



Identifying THB Victims Berlin, Sep. 26, 2013 Prof. Jan Van Dijk

Insufficient monitoring

- European Commission, Council of Europe and UNODC keep pushing for sound THB Statistics and National THB Rapporteurs, but so far very few European Governments have established national rapporteurs or even comprehensive statistical systems on THB.
- Good practices to be found in the Czeck Rep., Finland and The Netherlands (rapporteurs), Ireland, Rumania and Slovakia (comprehensive systems)
- Situation in, inter alia, France, Germany (?), UK and Spain below standard

Number identified victims and nationals (TRAFSTAT)

	Identified in 2011	of which nationals
Austria	70	2
Belgium	130	4
Bulgaria	541	
Cyprus	40	0
Czech Republic	10	2
Denmark	60	0
Estonia	56	
Finland	24	39
France	726	
Germany	672	139
Greece	97	1
Hungary	18	
Ireland	57	
Italy	692	6
Latvia	0	14
LITH	3	
LUX	8	
Malta	0	
Poland	33	81
Portugal	22	28
Romania	1015	1041
Slovakia	26	
Slovenia	21	8
Spain	234	
Sweden	127	
NL	1222	337
UK	712	
TOTAL EU	6616	

Inadequate identification mechanisms

- Huge differences in recording practices (many countries perform badly in identifying victims)
e.g. NL: 1.200/ Germany:700 (expected 6.000)
- National victims and child victims clearly underrecorded in most destination countries

Who are the identifiers/reporters?

- **Only police/immigration:** Cyprus, Estonia (2013), France, Greece, Ireland, Luxemburg, Sweden and the UK
- **Multi-disciplinary teams:** Belgium, Croatia, Montenegro, Portugal and Serbia
- **Police and NGO's independently:** Austria, Bulgaria, Czeck Rep, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Slovakia, the Netherlands (Comensha) and Rumania

Multiple identifiers are superior but suffer from double counting

- Countries with multiple identifiers probably do a better job in identifying victims but they struggle with double counting in their statistics
- Countries where double counting occurs: Austria , Czeck Rep, Finland, Hungary and Poland
- Countries who avoid double counting: Denmark, Estonia, Portugal, Slovak Rep, The Netherlands and Rumania

Catch 22

- If you have multiple identifiers and try to avoid double counting, you may hurt the data protection interests of the victims
- So, the “pressure to measure” from the EU is not without risks for data protection

Challenge and possible solutions

- Introduce wide-ranging identification systems, including both Police and NGO's, and avoid double counting, while respecting data protection standards
- IT solutions (Portugal, Rumania, and Slovakia)
- Institutional solutions: set up independent rapporteur outside the police who does not share any personal data with other parties (The Netherlands, Portugal)

GRETA recommendation on data collection

88. GRETA urges the French authorities to develop and maintain, for the purpose of preparing, monitoring and evaluating anti-trafficking policies, a comprehensive and coherent statistical system on trafficking in human beings by compiling reliable statistical information from all main actors and allowing disaggregation (concerning sex, age, type of exploitation, country of origin and/or destination, etc.). This should be accompanied by all the necessary measures to respect the right of data subjects to personal data protection.