence of 'Trafficking in human beings', 16 persons were charged, for the criminal offence of 'Enslavement', 2 persons were charged, in relation to trafficking in human beings for the 'Exploitation through prostitution' *18 persons were charged. 2012: For the criminal offence of 'Trafficking in human beings', 13 persons were charged, in relation to trafficking in human beings for the 'Exploitation through prostitution' 9 persons were charged
Sweden	*** included in total figure. Registration on forms of exploitation is based on a classifications system (4-digit code) which offers a separation between a) sexual exploitation and b) other forms of exploitation (which is all forms of exploitation except sexual exploitation i.e. forced labour, domestic servitude, forced begging, organ removal, criminal activities etc.). Future data, starting 2013, will offer a separation between forced labour, forced begging and organ removal.
The Netherlands	Because the Dutch police records on human trafficking do not provide reliable figures, it is impossible to gain a clear impression from those records of the number of human traffickers known to the police. For this reason, the Bureau of the National Rapporteur conducted a study into all 55 police investigations of human trafficking (both sexual and other forms of exploitation) that were completed and sent to the PPS for prosecution in 2009. Those 55 investigations represent only a portion of all the investigations that were completed by the police in 2009. They do not cover the human trafficking investigations that were ultimately halted because of insufficient evidence or the absence of further leads to investigate, for example. It is also not known how representative the investigations in 2009 are for human trafficking investigations in general, since a specific focus or priority on the part of the police, or the coincidental conduct of an unusually large or specific investigation (an outlier), in a particular year can greatly influence the impression created by the police investigations in that year (particularly because the total number of police investigations is small). Please see the 2012 and 2014 reports by the Dutch National Rapporteur for more information on police investigations regarding human trafficking.

3.1.5. Sources

Austria	Criminal Intelligence Service, not published
Belgium	The police data are based on a statistical download of the national police database. This database is fed with the initial police report of every police officer.
Bulgaria	The provided data about the new investigations is official, from the Supreme Cassation Prosecutor's Office.
Croatia	Records of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.
Cyprus	Office of Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, Cyprus Police.
Czech Republic	Statistical data from the Recording Crime Statistics System of the Police Presidium of the Czech Republic.
Denmark	NCI, National Center og Investigation.
Estonia	Data is from police information system ALIS.
Finland	Statfin database maintained by Statistics Finland. Statistics Finland, personal communication 2013.
Germany	Data from State police forces and federal criminal Police.
Greece	Hellenic Police Headquarters/ Public Security Division.
Hungary	Unified Statistical System of Investigations and Prosecutions and Prosecution Information System.
Ireland	Anti-Human Trafficking Unit Annual Report of Trafficking in Human Beings in Ireland 2010, at www.blueblindfold.gov.ie . 2011 and 2012 figures from Garda Síochána (Irish police) Report (not published)
Latvia	The State Police. Information Centre of the Ministry of the Interior.
Portugal	Directorate-General for Justice Policy (DGPJ) – Ministry of Justice.
Romania	The Directorate for Combating Organized Crime (DCCO)-General Inspectorate of Romanian Police.
Slovakia	Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic and Information Centre for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings and Prevention of Crime of Minister of Interior's Office of Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic, published on website http://www.minv.sk/?statistika_obchodovanie_s_ludmi

Slovenia	Annual Reports confirmed by Government http://www.vlada.si/en/projects/fight_against_trafficking_in_persons/
Sweden	Source: national database for official crime statistics Data is publicly available on The National Council for Crime Prevention's website (www.bra.se).
The Netherlands	Not available.

3.1.6. Technical information

Rules of statistical recording applied for Tables 3.1.1-3.1.4:

Table 3.1.5- When are the data in Tables 3.1.1-3.1.4 collected for the statistics?		
<i>When the police first registers a suspected offender (input statistics)</i>	<i>After the police first registers a suspected offender but before they complete the investigation</i>	<i>When the police completes the investigation (output statistics)</i>
Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Poland (table 3.1.2).	Austria, Hungary, Ireland, Slovakia (after the suspected offender is accused of the crime).	Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary, Poland (table 3.1.3), Slovenia, Sweden.

Table 3.1.6- What is the counting unit used in Tables 3.1.1-3.1.4?	
<i>Suspected Offender</i>	<i>Case</i>
Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia	Czech Republic (only the forms of sexual and labour exploitation), Finland (case=report of an offence)
Countries where the counting unit is not the suspected offender:	
Denmark: Charged person	
Romania: According to DCCO definition, data used in the above table reveal information about the persons investigated by the police in criminal cases.	
Sweden: For every different kind of trafficking offence (sexual exploitation or other exploitation), the suspected offender can only be counted once per year.	

Table 3.1.7- Is a principal offence rule applied? (i.e. How is an offender suspected of multiple offences of different kinds counted?)	
<i>Countries applying a principal offence rule</i>	<i>Countries not applying a principal offence rule</i>
Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia	Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Germany, Sweden.
Comments	
Belgium: The offender is always counted once. It rarely occurs that the offender is suspected of multiple offences of different kinds.	
Bulgaria: In Bulgaria principal offence rule is not applied. Each offence is recorded independently. Bulgaria is one of the 21 countries in Europe which do not apply the principal offence rule. If a trafficker has committed other crimes, such as money laundering, theft, etc., each offence will be taken into consideration. In Bulgaria multiple offences are counted as one offence.	
Czech Republic: In case of using standard statistical reports, the principle offence rule is applied.	
Estonia: Police information system counts suspects by the crime cases. If one suspect has done 3 different crimes, then the data in the information system shows the same person to be suspect in three different crimes.	
Latvia: If two offences committed by one person are interrelated – in such case the State Police initiates one criminal proceeding. If a person has committed two different offences which are not linked to each other, then there can be two separate criminal proceedings initiated and performed by different units of the State Police, e.g., Anti-trafficking Unit and Drug Combatting Unit.	
Slovakia: Standard statistical outcome displays the offender only with the “main” registered criminal offence. Only upon a special requirement it is possible to display also other offences being committed with the “main” criminal offence registered for one offender or within one case or other offences of the same type like the “main” criminal offence being committed by various offenders.	

Table 3.1.8- How is an offender suspected of multiple offences of the same kind (often called serial offences) counted?	
<i>As one offender</i>	<i>As two or more offenders</i>
Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden	Denmark, Finland, Germany.
Comments	
Slovakia: For repeated criminal offence as well as for continuing criminal offence.	
Denmark: As one offender: If the offence has taken place in the same place (brothel), it is counted as one offence. As two or more offenders: if the same person is charged for an offence of the same kind in more than one place, the offences are counted as one each place (3 brothels = 3 offences).	

Table 3.1.9- Do data in Table 3.1.1- 3.1.4 include minors?

Data include minors	Data do not include minors
Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden.	Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Slovenia.

Table 3.1.10- Have the data recording methods described above been modified between 2010 and 2012?
Countries that have not modified them:
Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Poland.
Countries that have modified them:
Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, Poland.
Comments
<p>Czech Republic: Source of information is the Unified Statistical System of Investigations and Prosecutions but since 2012 we try to collect more information with help of the members of the National Coordination Mechanism (Victim Support Service, Court, Prosecutors Office, Police Offices, Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and National Crisis Telephone Information Service etc.) Members of the Mechanism are all authorities who are taking part in the fight against human trafficking, they are asked to provide available information quarterly about victims/offenders of human trafficking cases.</p> <p>Estonia: There have not been any relevant changes of the information system, but there have been in defining the crime of trafficking. See explanation in 3.2.</p> <p>Ireland: Breakdown of suspect numbers into type of exploitation was not available in 2010 but was introduced for 2011 and 2012 reports.</p> <p>Poland: The main change is that more data available.</p>

Table 3.1.11- Comments on questions 3.1.5 – 3.1.10	
Hungary	<p>Table 3.1.10: Sentencing Principles: Section 83. (1) Punishment, with due consideration of its intended objective (Section 37), shall be imposed within the framework provided for by law, as consistent with the danger to society represented by the nature of the criminal act and by the perpetrator, with the degree of culpability and with other aggravating and mitigating circumstances. Cumulative Sentences. Section 85. (1) In case of multiple offenses (Section 12) a single cumulative sentence shall be imposed. (2) The principal punishment shall be imposed according to the one prescribed for the gravest of the multiple offenses to which it pertains. (3) If, in respect of a multiple count of charges, the imposition of imprisonment for a specific term is prescribed by law in respect of at least two of such criminal acts, the upper limit of applicable punishment set forth in Subsection (2) shall be increased by one-half, but may not reach the total duration of the maximum sentences established for such criminal acts. Section 85/A. (1) In the case of a waiver of right to trial (CPC, Chapter XXVI) the provisions of Subsections (1)-(2) of Section 85 shall apply, however, for multiple counts of criminal acts the principal punishment shall be imposed according to the one prescribed for the gravest of the multiple offenses as prescribed in Section 87/C. (2) In the case of waiver of right to trial (Chapter XXVI of the CPC), if the law prescribes imprisonment for a specific term in respect of at least two of the crimes included in the multiple count of criminal acts, the maximum sentence prescribed in Section 87/C shall be increased by one-half, however, it may not reach the sum total of the sentences which may be imposed for such crimes pursuant to Section 87/C.</p> <p>Section 86. (1) In case of multiple offenses, any ancillary punishment applicable for any one of the multiple counts of crimes may be imposed. (2) The ancillary punishment may not exceed the highest measure or duration prescribed in this Act in the case of cumulative sentences.</p>
Latvia	<p>Comment on Table 3.1.5 – According the Criminal Procedure Law Section 65 “Suspects” if the totality of evidence provides grounds for the assumption of a person directing the proceedings that the investigated criminal offence was most likely committed by a concrete person, he or she shall take a written decision that such person is recognised as a suspect. Comment on question Table 3.1.9– During assessment period no minor was involved in performing criminal offences related to human trafficking.</p>
Portugal	<p>As the data is collected by the Directorate-General for Justice Policy (DGPJ), the OTSH does not have an in depth information about the methodological process.</p>
Romania	<p>Data regarding the unknown gender are not meant to be considered transgender persons but cases were the authors remained unknown to the police. For the above section of the table, we didn't receive any other feedback or information.</p>
Slovakia	<p>Multiple offence/serial offence– there are two possibilities within the Slovak Penal Law – criminal offence committed repeatedly (more separate criminal acts of the same kind without any connection between them) and continuing criminal offence (the individual criminal acts connected and considered to be one)</p>
Sweden	<p>Table 3.1.9– Data excludes persons younger than 15 year old.</p>
The Netherlands	<p>Data not available</p>

PART 3.2.
**Suspected THB offenders
prosecuted by the
prosecution authority**

3.2.1. General comments

This section provides information on *total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority* in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Regarding suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority, the following data were requested:

- The *total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority* in 2010, 2011 and 2012 (see Table 3.2.1), breakdown into the following sub-categories: breakdown by gender: *males, females and unknown (specifying in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender)* (see Table 3.2.2), by type of exploitation: *sexual exploitation, labour exploitation and other (to be specified in the comments)* (see Table 3.2.3); by origin of the offenders: *nationals, foreigners from other EU countries and foreigners from non-EU countries* (see Table 3.2.4)
- Description of data recording methods for Tables on suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority: *When are the data in Tables 3.2.1-3.2.4 collected for the statistics?* (See Table 3.2.5); *What is the counting unit used in Table 3?* (See Table 3.2.6); *Is a principal offence rule applied? (I.e. How is an offender suspected of multiple offences of different kinds counted?)* (See Table 3.2.7); *How is an offender suspected of multiple offences of the same kind (often called serial offences) counted?* (See Table 3.2.8); *Do data in Tables 3.2.1-3.2.4 include minors?* (See Table 3.2.9); *Have the data recording methods described above been modified between 2010 and 2012?* (See Table 3.2.10); *Do the police have separate powers to drop proceedings, conditionally dispose of them or issue a penal order that counts as a conviction? If yes, which powers do they have?* (See Table 3.2.11); *General Comments to questions concerning the description of the data recording methods for tables suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority* (See Table 3.2.12).

3.2.2. Quality of the data

- Eighteen countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the *total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority* (see Table 3.2.1). Of those, nine countries could provide the breakdown for *males* and nine for *females*. Five countries provided data for the category *unknown* (although four of these countries reported 0) (see Table 3.2.2).
- Concerning the breakdowns asked of the *Total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority* by type of exploitation, eight countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the category *sexual exploitation*, six countries provided data for the category *labour exploitation*, and seven countries reported *other* (see Table 3.2.3).
- Six countries provided data (at least for two of the years) to the *national* identified victims, seven countries provided data for the category *Foreigners from other EU*

countries, and six provided data for the category of *Foreigners from non-EU countries* (see Table 3.2.4).

- All countries provided most of the information required for the *Technical information* section. (see Table 3.2.5-3.2.12).

3.2.3. Results

Despite the extensive availability of data on the number of suspected offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority, there are major differences across countries in the ways of collecting the data. This compromises the comparability between countries.

Some basic differences need to be highlighted since the beginning: For Cyprus, prosecution data include the individuals who were charged by the police. German data reflect the number of the individuals prosecuted that have been sentenced or against whom criminal proceedings have been concluded by dismissal, acquittal, or non-punishment (output data). In Ireland and Spain, the criminal investigation is not lead by the prosecutor; therefore, suspected offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority do not refer to persons against whom legal proceedings have been initiated by the prosecuting authorities, but rather to persons against whom legal proceedings have been initiated by police officers. Swedish data on suspected offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority are based on the prosecution authority's decision to prosecute, rather than on the actual prosecution. In addition to these remarks, the data concerning the statistical counting rules also reveal a number of differences that further limit the comparability of data between EU countries.

The moment in which the data are collected has a significant impact in the figures. Four countries reported that prosecution data on offenders are collected when the prosecution authority first registers an offender or case (input data). In four countries prosecution data are collected after the prosecution authority first registers an offender (or case) but before they complete the investigation. Seven countries indicated that prosecution data refer to output data, which means that the prosecution authority finished its investigation before registering the offender or case for the statistics. Finally, some countries did not indicate at what moment data on prosecuted offenders are collected.

Prosecution data on the number of suspected offenders mainly refer to offenders (12 countries). Belgium provided data on the number of suspected offenders as well as on the number of cases. Finnish, Spanish, and Swedish data on prosecuted offenders refer to cases and each case can include multiple offenders. Lastly some countries did not indicate the counting unit used.

Most of the countries reported that a principal offence rule is applied when registering prosecution data. When an explanation of the principal offence rule was provided, correspondents either specified that the most serious crime is registered or remarked that cases for separate offences are combined and prosecuted as a single case. Unfortunately, this does not clarify the way in which THB offenders are counted in these countries. Four countries indicated that no principal offence rule is used in their countries. In the

Netherlands, whether or not a principal offence rule is applied, depends on the offences an offender is summoned for. Finally a few did not indicate if a principal offence rule is used in registering prosecution data.

Almost all countries reported that an offender accused of multiple offences of the same kind is counted as one offender. Only Cyprus and Sweden count someone who is prosecuted for multiple offences of the same kind as two or more offenders. However, in Swedish police data a single offender can only be counted once in a year for each type of trafficking offence he or she is suspected of. As a result, the same person can be counted once in police statistics for each kind of trafficking offence. Information was missing for some countries.

Keeping in mind the previous methodological issues, the following results should be interpreted cautiously: In 2012, the average number of *suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authorities* in Europe was 141, with the highest number in Belgium (584), followed by Romania (536) (See Table 3.2.1). Among the total offenders, an average of 72 were *males* and 21 *females* (See Table 3.2.2). The highest number of suspected THB offenders were suspects of *sexual exploitation* (87), followed by *labour exploitation* (72) and finally *other types of exploitation* (8). Example of other type of exploitation in Belgium are removal of organs, exploitation of begging, or forcing someone to commit a crime; in Germany, support of sexual exploitation and support of labour exploitation; in Sweden it means all forms of exploitation except sexual exploitation i.e. forced labour, domestic servitude, forced begging, organ removal, criminal activities etc. (See Table 3.2.3). Concerning the origin of the offenders most of them were *nationals* (98), followed by *foreigners from non-EU countries* in a much smaller proportion (36) and finally by *foreigners from other EU countries* (12) (See Table 3.2.4).

3.2.4. Tables

Table 3.2.1- Total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	337	358	381
	479	535	584
Bulgaria	222	253	249
Croatia	6	3	6
Cyprus	64	53	68
Czech Republic	26	31	31
Denmark	17	12	12
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	1	5	333
Germany	192	148	162
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	14	27	16
Ireland	5	8	13
Latvia	4	0	1
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	32
Portugal	...	9	7
Romania	415	480	536
Slovakia	10	33	10
Slovenia	5	15	25
Spain	0	64	157
Sweden	15	15	15
The Netherlands	215	255	311

Table 3.2.2- Total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority: Males			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	***	***	***
	***	***	***
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	3	2	5
Cyprus	43	31	21
Czech Republic
Denmark	12	7	8
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	143	109	125
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	4	6	13
Latvia	3	0	1
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	338	393	446
Slovakia	5	33	8
Slovenia	5	***	***
Spain	0	***	***
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	175	210	253

Table 3.2.2- Total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority: Females			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	***	***	***

Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	3	1	1
Cyprus	21	22	47
Czech Republic
Denmark	5	5	4
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	49	39	37
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	1	2	0
Latvia	1	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	77	87	90
Slovakia	1	0	2
Slovenia	0	***	***
Spain	0	***	***
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	39	43	54

Table 3.2.2- Total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority: Unknown (please specify in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender)			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria
Belgium	***	***	***

Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany
Greece	***
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	0	0
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	0	0	0
Slovakia
Slovenia	0	***	***
Spain	0	***	***
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	2	4	4

Table 3.2.3- Total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority: Sexual exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	175	170	190
	238	227	289
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	41	44	67
Czech Republic
Denmark	17	12	12
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	172	139	142
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	5	8	13
Latvia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	5	***	***
Spain	0	59	131
Sweden	7	6	7
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.2.3- Total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority: Labour exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	136	165	164
	199	263	262
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	12	9	1
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	17	9	16
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	0	0
Latvia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	0	***	***
Spain	0	5	26
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	***	***	***

	2010	2011	2012
Austria
Belgium	26	23	27
	42	45	33
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	11	0	0
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	3	0	4
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	0	0
Latvia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovakia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Slovenia	***	***	***
Spain	0	0	0
Sweden	8	9	8
The Netherlands	***	***	***

	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	N.A	N.A	N.A
	N.A	N.A	N.A
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	34	25	12
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	N.A	N.A	N.A
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	4	0	1
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	26
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	412	476	533
Slovakia	6	8	4
Slovenia	***	***	***
Spain	0	***	11
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	83	101	139

Table 3.2.4- Total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority: Foreigners from other EU countries			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	N.A	N.A	N.A
	N.A	N.A	N.A
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	14	18	33
Czech Republic
Denmark	15	7	8
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	N.A	N.A	N.A
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	6
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	3	4	3
Slovakia	0	0	1
Slovenia	***	***	***
Spain	0	***	26
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	73	84	85

Table 3.2.4- Total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority: Foreigners from non-EU countries			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	N.A	N.A	N.A
	N.A	N.A	N.A
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus	16	10	23
Czech Republic
Denmark	2	5	4
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	N.A	N.A	N.A
Greece	N.A	N.A	N.A
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	0
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania
Slovakia	0	0	7
Slovenia	***	***	***
Spain	0	***	120
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	56	69	82

Comments on Tables 3.2.1-3.2.4	
Belgium	It is more common to extract the figures using the case as the counting unit, but we can also extract them by using the offender as the counting unit, this explains the duplicity of the data. Data reported in the above boxes refer to the CASES RECORDED, while data reported in the below boxes uses the OFFENDER as the counting unit. Other THB:– removal of organs (art. 433quinquies § 1, 4°): 2010 :1case/2 offenders , 2011: 1case/2 offenders, 2012: 2cases/offenders, – exploitation of begging (art. 433quinquies § 1, 2°): 2010: 5 cases/ 6 offenders , 2011: 8 cases/ 6 offenders 18, 2012: 7 cases/ 14 offenders – forcing someone to commit a crime (art. 433quinquies § 1, 5°): 2010:20 cases/34 offenders, 2011: 14 cases/25 offenders, 2012:18 cases/16 offenders.
Cyprus	Figures in table 3.2.1-3.2.4 include the individuals that were charged by the Police
Czech Republic	Number of prosecuted traffickers by citizenship should be available.
Finland	The counting unit used here is CASE, not the OFFENDER. Therefore no data can be provided on the total of prosecuted persons or their gender and nationality.
Germany	Available is the total number of persons prosecuted by the prosecution authority and accused before the court. The data provided above is the number of the individuals prosecuted that have been sentenced or against which criminal proceedings have been finally concluded by dismissal, acquittal, refrain from punishment e.a. The number of the suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority is not available. "Other exploitation" means support of sexual exploitation and support of labour exploitation.
Greece	The relevant authority for the prosecuted offenders is the Ministry of Justice, Transparency and Human Rights
Hungary	No data available.
Ireland	2012 figures are provisional and may be subject to revision. Breakdown by nationality is not available.
Latvia	Prosecutor prosecutes criminal proceeding according the Criminal Law Section 154.1 "Human Trafficking" and does not specify a form of exploitation of a victim of human trafficking for statistics.
Luxembourg	No data available.
Poland	Above data refer to cases, which received or should receive (in opinion of the General's Prosecutor Office (former: the National Prosecutor's Office) legal qualification from articles that punish the crime of trafficking in human beings. We presented only data for 2012 – previous data referred to other articles which are not currently counted as THB. Thus it is not possible to compare it. For example: Data for 2010 refer also to other articles of Penal code no longer seen as THB:- the Article 204 (3) - committing the crimes pointed in Articles 204 (1) [impelling another person to prostitution of facilitating it in order to gain material benefits] and 204 (2) [gaining material benefits from prostitution of another person]against minor. - Article 203 – leading another person to prostitution by means of violence, unlawful threats, deceit or by taking advantage of the dependency or critical position. These are not statistical data but data collected by General Prosecutor Office on a basis of analyses from cases.
Portugal	N.A. – Disaggregated data not available ... <i>Null data or protected under statistical secrecy</i>
Romania	No distinction between foreigners by member of EU or non-EU.
Slovakia	Indicators related to purpose of THB are not kept in the statistics.
Spain	1.-The offence of THB was introduced in the Spanish Criminal Code (CC) by Organic Law 5/2010 through the new Title VII bis on "Trafficking of Human Beings". Article 177 bis of the CC criminalising THB entered into force in December 2010 and the first judgments dealing with this offence were handed down at the end of 2012. Prior to the addition of Article 177 bis, THB was often confused with the smuggling of migrants and clandestine immigration, as the former Article 318 bis, paragraph 2, of the CC criminalised the smuggling of migrants for the purpose of sexual exploitation. That's why there were neither indictments nor convictions until 2012. 2.-The Spanish Criminal Code defines force prostitution as a different offence from human trafficking. As the questionnaire does not refer to force prostitution figures regarding this offence are not included.
Sweden	*** included in total figure. Data is based on the prosecution authority's decision to prosecute, not actual prosecution. Registration on forms of exploitation is based on a classifications system (4-digit code) which offers a separation between a) sexual exploitation and b) other forms of exploitation (which is all forms of exploitation except sexual exploitation i.e. forced labour, domestic servitude, forced begging, organ removal, criminal activities etc.). Future data, starting 2013, will offer a separation between forced labour, forced begging and organ removal.
The Netherlands	Comment on the gender: The category 'unknown' is interpreted as the category 'other' since in the Netherlands it refers to both 'unknown' and 'corporation' (in Dutch: rechtspersoon). Comment on 'exploitation': The Public Prosecution Service does not register whether a case is related to sexual or other forms of exploitation. It is difficult to do so, since the text of the relevant

	<p>article of the Dutch Criminal Code makes it impossible to make a distinction between them on the grounds of the sections and sub-sections. The new GPS registration system, however, creates a possibility. With regard to the above, the National Rapporteur recommended the following: 'Parties throughout the chain should register whether a human trafficking case involves sexual exploitation or exploitation in other economic sectors ('other forms of exploitation') or whether it is for the purpose of organ removal. The IND and the PPS, in any case, do not currently do so.'</p> <p>Comments on 'nationals/foreigners': Please note that these figures refer to the 'country of birth' and not to citizenship.</p> <p>Comment on the citizenship: The figures mentioned for the category 'nationals' exclude the former Netherland Antilles and the current municipalities of the Netherlands (Saba, Sint Eustatius and Bonaire). Suspects from these areas are included in the figures on 'foreigners from non-EU countries'.</p> <p>Suspects from the former Netherlands Antilles and the current municipalities of the NL, in: 2010: 5, 2011: 8.</p> <p>The countries of birth of suspects from other EU countries (not the NL) in 2010 and 2011 are the following: Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia (the current Serbia and the current Montenegro) – Other countries of birth within EU countries were not registered.</p>
--	--

3.2.5. Sources

Belgium	Database of the College of Principal Public Prosecutors
Bulgaria	Supreme Cassation Prosecutor's Office
Croatia	Official statistics.
Cyprus	Office of Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, Cyprus Police
Czech Republic	Supreme Prosecutor's Office
Denmark	NCI- National centre of investigation.
Estonia	Source for the data will be the register of Criminal Proceedings.
Finland	Ministry of Justice 2012, Ihmiskauppatyöryhmän mietintö. Mietintöjä ja lausuntoja 63/2012, page 38. Available online: http://oikeusministerio.fi/fi/index/julkaisut/julkaisuarkisto/1354191575312/Files/Ihmiskauppatyoryhman_mietinto.pdf
Germany	Federal Statistical Office, serial criminal prosecution 2010, 2011, 2012. Strafverfolgung – Fachserie 10 Reihe 3
Hungary	Prosecutors Office – Information System
Ireland	Anti-Human Trafficking Unit Annual Report of Trafficking in Human Beings in Ireland 2010, 2011, 2012 at www.blueblindfold.gov.ie
Latvia	The General Prosecutor's Office
Poland	The National Prosecutor's Office
Portugal	Directorate-General for Justice Policy (DGPJ) – Ministry of Justice
Romania	Directorate for Investigating Organized Crime and Terrorism (DIOCT)- formalized system of gathering of data from their regional structures.
Slovakia	General Prosecutor's Office of the Slovak Republic
Slovenia	Annual Reports confirmed by Government http://www.vlada.si/en/projects/fight_against_trafficking_in_persons/
Spain	General Prosecutor's Office. Foreigners Unit
Sweden	National database for official crime statistics. Data is publicly available on The

National Council for Crime Prevention's website (www.bra.se).

**The
Nether-
lands**

Analysis of the national database of the Public Prosecution Service (PPS), which contains information from the district offices and district courts, including annual statistics on the prosecution and trial of human trafficking. It is possible to select the cases in which at least the offence of human trafficking is registered (Articles 250a (old), 250ter (old), 273a (old) 29 or 273f DCC) from the complete PPS database. The secondary analyses of the 'human trafficking' subset were performed, at the request of the Bureau of the National Rapporteur, by the Statistical Information and Policy analysis (SIBA) department of the Ministry of Justice's Centre for Research and Documentation (WODC).

Published in: National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings and Sexual Violence against Children (2012). Visible and Invisible Human Trafficking. Statistical Data 2007-2011. The Hague: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.dutchrapporteur.nl). Complete overview of the statistics is included in the Dutch version: 'Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2012). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld. Cijfermatige rapportage 2007-2011. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl) and in the new report: Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2014). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld II. Cijfermatige rapportage 2008-2012. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl).

3.2.6. Technical information

Rules of statistical recording applied for Table 3.2.1-3.2.4:

Table 3.2.5- When are the data in Tables 3.2.1-3.2.4 collected for the statistics?		
<i>When the prosecution authority first registers a suspected offender (input statistics)</i>	<i>After the prosecution authority first registers a suspected offender but before it completes the investigation</i>	<i>When the prosecution authority completes the investigation (output statistics)</i>
Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Latvia,	Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Slovenia, Spain.	Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, The Netherlands.

Table 3.2.6- What is the counting unit used in Table 4?	
<i>Suspected Offender</i>	<i>Case</i>
Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, The Netherlands.	Finland, Hungary, Poland, Spain, Sweden,
Comments	
<p>Finland: The statistical information includes cases received, cases ended and application for a summons made. One case may include multiple offenders.</p> <p>Hungary: The Information System provides information on the number of cases, on the number of suspected offenders, on the number those offenders who were punished and on the number of the several punishments.</p> <p>Poland: Other data refer also to cases – but not presented in this questionnaire.</p> <p>Spain: Case means each police investigation of a specific case of human trafficking evaluated as such by the Prosecution Service.</p> <p>Sweden: In cases there are different decisions, for the same offence, made by the prosecution authority (for example a decision to prosecute one suspect and a decision to not prosecute one other suspect); a principal decision rule determines which decision that will be counted in the statistics. According to the principal decision rule the different decisions are ordered as follows: a) decision to prosecute, b) imposition of prosecutor fine, c) waiver of prosecution and other unspecified decisions not to prosecute. The first present decision in this order that is present in a criminal case will be counted in the statistics.</p>	

Table 3.2.7- Is a principal offence rule applied? (i.e. How is an offender prosecuted for multiple offences of different kinds counted?)	
<i>Principle rule applied</i>	<i>No Principle rule applied</i>
Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Spain, The Netherlands.	Bulgaria, Estonia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, The Netherlands.
Comments	
<p>Belgium: The informatics system foresees the possibility to register the principal and the secondary offences. When different prevention codes are registered in one case only the most important "prevention code" concerning this phenomena is taken in consideration.</p> <p>Bulgaria: In Bulgaria principal offence rule is not applied. Each offence is recorded independently. Bulgaria is one of the 21 countries in Europe which do not apply the principal offence rule. If a trafficker has committed other crimes, such as money laundering, theft, etc., each offence will be taken into consideration. In Bulgaria multiple offences are counted as one offence.</p> <p>Czech Republic: Offender registered for the most serious crime.</p> <p>Finland: Based on the most severe offence. 1- select the most serious type of punishment and the offence of which it is sentenced. Applicable in cases where one offence is punished by imprisonment, and another one by fines or other sanctions. In such case, imprisonment is selected, together with the offence for which imprisonment is sentenced. 2- select the offence for which the maximum punishment is highest. 3- if two offences have the same maximum punishment, a list of priority offences is applied. This list is unchanged over time. 4- if two offences are similar according to criteria 1-3, the most recent offence is selected.</p> <p>Hungary: Sentencing Principles (See comments on Table 3.1.11).</p> <p>Latvia: If investigation on interrelated offences was performed within one criminal proceeding at the same time, a prosecutor prosecutes one criminal proceeding and a person loses status of a suspect and gets a status of accused. If prosecutor receives two different criminal proceedings (even performed by different public institutions) with a same person as a suspect person, then a prosecutor merges both criminal proceedings in one with one accused.</p> <p>Romania: Once a file has been registered for the crime of trafficking it will be recorded as such in the statistical system. If during criminal investigation other offences are hold against the same author, statistical records are not</p>	

modified.

The Netherlands: Both options are possible, it all depends on what the offender is summoned for. More clarification for this question is needed. For now, please find below our understanding of the application of a principal offence rule.

- If a person is summoned for two different offences (e.g. rape and human trafficking) and is also convicted for two different offences (two convictions) then a principal offence rule is applied. The statistics the National Rapporteur receives show at least all prosecutions related to human trafficking. We also do have insight in the total number of summonses, by most serious offence.

- If a person committed for example both rape and human trafficking but is summoned for only human trafficking (possibly because rape may have been considered as the mean in the definition of human trafficking) and is also convicted for only human trafficking, then no principal offence rule is applied.

- It is also possible that a person committed multiple offences of different kinds but all related to human trafficking. Whether or not a principal offence rule is applied, is not traceable from the statistics (is always counted as one conviction).

Please also see 'Trafficking in Human Beings – Visible and Invisible. A quantitative report' (2012, p. 81 and further): 'Because human trafficking is often committed in combination with other offences, a case can also involve a number of other offences. Figure 6.2 provides an overview of the most serious offences recorded in the 784 summonses (2007-2011). The most 'serious' offence is the offence with the heaviest maximum sentence – it does not imply a qualitative judgment of the offence.' ... 'Human trafficking (unqualified or qualified) was the most serious registered offence for which charges were brought in 82% of the cases. Where there was also suspicion of a more serious offence than human trafficking, it was generally a form of sexual violence (11% of the total in the five years). This would mainly have been offences such as rape or sexual intercourse with a person under the age of 16.'

Table 3.2.8- How is an offender prosecuted for multiple offences of the same kind (often called serial offences) counted?

<i>Countries identifying victims as one offender</i>	<i>Countries identifying victims as two or more offenders</i>
Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, The Netherlands	Cyprus, Sweden.
Comments	
Latvia: A prosecutor merges all offences in one criminal proceeding with one accused. According to the Criminal Law if a person has committed several independent criminal offences, the public prosecutor by drawing up an injunction regarding the punishment shall determine punishment separately for each criminal offence.	
Slovakia: For repeated criminal offence as well as for continuing criminal offence.	

Table 3.2.9- Do data in Table 4 include minors?

Data do not include minors		
Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Slovenia, Spain.		
Data include minors		
	Minimum age	Maximum age
Czech Republic	15	...
Estonia	14	18
Finland	15	18
Germany	14	18
Romania	10	18
Slovakia	14	18
Sweden	15	...
The Netherlands	***	***

Table 3.2.10- Have the data recording methods described above been modified between 2010 and 2012?

Countries that have not modified them:
Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands.
Countries that have modified them :
Estonia, Poland.

Table 3.2.11- Do the police have separate powers to drop proceedings, conditionally dispose of them or issue a penal order that counts as a conviction? If yes, which powers do they have?				
Countries do not having police separate powers to drop proceedings, conditionally dispose of them or issue a penal order that counts as a conviction:				
Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands.				
Countries having police separate powers to drop proceedings, conditionally dispose of them or issue a penal order that counts as a conviction:				
<i>Drop because offender remains unknown</i>	<i>Drop for other factual or for legal reasons</i>	<i>Drop for public interest reasons / simple caution</i>	<i>Conditional disposal / conditional caution</i>	<i>Penal order</i>
Czech Republic, Ireland, Slovakia (police officer).	Czech Republic, Ireland, Slovakia (police officer).	Denmark, Ireland.	Ireland, Slovakia (only prosecutor).	--
Comments				
<p>Cyprus: A case can be classified as “otherwise disposed of” upon the decision of the Attorney General.</p> <p>Latvia: According to the Criminal Procedure Law: (1) An investigator with a consent of a supervising public prosecutor, public prosecutor or a court may terminate criminal proceedings, if: 1) a criminal offence has been committed that has the features of a criminal offence, but which has not caused harm that would warrant the application of a criminal punishment; 2) the person who has committed a criminal violation or a less serious crime has made a settlement with the victim or his or her representative; 3) a criminal offence has been committed by a minor and special circumstances of the committing of the criminal offence have been determined, and information has been acquired regarding the minor that mitigates his or her liability; 4) it is not possible to complete the criminal proceedings within reasonable term. (2) An investigator, with the consent of a supervising public prosecutor, or a public prosecutor may terminate criminal proceedings, and send materials regarding a minor for the application of a compulsory measure of a correctional nature. (3) A public prosecutor may terminate criminal proceedings, conditionally releasing from criminal liability. (4) The termination of criminal proceedings on the basis of a settlement shall not be permitted, if information has been acquired that the settlement was achieved as a result of threats or violence, or by the use of other illegal means. (5) The termination of criminal proceedings, releasing a person from criminal liability, shall not be permitted, if the person who has committed the criminal offence, or the representative thereof, objects to such termination.</p> <p>Estonia: Police refuse to commence the case and if the person is not agreeing this decision, then they have the right to dispute it and send their request to prosecutor. Rights to terminate for public interest, conditional disposal stay for the prosecutor. Police don't have the power to decide about these issues. We don't penal order in our system. All of the procedural issues are regulated by the Code of Criminal Procedure, which you may find here: http://www.legaltext.ee/et/andmebaas/tekst.asp?loc=text&dok=X60027K9&keel=en&pg=1&ptyyp=RT&tyyp=X&query=kriminaalmenetluse+seadustik.</p> <p>Romania: Ordinance delegation.</p> <p>Slovakia: The possibilities of a police officer or prosecutor to exercise the above mentioned powers are defined in Code of Criminal Procedure – Act No. 301/2005 Coll. as amended.</p>				

Table 3.2.12- Comments on questions 3.2.5 – 3.2.11	
Germany	German criminal law differentiates between “minors” and “adolescents”. “Minors” are young people between 14 and 18 years. “Adolescents” mean young adults between 18 and 21. The year at the time of the act is decisive. Young adults can be sentenced on the basis of Youth Court Law as well as on the basis of general law.(German Criminal Code)
Latvia	Table 3.2.5: According to Criminal Procedure Law Section 68 “Termination of the Status of a Suspect” a person shall lose the status of a suspect, if such person is held criminally liable and the criminal prosecution thereof is initiated. According to the Criminal Procedure Law an accused person shall be a person who is held criminally liable, with a decision of a person directing the proceedings, regarding the committing of a criminal offence, and against whom initiated criminal proceedings have not been terminated, and who has not been acquitted or found guilty with a court judgment that has entered into effect. One and the same person may not simultaneously be the accused and the suspect in the same criminal proceedings. Table 3.2.9: During assessment period no minor was involved in performing criminal offences related to human trafficking.
Poland	The prosecutor is a coordinator of an investigation, s/he undertakes a final decision.
Portugal	As the data is collected by the Directorate-General for Justice Policy (DGPJ), the OTSH does not have an in depth information about the methodological process.
Romania	Table 3.2.7: Suspect is counted only once, even if he is offender in several cases of human trafficking. The exact extent of the investigation process of THB is given by the number of known suspects at the level of DIOCT, but also by the number of cases in the DIOCT, for certain periods of time.
Spain	Data in this comments box regards indictments issued by the Prosecutor Service during 2012. We've already explain why there were not any indictments during 2011.

	<p>Number of indictments 11 (THB for sexual exploitation: 9/ THB for labour exploitation:2) Number of defendants 22 (THB for sexual exploitation: 15/ THB form labour exploitation:7)</p>
The Netherlands	<p>Table 3.2.7: The registered suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the public prosecution service are all prosecuted for at least one human trafficking offence. The statistics do not provide insight in the number of other offences simultaneously being prosecuted. Comment on 4.7: In 2010 1 suspect was minor and in 2011 3 suspects were minor. The exact age is unknown. Furthermore, the age refers to the age in the year of the offence is committed.</p> <p>Table 3.2.9: The answer refers to the human trafficking cases registered by the Public Prosecution Service (and not all suspects known to the police who are not necessarily registered at the Public Prosecution Service).</p> <p>Please note that the figures on suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the Public Prosecution Service and the figures on convicted THB offenders cannot be compared. The data on the prosecution of the human trafficking cases registered by the Public Prosecution Service and the data on the trial of human trafficking cases in first instance usually do not encompass a cohort and can therefore seldom be compared, since not all cases are dealt with by the Public Prosecution Service and heard by the court of instance in the year they are registered by the Public Prosecution Service.</p> <p>(For a more qualitative review of the prosecution and trial of human trafficking cases, see the case law study by the Bureau of the National Rapporteur (National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings And Sexual Violence against Children. Case law on trafficking in human beings 2009-2012. An analysis. The Hague: Nationaal Rapporteur, online at: www.dutchrapporteur.nl).</p>

PART 3.3.
Persons convicted for THB
offences

3.3.1. General comments

This section provides information on *persons convicted for THB offences* for 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Regarding Persons convicted for THB offences, the following data were requested:

- *Total number of Persons convicted for THB offences for 2010, 2011 and 2012* (See Table 3.3.1), with a breakdown for the following sub-categories: by gender: *males, females and unknown (specifying in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender)* (See Table 3.3.2), by type of exploitation: *sexual exploitation, labour exploitation and other (to be specified in the comments)* (See Table 3.3.3); by origin of the offenders: *nationals, foreigners from other EU countries and foreigners from non-EU countries* (See Table 3.3.4).
- Description of data recording methods for tables on *Persons convicted for THB offences: At what stage of the process do the data in Tables 3.3.1-3.3.4 refer to?* (See Table 3.3.5); *what is the counting unit used in Tables 3.3.1-3.3.4?* (See Table 3.3.6); *is a principal offence rule applied? (i.e. how is a person convicted for multiple offences of different kinds counted?)* (See Table 3.3.7); *how is a person convicted for multiple offences of the same kind (often called serial offences) counted?* (See Table 3.3.8); *do data in Tables 3.3.1-3.3.4 include minors?* (See Table 3.3.9); *have the data recording methods described above been modified between 2010 and 2012?* (See Table 3.3.10); *general comments to questions concerning the description of the data recording methods for tables on persons convicted for THB offences* (See Table 3.3.11).

3.3.2. Quality of the data

- *-Eighteen countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the total number of suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the prosecution authority* (See Table 3.3.1). Of these countries, most were able to provide detailed information on gender and nationality. Fourteen countries could provide the breakdown for *males* and fifteen for *females*. Ten countries provided data for the category *unknown* (although nine of these countries reported 0). Some countries such as Croatia and Luxembourg did not provide data on the total count of convicted offenders but provide their breakdown for gender (both), exploitation (Luxembourg), and nationality (both). Data were missing for Austria, Greece, Lithuania (although some qualitative information on the nationality of convicted offenders was provided), and Portugal (See Table 3.3.1 and 3.3.2).
- *Few information was provided on the breakdown by type of exploitation. Eight countries provided data (for at least two of the three years) for the category sexual exploitation, seven countries provided data for the category labour exploitation, and six countries reported other* (See Table 3.3.3).
- *Ten countries provided data (at least for two of the years) on the national identified victims, nine countries provided data for the category foreigners from other EU countries,*

and eleven provided data for the category of *foreigners from non-EU countries* (See Table 3.3.4).

- All countries provided most of the information required for the *Technical information* section (See Table 3.3.5- 3.3.11).

3.3.3. Results

The possibility of using conviction data to conduct comparisons between countries depends on the extent to which the countries apply the same statistical counting rules to register the convictions. It appears in this respect that conviction data are to a large extent comparable across countries.

A major issue to take into consideration is that data on persons convicted for THB should refer, whenever this is possible, to convictions after appeal. Convictions after appeal are definitive; while convictions before appeal can still be modified according to the result of the appeal. Thus, it is possible to increase the reliability of the figures and, at the same time, avoid double counting (i.e. counting the same person in first and second instance) by using as counting unit the persons convicted after appeal. Data from 14 countries refer to convictions after appeals, and 6 refer to convictions before appeals. The only exception is Slovenia where conviction data refer to convictions both before and after appeals. No information was available for Luxembourg.

The counting unit used by almost all countries was the person, with Belgium as the only exception.

Thirteen countries indicated that a principal offence rule is used in the registration of convictions and that the most serious offence is registered. Five countries do not use a principal offence rule for the recording of convictions for human trafficking.

Most countries count a person who is convicted for multiple offences of the same kind as a single person and only a few countries count them as two or more. For instance, in Sweden an offender will be counted as one convicted person if he or she is convicted for multiple offences in a single court case, but the same offender would be registered multiple times in the data if he or she is prosecuted multiple times and convicted multiple times in a single year. In Slovakia, if several convictions for the same offence exist, the offender will show up as a recidivist in the data. If someone receives a single conviction for multiple offences of the same type, however, he or she will be counted as a single person. The same situation applies to the Netherlands.

In 2012, the European average of convicted offenders was 48, with the highest number in Romania (427) and the lowest in Portugal (1) (See Table 3.2.1). Within the total convicted offenders, an average of 34 were *males* and 12 *females* (See Table 3.2.2). The highest proportion of offenders was convicted for *sexual exploitation* (14), and few data was reported for the other types of exploitation (See Table 3.2.3). Most of the convicted offenders were *nationals* (5), followed by *foreigners from EU countries* in a smaller proportion (4) and finally by *foreigners from other non-EU countries* (4) (See Table 3.2.4).

3.3.4. Tables

Table 3.3.1- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	64	68	48
Bulgaria	125	131	96
Croatia
Cyprus	11	9	37
Czech Republic	10	19	11
Denmark	10	6	4
Estonia	28	20	37
Finland	0	1	***
Germany	131	121	128
Greece
Hungary	13	23	9
Ireland	5	4	6
Latvia	2	0	1
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	20	19	16
Portugal	6
Romania	203	276	427
Slovakia	6	8	12
Slovenia	4	6	8
Spain	0	0	3
Sweden	6	2	9
The Netherlands	80	80	109

Table 3.3.2- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Males			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	N.A	N.A	N.A
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	2	0	2
Cyprus	5	2	15
Czech Republic	***	16	9
Denmark	6	5	3
Estonia	23	15	22
Finland	0	0	***
Germany	98	90	99
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	5	3	4
Latvia	2	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg	7
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	150	218	331
Slovakia	4	5	9
Slovenia	4	6	***
Spain	0	0	2
Sweden	3	2	8
The Netherlands	71	68	94

Table 3.3.2- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Females			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	N.A	N.A	N.A
Bulgaria
Croatia	1	1	0
Cyprus	6	7	22
Czech Republic	***	3	2
Denmark	4	1	1
Estonia	5	5	14
Finland	0	1	***
Germany	33	31	29
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	1	2
Latvia	0	0	1
Lithuania
Luxembourg	1
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	53	58	96
Slovakia	2	3	3
Slovenia	0	0	***
Spain	0	0	1
Sweden	3	0	1
The Netherlands	9	11	14

Table 3.3.2- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Unknown (please specify in the comments if this category includes, for example, transgender)			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	N.A	N.A	N.A
Bulgaria
Croatia	0	0	0
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic
Denmark	0	0	1
Estonia
Finland	***	***	***
Germany
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	0	0
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	0	0	0
Slovakia	0	0	0
Slovenia	0	0	***
Spain
Sweden	0	0	0
The Netherlands	0	1	1

Table 3.3.3- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Sexual exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	***	***	***
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	11	8	37
Czech Republic	10	19	15
Denmark	10	6	4
Estonia	28	20	37
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	115	117	115
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	5	4	6
Latvia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Lithuania
Luxembourg	8
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	NA	NA	NA
Slovakia	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	2	6	5
Spain	0	0	3
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.3.3- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Labour exploitation			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	***	***	***
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia
Cyprus	0	0	0
Czech Republic	0	0	6
Denmark
Estonia	0	0	0
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	13	4	10
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	0	0
Latvia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	NA	NA	NA
Slovakia	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	2	0	2
Spain	0	0	0
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.3.3- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Other (please specify in the comments)			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	***	***	***
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus	0	1	0
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	0	0	0
Finland	***	***	***
Germany	3	0	3
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	0	0	0
Latvia	N.A	N.A	N.A
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	NA	NA	NA
Slovakia
Slovenia	0	0	1
Spain	0	0	0
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	***	***	***

Table 3.3.4- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Nationals			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	N.A	N.A	N.A
Bulgaria	***	***	***
Croatia	3	1	2
Cyprus	6	4	13
Czech Republic	***	16	2
Denmark
Estonia	17	11	10
Finland	0	1	***
Germany	60	33	37
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	2	0	1
Lithuania
Luxembourg	1
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	NA	NA	NA
Slovakia	6	7	11
Slovenia	***	6	***
Spain	0	0	0
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	23	29	49

Table 3.3.4- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Foreigners from other EU countries			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	N.A	N.A	N.A
Bulgaria
Croatia	0	0	0
Cyprus	2	5	20
Czech Republic	***	2	6
Denmark	10	5	2
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	0	0	***
Germany	43	57	62
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania	***	1	***
Luxembourg	6
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	NA	NA	NA
Slovakia	0	1	0
Slovenia	***	0	***
Spain	0	0	1
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	22	28	31

Table 3.3.4- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Foreigners from non-EU countries			
	2010	2011	2012
Austria	***	***	***
Belgium	N.A	N.A	N.A
Bulgaria
Croatia	0	0	0
Cyprus	3	0	4
Czech Republic	***	1	3
Denmark	...	1	2
Estonia	***	***	***
Finland	0	0	***
Germany	28	31	29
Greece
Hungary	***	***	***
Ireland	***	***	***
Latvia	0	0	0
Lithuania	11	8	27
Luxembourg	1
Poland	N.A	N.A	N.A
Portugal	N.A	N.A	N.A
Romania	NA	NA	NA
Slovakia	0	0	1
Slovenia	***	0	***
Spain	0	0	2
Sweden	***	***	***
The Netherlands	24	22	28

Comments on Table 3.3.1-3.3.4	
Belgium	The data encoding is based on documents called "conviction reports" (reports established by the courts for each conviction). There are no computerized reports so the encoding is made manually. Therefore there is some delay in the encoding of the data. A new way of encoding is currently under consideration. The delay related to the encoding of the « convictions reports » coming from the first level and appeal courts is estimated at a little more than 15% for the year 2011 - 2012. It is thus possible that some THB convictions don't appear yet in the database. Moreover, it can happen that a smuggling conviction is registered as a THB conviction, so "false positive" convictions can be included in the data. Moreover, even if the codes allow us to distinguish the types of exploitation (economic, sexual exploitation,), it has been noted that the "convictions reports" (filled in by the court secretaries) don't often mention this piece of information. So it is difficult to obtain accurate information on the type of exploitation based on the final decisions database (but it is possible for instance on the basis of the prosecutions databank).
Croatia	The criminal offence from art. 175 from the 1997 Criminal Code was taken into account (Trafficking in human beings and slavery). In the criminal justice statistical surveys of the Croatian State Bureau of Statistics the "principle offence rule" is being used, but it is difficult to determine its effect in the case of merger and when criminal proceedings are being joint against the same perpetrator(s). The statistical results of the criminal justice statistics are being collected and presented according to articles, paragraphs and points. Article 175 of the Criminal Code names all forms of victim exploitation in the same paragraph, which makes a differentiation regarding type of exploitation impossible. In 2011 the Croatian State Bureau of Statistics participated in the first collection of statistical data on THB by EUROSTAT (covering the years 2008 – 2010).
Cyprus	In 2011 an individual was convicted for trafficking and exploitation in human organs
Denmark	In 2012 a couple from Thailand were convicted of 4 offences of THB (The same case, but at 4 different places. They were charged with 5 offences each in 2009, but only convicted in 4 of them – see table 3.3.1-3.3.4). Table 3.3.2: 2012: 1 (legal person)
Estonia	We only know the information on the citizenship when it is available in the court decision.
Finland	The court data for year 2012 has not been released yet by Statistics Finland. However, we already know, because we have the judgements from these cases, that at least 6 people were convicted for trafficking in first instance courts in 2012 in three different cases. All of these cases were related to trafficking for forced labour. There is one additional judgement related to sexual exploitation, with unknown number of convicted persons.
Germany	The Law enforcement statistics data is not comparable to the Police Data (Tables on Part 2.1, 2.2. and 3.1). Other exploitation: means support of sexual exploitation and support of labour exploitation. The Law enforcement statistics data (Tables from Part 3.3) is not entirely comparable to the Police Data (Tables from Parts 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2). Unlike the data on Part 3.3, which relates to the number of convictions, the data in Parts 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2 relates to the number of police investigations completed.
Ireland	2012 figures are provisional and may be subject to revision. Breakdown by nationality not available
Latvia	Court adjudicates criminal proceeding according to the Criminal Law Section 154.1 "Human Trafficking" and does not specify a form of exploitation of a victim of human trafficking for statistics.
Lithuania	Table 3.3.1-3.3.4- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Foreigners from other EU countries, year 2011, figure 1 is a Lithuanian. Table 3.3.1-3.3.4- Total number of persons convicted for THB offences: Foreigners from non-EU countries: 2010:11 (5 russian, without 1, unknown 5), 2011: 8 1 russian, 2 without, 5 unknown, 2012: 27 2 russian, 20 unknown, without 5).
Portugal	N.A. – Disaggregated data not available ... Null data or protected under statistical secrecy
Romania	Age, sex, duration and form of punishment are other indicators collected.
Slovakia	Indicators related to purpose of THB are not kept in the statistics.
Sweden	*** included in total figure. Number of persons convicted in county courts (first instance). Number of convicted traffickers by form of exploitation is currently not available in official registration systems.
The Netherlands	Comment on 'exploitation': The Public Prosecution Service does not register whether a case is related to sexual or other forms of exploitation. It is difficult to do so, since the text of the relevant article of the Dutch Criminal Code makes it impossible to make a distinction between them on the grounds of the sections and sub-sections. The new GPS registration system, however, creates a possibility. With regard to the above, the National Rapporteur recommended the following: 'Parties throughout the chain should register whether a human trafficking case involves sexual

	<p>exploitation or exploitation in other economic sectors ('other forms of exploitation') or whether it is for the purpose of organ removal. The PPS, in any case, do not currently do so.'</p> <p>Comments on 'nationals/foreigners': Please note that these figures refer to the 'country of birth' and not to citizenship. The figures mentioned for the category 'nationals' exclude the former Netherland Antilles and the current municipalities of the Netherlands (Saba, Sint Eustatius and Bonaire). Convicted THB offenders from these areas are included in the figures on 'foreigners from non-EU countries'. Convicted THB offenders from the former Netherlands Antilles and the current municipalities of the NL, in: 2010: 4, 2011: 2, 2012: 3.</p> <p>The countries of birth of convicted THB offenders from other EU countries (not the NL) in 2010 and 2011 are the following: Belgium, Bulgaria, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Tsjecho-Slovakia.</p> <p>The total numbers do not add up for the total number of 79 convicted THB offenders in 2010. The reason for this is that for 1 suspect in 2010 the country of birth was unknown or not registered. In 2011 for none of the convicted THB offenders the country of birth was unknown.</p>
--	---

3.3.5. Sources

Belgium	Criminal record service, Federal Public Service of Justice
Bulgaria	Supreme Cassation Prosecutor's Office
Croatia	Criminal courts holding the criminal proceeding in the first instance
Cyprus	Office of Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, Cyprus Police
Czech Republic	Ministry of Justice of the Czech Republic.
Denmark	NCI – National Center of Investigation.
Estonia	Source for the data is Information System of the Courts.
Finland	Statfin database maintained by Statistics Finland.
Germany	Federal Statistical Office, serial criminal prosecution 2010, 2011, 2012. Strafverfolgung – Fachserie 10 Reihe 3
Hungary	Statistical System of the Court
Ireland	Anti-Human Trafficking Unit Annual Report of Trafficking in Human Beings in Ireland 2010, 2011, 2012 at www.blueblindfold.gov.ie
Latvia	Court Information System
Luxembourg	Prosecutors Office
Poland	Ministry of Justice – court's data Data for 2012 refer only to the first 6 months of the year
Portugal	Directorate-General for Justice Policy (DGPJ) – Ministry of Justice
Romania	Superior Council of Magistracy (SCM) / Statistic Division, ECRIS, data base is operational since 01.01.2012, at the level of municipal and district courts.
Slovakia	Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic.
Slovenia	Annual Reports confirmed by Government http://www.vlada.si/en/projects/fight_against_trafficking_in_persons/
Spain	General Prosecutor's Office. Foreigner's Section

Sweden Source: national database for official crime statistics

Data is publicly available on The National Council for Crime Prevention's website (www.bra.se).

The Netherlands Source: Analysis of the national database of the Public Prosecution Service (PPS), which contains information from the district offices and district courts, including annual statistics on the prosecution and trial of human trafficking. It is possible to select the cases in which at least the offence of human trafficking is registered (Articles 250a (old), 250ter (old), 273a (old) 29 or 273f DCC) from the complete PPS database. The secondary analyses of the 'human trafficking' subset were performed, at the request of the Bureau of the National Rapporteur, by the Statistical Information and Policy analysis (SIBA) department of the Ministry of Justice's Centre for Research and Documentation (WODC).
Published in: National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings And Sexual Violence against Children (2012). Visible and Invisible Human Trafficking. Statistical Data 2007-2011. The Hague: National Rapporteur (www.dutchrapporteur.nl). Complete overview of the statistics is included in the Dutch version: 'Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel (2012). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld. Cijfermatige rapportage 2007-2011. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl) and in the new report: Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2014). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld II. Cijfermatige rapportage 2008-2012. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl).

3.3.6. Technical information

Rules of statistical recording applied for Tables 3.3.1-3.3.4:

Table 3.3.5- At what stage of the process do the data in Tables 3.3.1-3.3.4 refer to?	
Before appeals	After appeals
Finland, Latvia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands.	Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Poland (but not for 2012), Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia.

Table 3.3.6- What is the counting unit used in Tables 3.3.1-3.3.4?	
Person convicted	Conviction
Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, The Netherlands.	Belgium, Sweden.

Table 3.3.7- Is a principal offence rule applied? (i.e. How is a person convicted for multiple offences of different kinds counted?)	
Countries applying a principal offence rule	Countries not applying a principal offence rule
Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, The Netherlands.	Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Spain, The Netherlands.

Comments
<p>Belgium: One conviction report can mention one or more principal decisions. These decisions (sentences) concern one or a group of offences (THB + rape for instance).</p> <p>Bulgaria: A principal offence rule is not applied. Each offence is recorded independently. Bulgaria is one of the 21 countries in Europe which do not apply the principal offence rule. If a trafficker has committed other crimes, such as money laundering, theft, etc. each offence will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Croatia: According to the methodology of the Croatian Bureau of Statistics the following applies. If a perpetrator commits several criminal offences (merger), the major criminal offence (the most severe criminal offence) is considered the main criminal offence. If several persons participate in a commitment of a single offence, each participant (perpetrator) is considered a unit of observation. In that case, each offence will be recorded as each perpetrator's characteristic, providing that complicity is established by answering to a specific question.</p> <p>Czech Republic: Offender registered for the most serious crime.</p> <p>Germany: According to German law there is only one conviction even if the person has committed several crimes, for which they have been prosecuted if these offences concern the identical complex of circumstances of the criminal act. Statistically counted is only the statutory offence which is threatened with the heaviest sentence by law.</p> <p>Hungary: Sentencing Principles (See comments on Table 3.1.11).</p> <p>Latvia: According to the Criminal Procedure Law if one court has two or more criminal cases regarding criminal offences committed by one person or the taking part or participation of several persons in the commitment of one or several criminal offences, the criminal proceedings regarding such offences shall be merged, except for cases where the merger of criminal proceedings would substantially complicate the adjudication of the criminal case. In merging criminal proceedings, materials regarding a lighter criminal offence shall usually be attached to a criminal case regarding a more serious criminal offence.</p> <p>Slovakia: Convicted person is counted only once with "the most serious" criminal offence.</p> <p>Sweden: The most serious offence is counted as the principal offence.</p> <p>The Netherlands: Again both options are possible (please see also Table 3.3.7). -If an offender is summoned for one or more different human trafficking offences and also for another offence (e.g. rape/maltreatment/etc.) in one indictment, then this would result in one conviction with one sentencing. The sentence refers to one or more different human trafficking offences as well as to the other offence (e.g. rape). -If an offender is summoned for one or more different human trafficking offences and also for another offence (e.g. rape / maltreatment / etc.) in, for example two (or more) indictments, then this can result in two (or more) different cases / two (or more) different convictions / and two (or more) different sentences. It is also possible that these different cases come together in a joinder, resulting in one case in total / one conviction / one sentence. Conviction in the statistics of the National Rapporteur means a conviction for at least one human trafficking offence that is summoned for court. It is possible that simultaneously the offender is convicted for another offence. The sentence refers to all offences for which a conviction exists together. Therefore it is untraceable what the sentence would be if only was convicted for human trafficking (when there also exists a conviction for other offences than human trafficking).</p>

Table 3.3.8- How is a person convicted for multiple offences of the same kind (often called serial offences) counted?	
As one person convicted	As two or more persons convicted
Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands	Croatia, Cyprus, Germany, Romania, Slovakia, The Netherlands
Comments	
<p>Croatia: As two or more persons convicted (except in the case of prolonged criminal offences or when joining/merging criminal proceedings for all offences)</p> <p>Germany: As one person convicted: Convicted person is counted as one person in the statistics when there is one judgment of conviction for continuing criminal offence. <i>As two or more persons convicted:</i> In case of criminal offence committed repeatedly with several judgments of conviction, i.e. conviction for every single crime, the convicted person is counted separately for every single conviction and the statistics gives information that the convicted person is a recidivist.</p>	

Table 3.3.9- Do data in Table 4 include minors?		
Data do not include minors		
Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Slovenia, Spain.		
Data include minors		
	Minimum age	Maximum age
Belgium
Croatia	14	18
Estonia	14	18
Finland	15	18
Germany	14	18
Romania	14	18
Slovakia	14	18
Sweden	15	...
The Netherlands	***	***

Table 3.3.10- Have the data recording methods described above been modified between 2010 and 2012?	
Countries that have not modified them:	
Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands.	
Countries that have modified them:	
Belgium	...
Cyprus	The number of convicted persons was counted based on the cases investigated during the specific year. Since 2012 the number of convicted persons is counted based on the number of convictions achieved during the specific year.
Romania	Before 2012 data were collected through a system own. Operationalization of this database resulted in improved data centralization and the speed nationwide.

Table 3.3.11- Comments on questions 3.3.5 –3.3.10	
Croatia	In 2010 – 2012 there was no single registered case of a minor person convicted for THB.
Estonia	Sexual exploitation is the most spread form of THB.
Latvia	Table 3.3.8: According to the Criminal Law if a person has committed several independent criminal offences, a court in rendering a judgment or the public prosecutor by drawing up an injunction regarding the punishment shall determine punishment separately for each criminal offence. In such case the final punishment shall be determined according to the aggregation of the criminal offences, including the lesser punishment within the more serious or also completely or partially adding together the punishments imposed. Table 3.3.9: During assessment period no minor was involved in performing criminal offences related to human trafficking.
Poland	More data will be available on traffickers soon as the Ministry of Justice introduced a special questionnaire prepared in cooperation with MOI.
Portugal	Since the data is collected by the Directorate-General for Justice Policy (DGPJ), the OTSH does not have an in depth information about the methodological process.
Sweden	Comments on Tables 3.3.6 and 3.3.8: If someone is convicted in a single case for multiple trafficking offenses, this person will be counted as one convicted person (one conviction). If someone is convicted multiple times in a calendar year, this person will be counted multiple times (multiple convictions) in the statistics.
The Netherlands	Comment on Table 3.3.8: Both options are possible. It is possible that a person is convicted in one conviction for multiple offences (of the same kind or other offences). It is also possible that a person is convicted in multiple convictions for multiple offences (of the same kind or other offences). Comments on Table 3.3.9: Two minors were convicted in 2010, one minor was convicted in 2011, and four minors were convicted in 2012. The age is calculated on the basis of the year in which the convicted offender started to commit the first human trafficking offence for which the convicted offender was suspected of (this does not necessarily mean the conviction refers to the first human trafficking offence that has been prosecuted). Please note that the figures on suspected THB offenders prosecuted by the Public Prosecution Service and the figures on convicted THB offenders cannot be compared. The data on the prosecution of the human trafficking cases registered by the Public Prosecution Service and the data on the trial of human trafficking cases in first instance usually do not encompass a cohort and can therefore seldom be compared, since not all cases are dealt with by the Public Prosecution Service and heard by the court of instance in the year they are registered by the Public Prosecution Service. (For a more qualitative review of the prosecution and trial of human trafficking cases, see the case law study by the Bureau of the National Rapporteur (National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings. Case law on trafficking in human beings 2009-2012. An analysis. The Hague: Nationaal Rapporteur, online at: www.dutchrapporteur.nl) as well as in the new report: Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2014). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld II. Cijfermatige rapportage 2008-2012. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl).

PART 4

New trends in THB

4.1. General comments

This section provides information on possible changes in patterns of trafficking (new forms of exploitation, new modus operandi, new vulnerable groups and new interventions).

Regarding new trends in THB, the following data were requested:

- Have you identified any new type of exploitation or special victim groups? (See Tables 4.1).
- Are there any newly developed interventions or practices in your country that you would like to share with other member states (i.e. investigations methods, type of therapy, etc.)? (See Table 4.2).

4.2. Quality of the data

- Eighteen countries out of the twenty-four that participated in the questionnaire provided information on *new types of exploitation or special victim groups* (although Germany indicated that no types of new exploitations had been identified) (See Table 4.2).
- Ten countries provided information on newly developed interventions or practices (See Table 4.2).

4.3. Results

This section of the questionnaire yielded a number of interesting qualitative observations. Several source countries mentioned Roma as an at risk group for various forms of trafficking. Other countries mentioned mentally challenged and handicapped persons trafficked for forced begging or sexual exploitation. Several signals were also given regarding new forms of exploitation such as trafficking of women for harvesting of their tissue and eggs (Bulgaria and Greece) or for forced marriages with men from third-countries seeking entry to the EU (Cyprus, Latvia and Slovakia). Countries also mentioned trafficking for benefit fraud (UK) and for recruitment into armed conflicts (Sweden). Although this part of the questionnaire has definitely produced interesting data, the collection of early warning signals calls for other means of data collection besides survey research. It also calls for building the institutional capacity to respond to such signals with remedial or preventive action.

4.4. Tables

Table 4.1- New trends in THB: Have you identified any new type of exploitation or special victim groups?	
Austria	Increase of the Lover- Boy method.
Belgium	<p>The Social Inspectorate notices an increasing tendency of both exploited workers and exploited self-employed persons being posted from other EU countries to Belgium. In a number of cases the posting itself is irregular (e.g. false documents, fictitious constructions, no actual activity in the country of origin).</p> <p>Besides, workers are increasingly being forced into the statute of self-employed workers whereas in reality they are working under a contract of employment (bogus self-employed workers).</p> <p>These 2 phenomena (bogus social statutes of self-employed workers and the use of posting mechanisms), which are sometimes combined used by THB offenders, serve as a cover up for labour exploitation.</p>
Bulgaria	<p>Roma minority is one of the most vulnerable groups in Bulgaria for becoming victims of THB. Roma men and women are extremely vulnerable in terms of labour and sexual exploitation and Roma children in terms of forced begging and pickpocketing.</p> <p>Trafficking of pregnant women for the purpose of selling their newborn babies was criminalized in Bulgarian Penal Code in 2006. This type of exploitation is quite common among Roma women in Bulgaria. In 2011 29 pregnant women were identified as victims, in 2012 the number increased to 38. Main country of destination is the northern part of Greece.</p> <p>A new phenomenon which is emerging is trafficking of tissues and ovaries. There were some cases of Bulgarian women in Greece who were forced to sell their ovaries after a very intense hormone treatment which damaged their health. It is foreseen that THB for the purpose of selling tissues, ovaries, blood fluids will be criminalized in Bulgaria.</p> <p>For the past two years there has been an increase of the number of identified mentally challenged Bulgarian victims. There were several cases of THB for the purpose of sexual exploitation in the Netherlands and Cyprus. On purpose, some traffickers prefer to recruit mentally challenged persons as it is more difficult to get a testimony from them.</p>
Croatia	<p>The Government's Office for Human Rights and the Rights of National Minorities points out the following important trends:</p> <p>Croatia is more and more becoming a country of origin and destination for victims who are Croatian nationals. Most of the identified victims are Croatian nationals who are sexually exploited inside the Croatian state borders.</p> <p>During the last 4 years we noticed that almost all foreign victims are nationals of Serbia and/or Bosnia and Herzegovina, which confirms the finding that Croatia is becoming a country of destination for victims from the region.</p> <p>The transportation routes of THB are changing, as Croatia is no longer only a transit country, but more and more becoming a country or destination (and origin).</p> <p>Crime analysis shows that the perpetrators of THB are mostly nationals of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia.</p> <p>During the last 4 years the number of identified victims from the Roma national minority has grown.</p>
Cyprus	<p>During the last few years the phenomenon of trafficking for the purpose of forced marriage has arisen. Usually, female EU citizens are recruited and transferred to Cyprus and continuously forced to marry male citizens from third countries, marriage which is a sham.</p> <p>Furthermore, recently cases of economic exploitation of foreigners have been noted. In these cases third country citizens are usually forced to pay large amounts to agents to come to Cyprus to work, but upon their arrival no employment has been arranged leaving them without any job. Continuously they are threatened by the agents that if report them to the Authorities they will be deported.</p>
Denmark	Lately we have seen more Chinese people, especially in connection with THB - forced labour.
Finland	<p>The identification of victims of labour related exploitation has improved in the recent years. The reports of trafficking offences registered by the police have increased and the majority concern trafficking for forced labour.</p> <p>In 2012 -1 June 2013, a total of 5 judgements have been passed in the first instance courts on trafficking in person for forced labour. Some of these judgements are not yet legally valid as they may have been appealed. The cases concern ethnic restaurants (2 cases), a nail salon (1 case), a wood processing plant (1 case) and a plastic factory (1 case). The victims in these cases come from South East Asia (mainly Vietnam) and Central Asia (Kyrgyzstan). It is clear that the sectors in which severe labour exploitation is uncovered have diversified in the recent years, as previously most cases concerned ethnic restaurants in particular. Kyrgyzstan is also a new source country for victims of trafficking identified in Finland.</p> <p>Conflicting views exist whether the Roma beggars coming to Finland could be victims of trafficking and how systematic or organised these begging activities are.</p>
Germany	No

Greece	<p>There is a trend of the increasing number of female traffickers. Also, it should be mentioned that since the expansion of the European Union, nationals of the new E.U. States have more opportunities to travel and work within Europe. Traffickers have quickly identified this and the trend is currently for a victim of trafficking to be trafficked using their own valid travel documents, meaning there is no longer the offence of facilitation of an illegal immigrant. The benefits to the trafficker are that there is less expense involved as no false documents have to be obtained and the offence of trafficking can be more difficult to prove.</p> <p>The last few years, it has been noticed that some female victims were forced to submit to medical treatment designed to cause multiple production of cells (ovules: the eggs which are the female component parts of reproduction) to be harvested and sold on, in order to pay back the debt incurred for the transportation and accommodation in our country.</p>
Hungary	<p>Arising from its geographical situation Hungary lies in the crossroad of east-western and south-eastern migration. Hungary is primarily a source and transit country for women and girls subjected to trafficking for sexual exploitation and on a lesser extent a source country for men and women for trafficking for labour exploitation. The main destination countries in terms of trafficking for sexual exploitation are the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria and Germany. Regarding trafficking for labour exploitation the relevant destination countries are the United Kingdom, Austria, Germany, Belgium, Canada. From Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine, Serbia, Kosovo, China, Vietnam, Mongolia victims are transported to Western European countries through Hungary. Besides the transnational form, human trafficking exists in Hungary internally in a lesser extent too. Within the country the exploitation of victims is concentrated in the capital and its surroundings, around Lake Balaton and along the Austrian border.</p> <p>Human trafficking has several root causes, so called pull and push factors which play important role and contribute to the spread of human trafficking. The economic and social factors like high unemployment, poverty, inequality in the labour market, and demand for cheap labour are incentive and contribute to human trafficking.</p> <p>Regarding the groups at risk of trafficking it can be established that the low educated young adults – mostly women – in East, North Eastern Hungary are the most vulnerable. They are easily trapped by false promises of very well paid easy jobs which do not require any special skills. High-risk groups for trafficking included under-educated young adults, mainly women of Roma origin, who resided in poor conditions or child welfare facilities in eastern and north-eastern Hungary.</p> <p>Regarding the perpetrators in our country and in the countries of origin we can mention that they have informal relationship and in many case a family relationship to the victim. They are often old offender or recidivist.</p> <p>Regarding the modus operandi of recruitment the results suggest that the false promises and deception of well-paid jobs and better working conditions are common. Traffickers are recruiting through advertisements published online, in newspapers or through persuasion. The proposed jobs contain few and deceptive information about the working conditions.</p> <p>The victims appear usually in the agriculture, catering, construction industry, manufacturing which do not require professional skills.</p>
Ireland	<p>In 13 cases, involving 19 Irish victims, in 2012 investigations into child sexual abuse, child sexual assault and child pornography were determined at a later stage in the investigation/prosecution to involve all the necessary constituent elements of trafficking for sexual exploitation of a minor and charges were brought under anti-human trafficking legislation, namely, the Child Trafficking and Pornography Act 1998 as amended by Section 3 of the Criminal Law (Human Trafficking) Act 2008.</p>
Latvia	<p>Latvian citizens are recruited through social networks to conclude sham marriages for money with third-country nationals (mostly from Pakistan, Bangladesh, India), with the sole aim of circumventing the rules on entry and residence of third-country nationals and obtaining for the third-country national a residence permit or authority to reside in the Member State. In many cases after concluding a marriage Latvian citizens are exploited sexually and in domestic servitude, they suffer from violence, threats, they are not allowed to contact relatives in Latvia, the personal identity documents are taken away. Organizers of sham marriages usually reside in a country of destination, recruiters – in the country of destination or in Latvia. In some cases third country nationals approach persons themselves, but usually recruiters are Latvians, also married with third countries nationals, reside in a country of destination, and they contact their acquaintances and former friends and class-mates in Latvia proposing just to visit a foreign country or offering job or directly offering to conclude sham marriages promising good money for that, that there will be no consequences of such marriage and it will be easy to divorce in short time. All participants involved in organizing sham marriages receive money for that, sometimes brides and grooms get payment, but in many cases they are not paid, but exploited after getting married. The latest tendency shows that the citizens of Latvia are involved in marriages in convenience using fraud or their social vulnerability. Potential victims usually are Latvian citizens under 30 years, with disabilities, low level of education, from low income or socially unfavourable large families, or who were under guardianship or have lived in social care institutions in Latvia until 18 years, or whose parents are dead. In some cases there were women who have underage</p>

	<p>children or they have lost parental authority or the children are left by the relatives in Latvia.</p> <p>The main groups at risk of becoming victims of human trafficking are young women, single mothers, unemployed persons, persons from big families, persons from low income families, persons from orphanages and social care institutions, persons with low level of education and persons with credit commitments</p>
Poland	Trafficking for taking social benefits in UK
Portugal	Identifying trends is difficult when the statistical universe is not sufficiently high. Nonetheless, the number of identified victims for labour exploitation has increased in the last years. Up to 2012 victims are mainly Portuguese men explored abroad (within EU countries).
Romania	For the period under review there were not identified new forms of exploitation and new groups vulnerable to traffic. Trafficking in human beings for sexual exploitation is the most common form of exploitation among Romanian citizens. Starting with 2010 has been found in the case of this form of exploitation, victimization of male persons, mostly children. The percentage is small however from 2010 male victims are sexually exploited.
Slovakia	<p>When taking various purposes of THB into account, during years 2010 – 2012 there has been an increase of cases of forced begging. Since 2011 cases of forced marriage appeared as a new type of exploitation and the number of forced marriages increased in 2012 to 2 cases. Sexual exploitation remains the prevailing type of exploitation followed by labour exploitation. In 2010 and 2011 sexual exploitation was even equal to cases of labour exploitation while in 2012 labour exploitation had a decreasing tendency with 3 cases in comparison to 15 cases of sexual exploitation.</p> <p>Regarding specialities within the victim group, for the purpose of forced begging handicapped people were recruited, also one case of mentally handicapped person appeared being trafficked for sexual exploitation.</p>
Slovenia	<p>The Slovenian police have been detecting trafficking in human beings in connection with exploitation through prostitution and forced begging.</p> <p>Prostitution has been permitted in Slovenia since 2003, when the prohibition on prostitution was repealed with amendments to the Act on Criminal Offences against Public Order and Peace. Pursuant to Article 7 of the Protection of Public Order Act; soliciting in public place remains a criminal offence. Thus the offence is not sexual intercourse for money, but intrusive offering of sexual services in a public place. It is characteristic of prostitution in Slovenia that it is mainly unnoticeable, as it is performed in closed spaces, usually in hired or own flats, hotel rooms, etc. Street prostitution has not been detected. Therefore advertising prostitution is one of the forms more and more often detected by the police in Slovenia. Advertisers publish photographs of prostitutes, the area of prostitution, contact telephone numbers and prices of services offered. It is evident from the website that the aforementioned activity takes place in flats, hotel rooms and other private places. By monitoring the problem, it was established that the activity was advertised and offered by domestic and foreign prostitutes mainly from Hungary, Slovakia and the Czech Republic. Some assume that prostitution (of mainly foreigners) is advertised by criminal gangs or individuals, who commit the aforementioned criminal offences. Prostitutes are usually the injured parties of the criminal offence of exploitation through prostitution, and potential or actual victims of trafficking in human beings.</p> <p>Middle and higher levels of prostitution are prevalent in Slovenia. The middle level is prostitution in hotels and bars, and includes mainly foreigners with work permits such as dancers, entertainers, auxiliary workers and stage performers employed in nightclubs. The police have been monitoring the employment of female foreigners in nightclubs, mainly from South America – the Dominican Republic, the Philippines, Ukraine and Moldova. The problem the police have been facing with for years is that the alleged victims do not recognise themselves as victims of trafficking in human beings in the police procedures, in spite of the cooperation of non-governmental organisations. Perpetrators do not force them physically and do not control them by restricting their movement, but by using subtle methods of pushing them into financial dependence, i.e. they are forced out of economic necessity (financial sanctioning for breaking house rules and rules at work, fictitious minimum wage, repayment of debt from acquiring the work permit and transport to Slovenia, etc.). This is how they push their victims into prostitution. It needs to be emphasised that mainly female citizens of the Dominican Republic and Ukraine, who do not recognise themselves as victims of trafficking in human beings, come from poor social and economic backgrounds.</p> <p>The Slovenian police occasionally detect criminal gangs which deal with trafficking in human beings for forced begging. Typical of these gangs or perpetrators is a high degree of mobility, as, during enhanced controls, they swiftly withdraw the persons begging to another town or to country. Also typical is the inclusion of especially vulnerable groups (mothers with children, disabled, etc.), since begging provides them with greater income. The illiteracy of victims is also abused, regular control is introduced, and obedience is achieved by intimidation, beating and threats to someone's life. By monitoring begging as an offence pursuant to Article 9 of the Protection of Public Order Act, the attention in police procedures against the stated persons is aimed at identifying victims of trafficking in human beings.</p>

<p>Sweden</p>	<p>Type of exploitation – war service, forced into armed conflict: Particularly vulnerable to victimization for this type of exploitation are young boys who are politically involved and who are members of social network in their homeland.</p> <p>A case regarding this form of exploitation has been described in a report to EU. A 16-year old boy was apprehended based on indications that he risked being removed from Sweden for the purpose of taking part in an armed conflict. The decision to apprehend was based on the fact that the boy had been drawn into a criminal organisation where he risked being recruited into war service. A preliminary investigation about trafficking in human beings was initiated.</p>
<p>The Netherlands</p>	<p>From the website of the Dutch rapporteur: 'There are no indications of a high incidence of trafficking in human beings for the removal of organs (sometimes referred to as 'organ harvesting') within the Netherlands. Neither do Dutch citizens appear to be involved in this crime abroad often. Nevertheless, the Rapporteur calls for watchfulness: 'Considering the continuous severe shortage of organ donors, growing globalization and interconnectedness as a result of the Internet, we have to be on the alert. Manifestations of trafficking in human beings we are witnessing in other countries, will sooner or later affect us too. For that we have to be prepared.'</p> <p>The Rapporteur has called on the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport to take the lead in recording the scale and nature of organ trafficking and organ tourism.</p> <p>The Netherlands are experiencing a shortage of organ donors. Live organ donations are rare, and must be voluntary and non-commercial. Because of the severe shortage of organs, patients seem to be willing to pay for them. There are calls from various quarters for financial incentives for organ donation. A number of points need to be considered in this context. Financial incentives could alleviate the shortage of organs and, hence the chance of human trafficking for the purpose of the removal of organs. However, financial incentives for organ donation would also make organ donation a commercial activity and create a market for organs, which would, in itself, carry the risk of human trafficking for the purpose of the removal of organs. That risk could be avoided by offering donors an exemption from health insurance premiums rather than a direct monetary reward.</p> <p>Trafficking in organs and human trafficking for the purpose of the removal of organs are not constrained by national borders. It is important for states to try to reach new joint solutions and, where possible, coordinate policies and strategies with respect to organ donation, trafficking in organs and human trafficking for the purpose of the removal of organs.'</p> <p>See also the report 'Trafficking in human beings for the purpose of the removal and forced commercial surrogacy (2012)', online at: http://www.dutchrapporteur.nl/reports/organ-removal-forced-commercial-surrogacy/.</p> <p>From the website of the Dutch Rapporteur: In addition to the trade in these 'classical organs', a market is also growing for other parts of the body. One such market is the demand for surrogate mothers. Commercial surrogacy is increasingly common, partly as a result of developments like the Internet, the globalization of society and advances in procreation techniques. For the first time Dutch National Rapporteur Corinne Dettmeijer studied the relationship between forced commercial surrogacy and trafficking in human beings. Forced surrogacy is not explicitly included in the Dutch Criminal Code as a form of trafficking. It can be argued that, under certain circumstances, surrogacy could constitute exploitation in the sense of forced services. An important indication of exploitation would be if other persons than the woman carrying the child, such as an intermediary or a spouse, earn money out of the surrogacy and if the financial risks and health risks are borne entirely or largely by the surrogate mother.</p> <p>The Netherlands have strict laws about surrogacy. Commercial surrogacy (receiving payment for carrying someone else's child) is not allowed. National policy is aimed at preventing the spread of commercial surrogacy, and accordingly, behavior that promotes supply and demand in relation to surrogacy has been made a criminal offence. Surrogacy itself is not a criminal offence. In some other countries, such as the United States, India and Ukraine, commercial surrogacy is allowed.</p> <p>Intermediary companies operate in the international 'baby market', bringing together donors, parents, surrogate mothers and fertility clinics and making the legal arrangements. The internet, globalization and advances in procreation techniques bring services abroad within reach of Dutch couples who wish to become parents through surrogacy. But there is a risk there: the rights of surrogate mothers are not respected in all countries. When it comes to commercial surrogacy, the question is to what extent the surrogate mothers are acting voluntarily. As with trafficking in organs, social determinants such as poverty, debt, a vulnerable social position and illiteracy can force a woman to become a surrogate mother. "No one wants to contribute to the phenomenon that women are being exploited to have children. The Dutch government should inform prospective parents about this risk," says the Dutch National Rapporteur.</p> <p>See also the report 'Trafficking in human beings for the purpose of the removal and forced commercial surrogacy (2012)', online at: http://www.dutchrapporteur.nl/reports/organ-removal-</p>

	<p>forced-commercial-surrogacy/.</p> <p>The latest report of the National Rapporteur has been published as: Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2014). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld II. Cijfermatige rapportage 2008-2012. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl)..</p>
--	---

Table 4.2- Are there any newly developed interventions or practices in your country that you would like to share with other member states (i.e. investigations methods, type of therapy, etc.)?	
Austria	None
Belgium	<p>In one case, the Criminal Tribunal in Ghent convicted a German employer for THB by labour exploitation with aggravated circumstances (sentence 5th November 2012). Along with the employer, the Belgian contracting company (which had outsourced part of its activities to the German subcontractor) was convicted as an accomplice to this crime because the fact that this company deliberately closed its eyes to the exploitative working conditions of its subcontractor had facilitated the crime.</p> <p>This case got a lot of media attention, which undoubtedly resulted in brand reputation damage for this contractor (it being a large company with a well-known brand) on the one hand and in awareness raising of employers and bigger companies on the other hand.</p>
Bulgaria	<p>In line with the adopted in 2012 EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings and especially Priority 2 of the Strategy: Stepping Up the Prevention of Trafficking and one of the suggested activity to fulfil the priority: the involvement of the private sector, the NCCTHB has established successful collaboration with international business companies such as Manpower and Postbank. The involvement of the private sector in combating the crime is a main priority in the adopted in 2012 EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings (2012-2016). Some of the foreseen activities for the implementation of the Strategy are the establishment of European Business Coalition against Trafficking in Human Beings which will improve the cooperation between companies and stakeholders.</p> <p>Manpower was the first company to sign the Athens Ethical Principles which demonstrate "Zero Tolerance towards THB". Currently there are only 15 Bulgarian private companies which signed the Principles and the aim of the NCCTHB and Manpower is to involve the private sector in the common fight against THB.</p>
Finland	<p>The Finnish Ministry of Interior has recently proposed to establish a position of a National Coordinator on trafficking in persons. The Coordinator would be responsible for the overall coordination of all activities relating to human trafficking in Finland including data collection. The National Coordinator will be appointed in 2014.</p>
Germany	No
Latvia	<p>Recognising sham marriages as the risk of human trafficking, in order to reduce the essential increase of sham marriages concluded mostly in Ireland, UK and Cyprus between citizens of Latvia and third-country nationals (mostly from Pakistan, Bangladesh, India), with the sole aim of circumventing the rules on entry and residence of third-country nationals and obtaining for the third-country national a residence permit or authority to reside in the Member State, and to discourage demand for brides and grooms from Latvia, a new article supplementing the Criminal Law was elaborated: "Article 285.2 Malicious (abusive) provision with an opportunity to obtain legal right to reside in Latvian Republic, another EU Member State, Member State of the European Economic Area or the Swiss Confederation (1) For malicious provision with an opportunity to obtain legal right to reside in Latvian Republic, another EU Member State, Member State of the European Economic Area or the Swiss Confederation,- the applicable punishment is deprivation of liberty for a term not exceeding three years, or short-term imprisonment or community service, or a fine. (2) For malicious provision with an opportunity to obtain legal right to reside in Latvian Republic, another EU Member State, Member State of the European Economic Area or the Swiss Confederation, if it is committed for purposes of acquiring property or if it provided for two or more persons, or if it is committed by a group of persons,- the applicable punishment is imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years or short-term imprisonment, or community service, or a fine, with or without confiscation of a property."</p> <p>Criminal Law Amending Law was adopted by the Parliament on December 13, 2012, published on December 27, 2012 in "Official Gazette" No 201 (4805), came into force on April 1, 2013.</p> <p>Two criminal proceedings are initiated by the State Police and in several operative intelligence cases information about recruiters or organized groups of recruiters is being collected.</p>
Portugal	The OTSH is a partner of a new inter-institutional framework known as the <i>National</i>

	<p><i>Trafficking Victims Support and Protection Network (RAPVT)</i>. This partnership, coordinated by the Commission for Citizenship and Gender Equality, aims to create a platform for the implementation of new forms of intervention, through the enhancement of agent's skills, in order to promote a social reintegration of victims of trafficking.</p> <p>In 2013, following the VII Conference "Missing and Sexually Exploited Children" organized by the Institute for Child Support (IAC), the OTSH coordinate the launch of the booklet and flyer "Forced Begging – the invisible face of Trafficking in Human Beings for Labour Exploitation". These two publications were developed in partnership with the Commission for Citizenship and Gender Equality, with the Law Enforcement Agencies (National Republican Guard, Public Security Police, Judiciary Police, Border and Migration Police), and with IAC, Cáritas, National Commission for Protection of Children and Youngsters at Risk, Social Security Institute and Portuguese Association for Victims Support (APAV). These two documents aim to approach the relationship between Trafficking in Human Beings and the labour exploitation in forced begging. Furthermore, these publications intends to be a guideline for professionals and general public, to help identifying victims and know what to do.</p> <p>At the same time, the OTSH/ Directorate-General of Internal Affairs (Portuguese Ministry of the Interior) coordinate the project "Towards a Pan-European Monitoring System on Trafficking in Human Beings", an European project that aims to improve the data collection, especially the lack of systematic collection and management of relevant data, such as the lack of common definitions within the data sources and the lack of data for segmenting different forms of exploitation; fragmented data collection systems as well as double counting problems within existing data collection systems (public and NGO actors); and the lack of sufficient trust for data sharing between stakeholders with a common mission.</p> <p>Project summary: The main objective of the project is to provide countries with a THB efficient monitoring system (MoSy) in the framework of Best Practices regarding the harmonization of procedures for the collection, treatment, analyses and sharing of information. The system is based on reliable collaboration network platform (web based) for the collection and dissemination of information and knowledge on THB that allows users to define what to share between them, with minimum cost.</p> <p>To accomplish this there are e secondary (operational) objectives: 1) To deliver customized technical solutions and to improve the capacity of the partners capabilities to collect THB data, build up their national systems and network of data providers and support them to analyze the data in a collaborative network environment; 2) To develop a common system to support all the partners to analyze data at a transnational level, namely by sharing geo-statistical data among them by using the same indicators; 3) To extend the project to other relevant countries of origin, transit and destination in the EU and neighboring countries by presenting its outputs as Good Practices to be adopted.</p>
Romania	<p>In addition to traditional means of investigation of offenses (investigations, examination of witnesses and injured parties, confrontations, hearings, photo reconnaissance after board, lifting of documents and records, house searches, finding flagrant crimes special proceeds can be used as: -interception and recording of conversations or communications by telephone or by any electronic means of communication; -ambient records; - undercover surveillance; -GPS locating and tracking; - telephone listings; -video recordings;-surveillance operative technique; -undercover investigators. We appreciate and consider useful (DIOCT opinion)</p>
Slovakia	<p>Agreement between Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic and the National Labour Inspectorate on the cooperation upon controls of business entities enabling illegal labour was concluded on 13 April 2012 in order to ensure regulation and monitoring of business areas and identify victims of THB. Based on this agreement, 12 controls were performed during 2012. Typologies of business entities where the controls took place were proposed by the National Labour Inspectorate based on their previous experience. Unit of Combating THB of Criminal Police Bureau of Presidium of Police Force and Border and Alien Police Bureau of Presidium of Police Force proposed business entities based on their operational information on suspicion of THB. During the controls, police officers from Border and Alien Police Bureau of Presidium of Police Force aimed their activity at disclosing aliens with illegal stay in the Slovak Republic, police officers from Unit of Combating THB of Criminal Police Bureau of Presidium of Police Force aimed at searching and identification of victims of THB and staff of the National Labour Inspectorate aimed at disclosure of illegal work. No victim of THB was directly identified during the controls. Foreign nationals working for business entities were informed by means of information hand-outs on the possibilities of assistance for victims of THB and organizations providing such assistance. The controls proved to be a good way of disclosing potential victims of THB and this activity continues also in 2013.</p>

Slovenia	Since 2000, the police have been performing guided activities connected with trafficking in human beings. They are intended to identify persons who have been dealing in Slovenia with trafficking in human beings, enslaving people, abusing prostitution and intrusively offering sexual services; establish the mode of operation of these people, and methods, procedures and means for such activities; identify victims of trafficking in human beings and new forms of exploitation; implement measures on the basis of existing legislation and cooperate with non-governmental organizations to protect and deal with victims of trafficking in human beings.
Spain	A Framework Protocol for the Protection of Victims of Trafficking was adopted in October 2011 with a view to improving the fight against THB, from identification to assistance and protection. It establishes procedures for the detection, identification, referral, support and protection of adult and child victims of trafficking, covering both EU nationals and third-country nationals. The framework protocol was signed by the Ministries of Justice, the Interior, Employment and Immigration, and Health, together with the General Council for the Judiciary and the Prosecution Service. The agreement applies throughout Spain, irrespective of the adoption of regional and local protocols which take account of the specificities of each autonomous community.
The Netherlands	<p>For the first time, the National Rapporteur has critically reviewed national and international estimates on the scale of human trafficking. Two things are needed to illuminate the full scale of human trafficking. First, the invisible part must be estimated as carefully as possible, so that relevant agencies know what they are looking for. The problem is not that there are no estimates, but that they are not accurate and reliable. The Dutch rapporteur has made a number of important suggestions for improving these estimates. Please see also the report: National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings and Sexual Violence against Children (2012). Visible and Invisible Human Trafficking. Statistical Data 2007-2011. The Hague: National Rapporteur (www.dutchrapporteur.nl). Complete overview of the statistics is included in the Dutch version: 'Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2012). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld. Cijfermatige rapportage 2007-2011. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl).</p> <p>Furthermore, since human trafficking is not bound by national borders – both offenders and victims often move through different countries – there is considerable international interest in generating comparable data. The Dutch rapporteur reviewed some initiatives, mainly at European level (amongst which Eurostat and TrafStat), that have already been taken or are still underway in this area, which also illustrate the importance of international cooperation. Please see also the report: National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings Sexual Violence against Children (2012). Visible and Invisible Human Trafficking. Statistical Data 2007-2011. The Hague: National Rapporteur (www.dutchrapporteur.nl). Complete overview of the statistics is included in the Dutch version: 'Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen (2012). Mensenhandel in en uit beeld. Cijfermatige rapportage 2007-2011. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur (www.nationaalrapporteur.nl) and the new report Nationaal Rapporteur Mensenhandel en Seksueel Geweld tegen Kinderen. Mensenhandel in en uit beeld II. Cijfermatige rapportage 2008-2012. Den Haag: Nationaal Rapporteur.</p> <p>All other reports can be found on the websites of the National Rapporteur on Trafficking in Human Beings and Sexual Violence against Children: - www.dutchrapporteur.nl - www.nationaalrapporteur.nl</p>