



**FR Ad-Hoc Query on Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

**Requested by FR EMN NCP on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2013**

**Compilation produced on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2013**

**Responses from Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, France, Hungary, Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom and Norway**  
**(10 in Total)**

*Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.*

**1. Background Information**

The Directorate of Immigration of the French Ministry of Interior (Removal department) would like to gather information on removal policies of third-country nationals found to be illegally present in EU Member States and Member States of the Schengen area.

The aim is to carry out an intern comparative study based on 2012 data about the practices of the States regarding some topics of the directive 2008/115/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 16 December 2008 on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals.

Member States concerned are Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom and Norway. Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Hungary, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, United Kingdom and Norway, plus France, provided answers.

We would very much appreciate your responses by **5<sup>th</sup> July 2013**.

**2. Responses**

		<b>Wider Dissemination?</b>	<b>1) In 2012, how many forced returns, assisted returns and voluntary returns were they? What are the main nationalities for each of these categories?</b> <b>2) In 2012:</b> <b>- In how many flights organized by FRONTEX has your country participated? How many returned persons were there?</b> <b>- In how many joint flights, beyond FRONTEX, has your country participated? How many returned persons were there?</b>
--	--	-----------------------------	---

FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present

**Disclaimer:** The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

			<p>- How many national flights dedicated to removal have been organized by your country? How many returned persons were there?</p> <p>- What are the main destinations of these flights? You do not have to make the distinction between the FRONTEX flights, joint flights and national flights.</p> <p>- How many forced returns have been organized through commercial flights?</p> <p>3) How many removal orders have been issued in 2012? How many of them have been carried out? Which categories of persons can be subject to a removal order? How many removal orders have been assorted with a prohibition of return? What is the average length of these prohibitions of return? Have there been prohibitions of return for more than 5 years?</p> <p>4) In 2012, how many persons were placed in administrative detention? Among these, how many women were there? What is the maximal authorized length of detention? What is the average length of detention?</p> <p>5) Regarding alternatives to detention, in 2012, how many persons were subject to house arrest, placed in open center, compelled to clock in, or under electronic watching?</p> <p>6) In 2012, how many unaccompanied minors have been subject to forced return / assisted return / voluntary return? How many unaccompanied minors are there on your territory? What are the main nationalities in each category?</p> <p>7) In 2012, regarding waiting zones:</p> <p>- Do you make the distinction between allocation in waiting zone and detention?</p> <p>- If yes, how many waiting zone are there on your territory?</p> <p>- What are the maximal and average lengths of stay in waiting zones?</p> <p>- How many persons, and unaccompanied minors, are placed in waiting zones?</p> <p>- How many persons, and unaccompanied minors, are returned?</p>
	Austria	No	This EMN NCP has provided a response to the requesting EMN NCP. However, they have requested that it is not disseminated further.
	Belgium	Yes	<p>1. In 2012, there were <b>3.847 forced returns</b> among which there were 970 Dublin readmissions and 239 readmissions through bilateral agreements. In 2012 there were <b>5.656 assisted voluntary returns</b> (4.694 by IOM and Fedasil and 962 by the Immigration Office). This number of assisted voluntary represents a significant increase compared to previous years<sup>1</sup>. Contrary to France, there is, in Belgium, no distinction made between assisted returns and assisted voluntary returns.</p> <p><b>Top 5 countries of origin forced returns 2012</b> (total 3.847):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Albania (415)</li> <li>• Morocco (320)</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Assisted voluntary returns:

2012: 5 656  
 2011: 3 558  
 2010: 2 957  
 2009: 2 659  
 2008: 2 669  
 2007: 2 593

FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present

**Disclaimer:** The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Romania (277)</li> <li>• Bulgaria (166)</li> <li>• Brazil (145).</li> </ul> <p><b>Top 5 countries of origin voluntary returns 2012</b> (total 5.656):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brazil (683)</li> <li>• Russia (554)</li> <li>• Ukraine (403)</li> <li>• Iraq (359)</li> <li>• Kosovo (315).</li> </ul> <p>2. - Belgium participated in 2012 in <b>one secured flight, organized by Germany in cooperation with FRONTEX</b>. Five persons were returned from Belgium towards Serbia.</p> <p>- Belgium organized <b>two joint secured flights beyond FRONTEX</b>. 1 joint flight with the Netherlands to Kinshasa (18 persons from Belgium and one from the Netherlands) and 1 joint flight to Kinshasa with Ireland and Germany (15 persons from Belgium, one from Ireland and one from Germany).</p> <p>- Belgium organized <b>11 secured flights</b> (2 joined flights to Kinshasa included). In total there were 156 persons returned via a secured flight.</p> <p>- The 11 secured flights organized by Belgium had the following <b>destinations</b>: DR Congo, Guinea, Kosovo, Senegal, United Kingdom and Albania.</p> <p>- Overall, <b>3.425 forced returns</b> have been carried out <b>by commercial flights</b>.</p> <p>3. In 2012, <b>51.220 third country nationals were ordered to leave the territory</b> and <b>7.840 third country nationals returned</b> following an order to leave<sup>2</sup>. Third-country nationals found to be illegally present can be subject to a removal order, including people who have received a (final) negative decision on their application(s) for refugee status or any other residence permit. Since July 2012 an order to leave can be complemented by an entry ban. In <b>2012 (July-December) 3.309 orders to leave were issued assorted with an entry ban</b>.</p>
--	--	--	---

<sup>2</sup> Source Eurostat database

<sup>3</sup> Former INAD Centre in the Brussels National Airport for "inadmissible" aliens

<sup>4</sup> Source : Activity Report Immigration Office 2012

<sup>5</sup> Activity report Immigration Office 2012, p.163.

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

***Disclaimer:*** The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

			<p>In principle the duration of the entry ban is maximum <b>3 years</b>, in case of fraud maximum <b>5 years</b> (40 entry bans in 2012 on this ground) and can be <b>8 years</b> in case the person is considered a danger to public order or national security. There are no details on the average duration of the entry ban, but in most cases the maximum duration of the entry ban was applied.</p> <p>4. In 2012 there were 20.746 apprehensions of people in irregular stay. This resulted in <b>3.583 administrative detentions</b>, the others received an order to leave the territory (and an entry ban since June), without detention. We have <b>no figures as to how many women there were</b>.</p> <p>Besides illegally staying persons, also persons who were not admitted to the territory and were subject to a refoulement decision and those subject to a Dublin or Schengen readmission were held in administrative detention (see question 1). Article 7 of the Aliens Act provides that a person <b>cannot</b> be held in administrative detention <b>longer than necessary for the execution of the removal order</b>, with a <b>maximum of two months</b>. This can be extended to a <b>maximum of five months</b> if an effective removal within a reasonable time is still possible, and <b>exceptionally eight months</b> in cases of public order offenses. The average duration of the detention varies between the different closed centers (from 2,5 days on average in the INAD<sup>3</sup> to 33,9 days in the closed center in Bruges)<sup>4</sup>.</p> <p>5. Since October 2008, families with minor children who have received an order to leave the territory and families who have applied for asylum at the border are no longer staying in detention centers, but in <b>open return homes</b>. In Belgium electronic watching or house arrest does not exist. The period within which the order to leave the territory must be carried out is in principle 30 days. During this period failed asylum seekers can stay in specific places in <b>open reception centers</b> where they are prepared for voluntary return (or forced return if they refuse to cooperate).</p> <p>6. There were <b>no forced returns of unaccompanied minors</b>.</p> <p>Voluntary return is only possible if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The minor has formally expressed his desire to return.</li> <li>• The minors' parents/relatives in the country of origin formally agreed with the return and to assist the reintegration of the child.</li> <li>• Monitoring by IOM and Caritas in the country of origin can be ensured.</li> <li>• In case a guardian has been appointed, he agrees with the return of the minor.</li> </ul> <p>In 2012:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 voluntary returns of unaccompanied minors (&lt;18 years)</li> <li>• 12 unaccompanied minors with reintegration support, including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>→7 unaccompanied minors</li> <li>→5 former unaccompanied minors (18-21 years)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

**Disclaimer:** *The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.*

			<p>7. Yes, persons who are not admissible and asylum seekers applying for asylum at the border are held, <b>since May 2012, in a new centre “the Caricole”</b> (replacing the INAD-centre and Centre 127).</p> <p>- There is <b>one closed center</b> for inadmissible persons and people applying for asylum at the border (the TC Caricole). The Caricole has <b>about 90 places</b>.</p> <p>- The average length of staying in the Caricole was <b>13 days in 2012</b>.<sup>5</sup></p> <p>In 2012, there were <b>1.895 cases of refoulement</b> of persons who were declared inadmissible at the border. In 2012, <b>17 unaccompanied minors</b> who were declared inadmissible at the border were returned to their country of origin (their family had been found through family tracing).</p>				
	Cyprus	Yes	<p align="center"><b>Forced Return 2012</b></p>		<p align="center"><b>Assisted and Voluntary Return 2012</b></p>		
			COUNTRIES	TOTAL	COUNTRIES	TOTAL	
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3529</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1135</b>	
			1	Viet Nam	474	Bangladesh	193
			2	Sri Lanka	442	Sri Lanka	177
			3	Bangladesh	388	India	137
			4	India	307	Pakistan	117
			5	Pakistan	297	Egypt	100
			6	Philippines	271	Nepal	85
			7	Romania	175	Viet Nam	47
			8	Egypt	148	China (including Hong Kong)	42
			9	Syrian Arab Republic	125	Syrian Arab Republic	39
			10	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	114	Philippines	38
			11	China (including Hong Kong)	104	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30
			12	Georgia	95	Turkey	15
			13	Nepal	67	Iraq	14

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

***Disclaimer:*** The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

14	Bulgaria	59	Jordan	14	
15	Cameroon	46	Georgia	11	
16	Nigeria	46	Moldova, Republic of	8	
17	Turkey	41	Ukraine	7	
18	Russian Federation	29	Armenia	6	
19	Moldova, Republic of	27	Uzbekistan	6	
20	Ghana	24	Ghana	5	
21	Others	250	Others	44	
MALE		2158	MALE		810
FEMALE		1371	FEMALE		325
<p>2) No participation to return flights organized by FRONTEX                      No participation to joint flights beyond FRONTEX                      Cyprus Police organized one return flight and as a result 49 Pakistan nationals were repatriated.                      The abovementioned flight has as destination Islamabad – Pakistan.                      3480 forced returns have been organized through commercial flights</p> <p>3) Totally 4027 removal orders out of which 3284 return orders and 743 administrative decisions were issued.</p> <p>The total number of removals for 2012 is 4664. This number includes forced returns as well as voluntary or assisted returns, for which number of orders had been issued in year 2011 and executed in 2012.                      It should be noted that the data regarding the date of issue of the order is not included in the database, consequently it is not clear whether the executed orders during the year 2012 concerned the same year.</p> <p>A removal order can be issued to a person who has violated any provisions of Cap.105 (Aliens and Immigration Law), or any other Law in Cyprus.                      All cases of persons returned based on return orders are banned to enter the country.                      There is no time limit for the prohibitions of return.                      Since there is no time limit for the prohibition of return and each request for return is examined on a case-by-case basis, there can be a prohibition of return longer than 5 years.</p> <p>4) In 2012, 3529 administrative detentions were carried out.</p>					

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

***Disclaimer:*** The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

			<p><b>Among these, how many women were there?</b>                  N/A                  The maximum authorized length of detention is 18 months. The average length of detention is one week.</p> <p>5) Nothing of the above is applied.</p> <p>6) No unaccompanied minors under 16 year of age is subject to return</p> <p><b>7) In 2012, regarding waiting zones:</b>                  N/A</p>
	<p><b>France</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>1. In 2012, there were 21 841 forced returns (mostly of people from Tunisia, Romania, Morocco, Algeria and Moldova), among which there were 6 313 Schengen or Dublin readmissions. There were 4 971 assisted returns (mostly of people from Romania, China, Russia, Mongolia and Kosovo). There were 10 010 voluntary assisted returns (mostly of people from Romania, Bulgaria, Tunisia, China and Algeria).</p> <p>2. In 2012, France participated in 21 flights organized by FRONTEX (57 returned persons), and 2 joint flights beyond FRONTEX (9 returned persons). France organized 46 national flights dedicated to removal (177 returned persons). The main destinations of these flights were Albania, Kosovo, Georgia, Nigeria and Serbia. Overall, 8 666 forced returns have been carried out by commercial flights.</p> <p>3. In 2012, France issued 84 570 removal orders, among which 36 822 have been carried out. Third-country nationals found to be illegally present can be subject to a removal order, including people who have received a (final) negative decision on their application(s) for refugee status or any other residence permit, except for third-country nationals protected by legislation, e. g. minors. Among the issued orders, 5 393 have been assorted with a prohibition of return. To date, the average length of prohibitions of return is not known. French law has not transposed the possibility to issue prohibition of return for more than 5 years.</p> <p>4. In 2012, 39 989 persons have been placed in administrative detention, among whom there were 6 167 women. The maximal authorized length of detention as provided in legislation is 45 days. The average length of detention is 6,4 days (it lasts however 11 days on average in metropolitan France).</p> <p>5. France does not use either allocation in open center, or electronic watching. 668 persons were subject to house arrest in 2012. Information on obligation to clock in is not available.</p> <p>6. In 2012, no unaccompanied minor has been subject to forced or assisted return (national law protects unaccompanied minors). 10 unaccompanied minors have been subject to voluntary return (to Germany, Macedonia, Romania, Bulgaria and Spain). France counts around 7 500 unaccompanied minors on its territory (mostly from Democratic Republic of Congo, Angola, Guinea, Afghanistan, Pakistan</p>

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

***Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.***

			and Bangladesh).  7. France makes the distinction between allocation in waiting zones at the border and detention on the territory. There are 16 permanent waiting zones in mainland France and 6 over-seas. The maximal length of allocation in waiting zones is 20 days in mainland France; over-seas territories have derogations (e. g. it is 28 days in Mayotte). France does not have statistics on the average length of a stay in a waiting zone. 8 884 persons, among whom 416 unaccompanied minors, have been placed in waiting zones. 5 530 persons have been returned (there is no distinction between adults and minors).
	<b>Hungary</b>	<b>No</b>	This EMN NCP has provided a response to the requesting EMN NCP. However, they have requested that it is not disseminated further.
	<b>Netherlands</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<p>1. In 2012 there were in total 5.970 forced returns from the Netherlands including 2.480 removals at the border (the Repatriation and Departure Service does not cover all forced return, for example not the most part of the removals at the border), mostly people from Surinam, Turkey, Afghanistan, Morocco and Russia and 4.120 assisted voluntary returns, mostly people from Iraq, Brazil, China, Honduras and Nicaragua.</p> <p>2 In 2012 Frontex organized 39 JRO's (Frontex flights). The Netherlands participated in 6 JRO's. 5 to Nigeria and 1 to Ecuador-Colombia. With these JRO's the Netherlands repatriated 25 returnees to there country of origin. The Netherlands participated in a joint flight organized by Belgium to DRC with 1 returnee. The Netherlands organised 1 national flight to Guinea. 13 nationals from Guinea were repatriated (forced returns) with this (charter flight) to Conakry.</p> <p>- 3.100 forced returns from the caseload of the RDS were carried out by commercial airlines</p> <p>4. In the Netherlands, 5.420 persons have been placed in administrative detention in 2012. Among them, 811 women have been placed in administrative detention. In accordance with the Return Directive the maximal authorized length of detention is 6 months. In exceptional cases this can be extended to 18 months. The average length of detention is 75 days in the Netherlands for 2012.</p> <p>5. The Netherlands do not use house arrest, clock in or electronic watching. Placement in open housing is available to persons who are actively working on return (530 in 2012). For families with under aged children placing is available when there is a humanitarian need. In 2012 the Netherlands have started with new alternatives next to placing in open housing. These alternatives were subjected to strict criteria. The alternatives were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bail combined with a return contract : 15 persons</li> <li>- Duty to report to the police combined with case management with the Repatriation and Departure Service: 75 persons</li> <li>- Grants to NGOs for return: 180 persons</li> </ul> <p>6. In 2012 35 unaccompanied minors were forced returned, mostly from Afghanistan, Morocco and Somalia. 25 unaccompanied miners were assisted voluntary returned (AVR), mostly from Afghanistan, Belarus and Angola. Netherlands counts 50 unaccompanied minors on its territory, mostly from Morocco, Afghanistan, Algeria, Tunisia and Ghana.</p> <p>7. Article 6 (1) of the Dutch Alien Act gives the possibility to order someone to remain at a certain designated place.</p>

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

***Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.***

			At this moment the entire waiting zone at Schiphol Airport can be used.
	<b>Poland</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<p>1. In 2012, there were 512 forced returns (mostly nationals of Georgia, Ukraine, Russia, Vietnam and Afghanistan). There were 764 assisted voluntary returns (mostly citizens of Russia, Georgia, Ukraine, Armenia and Uzbekistan). There were 6 143 voluntary assisted returns (mostly nationals of Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, Moldova and Kazakhstan).</p> <p>2. In 2012:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poland participated in 4 return operations organised by FRONTEX during which 18 persons were returned.</li> <li>• Poland organised, in cooperation with Lithuania, 2 charter flights. 37 persons were returned (including 7 from the territory of Lithuania).</li> <li>• In 2012, Poland organised on its own 3 charter flights, including two flights to Georgia and one flight to Afghanistan with a stop in Georgia. 52 persons were removed.</li> <li>• The destination of return operations organized by FRONTEX were Nigeria (2 flights), Pakistan and Armenia – Georgia (with a stop in Armenia) and return operations organised jointly with Lithuania were Georgia and Afghanistan (one flight to Georgia, one joint flight to Afghanistan with a stop in Georgia).</li> <li>• In 2012, 293 persons were returned by commercial flights.</li> </ul> <p>3. In 2012, 2 106 decisions on removal were issued. Pursuant to the applicable provisions, a decision on removal entails a “re-entry ban” order preventing re-entry into the Schengen area for a maximum of 5 years. The Border Guard keeps no statistics on the period of re-entry ban specified in the order. The decision on removal from the territory of the Republic of Poland is issued to a foreigner if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) he/she has been staying within this territory without a valid visa, if it is required, or another valid document entitling to entry and stay in this territory;</li> <li>1a) has not left the territory of the Republic of Poland after the end of the permissible period of stay in the territory of Schengen countries within 3 months in the period of 6 months counted from the day of first entry;</li> <li>2) has performed work non-compliant with the <i>Act of 20 April 2004 on employment promotion and labour market institutions</i> or set up a business against the applicable provisions in this regard in the Republic of Poland;</li> <li>3) does not possess necessary financial resources to cover the costs of stay within the territory of the Republic of Poland and is unable to indicate reliable sources for obtaining them;</li> <li>4) his/her data are included in the list of foreigners whose stay within the territory of the Republic of Poland is not desired, should the foreigner’s entry into this territory occur in the period of this record’s validity;</li> <li>4a) his/her data are included in the Schengen Information System for the purposes of entry refusal, if a foreigner stays within the territory of the Republic of Poland under the visa-free regime or based on the Schengen visa, excluding the one that entitles only to enter and stay in the territory of the Republic of Poland;</li> <li>5) his/her further stay would pose a threat to state defences or security, the protection of public safety and order or would violate the interest of the Republic of Poland;</li> <li>6) has crossed or made an attempt to cross the border illegally;</li> <li>7) has not left the territory of the Republic of Poland voluntarily by the deadline specified in the decision:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) compelling to leave this territory,</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

***Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.***

			<p>b) refusing to grant a residence permit for a specified period of time,  c) withdrawing a residence permit for a specified period of time;  8) does not comply with tax obligations towards the State Treasury;  9) has finished serving a prison sentence pronounced in the Republic of Poland for a specific-intent crime or tax crime;  10) has been sentenced to prison in the Republic of Poland by an enforceable and legally valid decision and there are grounds for conducting proceedings to sent him/her abroad to execute the punishment;  11) has been staying outside the border zone where he/she can stay in line with the permission to cross the border under the local border traffic;  12) has been staying within the territory of the Republic of Poland after the end of the period of stay to which he/she was entitled in line with the permission to cross the border under the local border traffic.</p> <p>4. In 2012, 1 414 persons were admitted to Guarded Centres for Foreigners, including 175 women. The maximum detention period is 12 months. The average detention period is 3 months.</p> <p>5. In Poland, no alternatives to detention are used. The draft new act on foreigners, which is planned to be adopted in the second half of 2013, envisages the introduction of such alternative measures.</p> <p>6. In Poland, data on the total number of unaccompanied minors are not available. In 2012, 16 unaccompanied minors without a travel document were detained and placed in a custody facility (such persons, due to their unique situation, are not placed in detention centres in Poland); an identification procedure has been initiated.</p> <p>7. In Poland, there are no facilities equivalent to “waiting zones”.</p>
	<p><b>Sweden</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>1. Forced returns 2012: 5 754, assisted forced returns: 3 641, voluntary returns: 11 737. Main nationalities: Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Iraq, Kosovo, Albania.</p> <p>2. Sweden has participated in 20 organized flights in total. 200 persons were returned and mainly to Serbia, Nigeria and Kosovo.</p> <p>3. Removal orders 2012: 7 564. We can't say how many of these in particular were carried out. Any category of person can be subject to a removal order, rejected asylum seekers, persons with expired residence permits, refusals of entry. 3 199 were assorted with a prohibition of return. The average length of these prohibitions was 1 year. There have been no prohibitions of return for more than 5 years.</p> <p>4. Placed in detention were 2 550, among these were 276 women. The maximal authorized length of detention:  An alien may not be detained for investigation of identity for more than 48 hours.  In other cases, such as investigation of the right of the alien to remain in Sweden or with the purpose to enforce an expulsion order, an alien who has attained the age of 18 may not be detained for more than two weeks, unless there are exceptional grounds for a longer period. If, however, a refusal-of entry or expulsion order has been issued, the alien may be detained for not more than two months unless there are exceptional grounds for a longer period.  A child may not be detained for more than 72 hours or, if there are exceptional grounds, for a further 72 hours.</p>

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

***Disclaimer:*** The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

			<p>The average length of detention was 11, 2 days in 2012.</p> <p>5. Regarding alternatives to detention, house arrest, being placed in open center or under electronic watching are not done in Sweden. They can be subject to clocking in and the number for 2012 is 396 persons.</p> <p>6. Unaccompanied minors subject to forced return 2012: Turned over to police due to absconding 176, turned over to the police due to not cooperating in return procedure: 144 Voluntary return: 164 As of June 19, 2013, 1 766 unaccompanied minors are on Swedish territory. They are mainly from Afghanistan, Somalia and Morocco</p> <p>7. Sweden does not have any waiting zones.</p>												
	<p><b>United Kingdom</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>1)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="638 667 1901 890"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of return*</th> <th>Numbers</th> <th>Main countries</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Forced Returns 2012</td> <td>14,435</td> <td>India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Afghanistan, China, Vietnam</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assisted Returns 2012</td> <td>3,699</td> <td>Brazil, India, China, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq, Bangladesh</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Voluntary Returns 2012</td> <td>25,997</td> <td>India, Pakistan, China, Nigeria, Bangladesh, Philippines, Sri Lanka</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*These figures include both asylum and non-asylum figures</p> <p>2) The UK participated in one flight and removed 3 individuals, two were subsequently returned to the UK as landing permissions were refused in the receiving country. The UK participated in 3 joint flights (1 to Ghana, 1 to Nigeria and the other to Kosovo and Albania), in total we returned 99 individuals on those flights. In addition to the above joint flights, the UK had 41 national flights in 2012. On these flights we returned a total of 1886 individuals The major, regular charter destinations are currently Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nigeria and Ghana.</p> <p>3) Deportation orders in the UK mainly deal with Foreign National Offenders.</p> <p>The Home Office's objective is to protect the public by deporting foreign nationals who commit serious criminal offences, where legislation permits. Tough enforcement is the cornerstone of this Government's immigration policy. Those who break our laws should be removed from the country at the earliest opportunity, and we will seek to deport any foreign national criminal who meets our deportation criteria.</p>	Type of return*	Numbers	Main countries	Forced Returns 2012	14,435	India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Afghanistan, China, Vietnam	Assisted Returns 2012	3,699	Brazil, India, China, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq, Bangladesh	Voluntary Returns 2012	25,997	India, Pakistan, China, Nigeria, Bangladesh, Philippines, Sri Lanka
Type of return*	Numbers	Main countries													
Forced Returns 2012	14,435	India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Afghanistan, China, Vietnam													
Assisted Returns 2012	3,699	Brazil, India, China, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq, Bangladesh													
Voluntary Returns 2012	25,997	India, Pakistan, China, Nigeria, Bangladesh, Philippines, Sri Lanka													

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

***Disclaimer:*** The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.

		<p>Since 2006, the Home Office has removed or deported more than 32,000 foreign national offenders, including a total of 4,589 in 2012 34% of which were EEA nationals</p> <p>The final decision to remove the FNO can be via court or Home Office, dependant on the case. This is also the case when dealing with general removals.</p> <p>The length of the re-entry ban will depend on the circumstances of the case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the applicant made a voluntary departure at no public cost: <b>One year</b></li> <li>• If the applicant made a voluntary departure at public cost and within six months: <b>Two years</b></li> <li>• If the applicant made a voluntary departure at public cost but not within six months: <b>Five years</b></li> <li>• If the applicant was removed or deported from the UK (i.e. through an enforced removal arranged by the UKBA): <b>Ten years</b></li> <li>• If the applicant used deception: <b>Ten years</b></li> </ul> <p>The UK government intends that the re-entry bans that have been introduced following a recent change in the immigration rules will provide a stronger incentive for persons without valid immigration leave to depart from the UK at an earlier stage or take up assisted voluntary schemes offered by the Home Office.</p> <p>4) 28,909 people entered detention solely under Immigration Act powers and exclude those in police cells, Prison Service establishments, short term holding rooms at ports and airports (for less than 24 hours), and those recorded as detained under both criminal and immigration powers and their dependants, in 2012, 4,423 were female. Currently there is no maximum length of detention. There are no published average figures on length of detention, but the table below shows the length of detention (grouped) of those leaving detention in 2012</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td><b>Total detainees leaving detention</b></td> <td align="right"><b>28,538</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>A: 3 days or less</td> <td align="right"><b>7,111</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>B: 4 to 7 days</td> <td align="right"><b>3,928</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>C: 8 to 14 days</td> <td align="right"><b>3,685</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>D: 15 to 28 days</td> <td align="right"><b>4,080</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>E: 29 days to less than 2 months</td> <td align="right"><b>4,782</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>F: 2 months to less than 3 months</td> <td align="right"><b>1,987</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>G: 3 months to less than 4 months</td> <td align="right"><b>1,059</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>H: 4 months to less than 6 months</td> <td align="right"><b>917</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>I: 6 months to less than 12 months</td> <td align="right"><b>667</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>J: 12 months to less than 18 months</td> <td align="right"><b>187</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>K: 18 months to less than 24 months</td> <td align="right"><b>68</b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Total detainees leaving detention</b>	<b>28,538</b>	A: 3 days or less	<b>7,111</b>	B: 4 to 7 days	<b>3,928</b>	C: 8 to 14 days	<b>3,685</b>	D: 15 to 28 days	<b>4,080</b>	E: 29 days to less than 2 months	<b>4,782</b>	F: 2 months to less than 3 months	<b>1,987</b>	G: 3 months to less than 4 months	<b>1,059</b>	H: 4 months to less than 6 months	<b>917</b>	I: 6 months to less than 12 months	<b>667</b>	J: 12 months to less than 18 months	<b>187</b>	K: 18 months to less than 24 months	<b>68</b>
<b>Total detainees leaving detention</b>	<b>28,538</b>																									
A: 3 days or less	<b>7,111</b>																									
B: 4 to 7 days	<b>3,928</b>																									
C: 8 to 14 days	<b>3,685</b>																									
D: 15 to 28 days	<b>4,080</b>																									
E: 29 days to less than 2 months	<b>4,782</b>																									
F: 2 months to less than 3 months	<b>1,987</b>																									
G: 3 months to less than 4 months	<b>1,059</b>																									
H: 4 months to less than 6 months	<b>917</b>																									
I: 6 months to less than 12 months	<b>667</b>																									
J: 12 months to less than 18 months	<b>187</b>																									
K: 18 months to less than 24 months	<b>68</b>																									

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

**Disclaimer:** *The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.*

			<table border="1" data-bbox="613 256 1211 363"> <tr> <td>L: 24 months to less than 36 months</td> <td align="right"><b>44</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>M: 36 months to less than 48 months</td> <td align="right"><b>16</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>N: 48 months or more</td> <td align="right"><b>7</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>5) The UK do not utilise house arrest nor open centres as alternatives to detention. Two types of electronic monitoring are utilised; voice recognition and tagging. Voice recognition utilises special technology which allows an offender to report in remotely by telephone and their voice is matched to vocal records to check authenticity of the reportee. Tagging involves the offender wearing an electronic tag around their ankle, with a monitoring unit placed at their home address. When the subject is required to be at home, the tag sends a signal to the monitoring unit, which will in turn send a signal to a monitoring control centre. This confirms whether or not the subject is present at the specified address. Official statistics are not published on voice recognition and tagging however “Monthly averages for electronic monitoring (tagging and voice recognition) as an alternative to detention are consistently around 400 – 500 individuals”</p> <p>6) Figures are only available for the first half of 2012 (quarters 1 &amp; 2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the first half of 2012, there were no children subject to forced return.</li> <li>• A total of 6 minors were returned in the first half of 2012 either as assisted returns or voluntary returns made up of 2 Afghans and 1 each from Croatia, Iraq, Kosovo and Sudan.</li> </ul> <p>With regard to the number of UASCs ‘in territory’, it is difficult to be precise but the number of UASC’s who arrived in the first 2 quarters of 2012 was 503. This figure is broken down into the top 5 countries as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="613 954 1189 1182"> <thead> <tr> <th>Country</th> <th>Number of UASC</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Afghanistan</td> <td align="right">113</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Albania</td> <td align="right">90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Iran</td> <td align="right">51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vietnam</td> <td align="right">39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eritrea</td> <td align="right">29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td align="right">181</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>7) The United Kingdom does not operate any similar arrangements to that of the “waiting zones” used in France.</p>	L: 24 months to less than 36 months	<b>44</b>	M: 36 months to less than 48 months	<b>16</b>	N: 48 months or more	<b>7</b>	Country	Number of UASC	Afghanistan	113	Albania	90	Iran	51	Vietnam	39	Eritrea	29	Other	181
L: 24 months to less than 36 months	<b>44</b>																						
M: 36 months to less than 48 months	<b>16</b>																						
N: 48 months or more	<b>7</b>																						
Country	Number of UASC																						
Afghanistan	113																						
Albania	90																						
Iran	51																						
Vietnam	39																						
Eritrea	29																						
Other	181																						
	<p><b>Norway</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>1. The total number of foreigners returned from Norway by the police to their home country or another country in 2012 were 4.902. The number of forced returns of third-country nationals were 4.079 in 2012 (<i>i.e. non-EU citizens returned with the assistance of the police, including persons returned according to the Dublin II-regulation. The number of third country nationals returned according to the Dublin II-regulation was 1.108. The number of persons returned to another EU/ Schengen country totally, including those returned according to the Dublin II-regulation, was 2.906</i>). The most common nationalities of the forced returnees were Nigerians, Afghans, Russians and</p>																				

**FR Ad-Hoc Query: Removal policies towards third-country nationals found to be illegally present**

***Disclaimer: The following responses have been provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs have provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that is up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided does not necessarily represent the official policy of an EMN NCPs' Member State.***

		<p>Albanians. (Main EU-destinations: Italy, Spain and Sweden. Main destinations outside EU: Russia, Albania and Afghanistan).                  There were 1 740 voluntary returns from Norway in 2012. Most voluntary returns were to Iraq (441), Russia (236), Afghanistan (141) and Kosovo (80)</p> <p>2. Norway participated in 9 Frontex-charters in 2012. 72 persons were returned on these flights.                  Norway participated in 3 joint flights beyond Frontex in 2012. 28 persons were returned on these flights.                  Norway organized 2 national charters for removal purpose in 2012. 20 persons were returned on these flights.                  Destinations for the Frontex flights: Nigeria and Kosovo.                  Destinations for the joint flights: Iraq.                  Destinations for the national charters: Kosovo and Romania.                  Commercial flights: 4.782 persons were returned (4.902 minus the 120 who were returned by use of charters).</p> <p>3. 5 034 removal orders were given in 2012. There were 1 076 refusals to enter the country (before or after border crossing) and 3 958 expulsions. We don't have numbers for how many removal orders were executed. In about 4 in 5 expulsions the ban on re-entry to Norway was limited to a maximum of 5 years. In 1 in 5 expulsions the ban was unlimited (more than 5 years)</p> <p>4. In total, 2.164 foreigners were placed in administrative detention following decisions according to the Norwegian Immigration Act in 2012. We do not have statistics available on the number of women among these. As a main rule, no foreigner is allowed to be kept in administrative detention under the Immigration act for more than 18 months (<i>unless the foreign national is expelled after having been subject to a penal reaction, or because he/she is seen as a threat to foundational national interests</i>). We do not have statistics available for 2012 regarding the average length of administrative detention.</p> <p>5. Of the mentioned alternatives to detention, Norway does only use "compelled to clock in". We do not have relevant statistics covering the use of this in 2012.</p> <p>6. 80 unaccompanied minors were subject to forced return in 2012. Their main nationalities were Afghans, Algerians, Somalis and Moroccans. (<i>Please note that most of these were returned to another European country according to the Dublin II-regulation. They were not subject to age assessments. The number of minors being returned to a third country in 2012 were three. These were returned to Russia, Albania and Sri Lanka</i>).                  Among the 1 740 who returned voluntarily in 2012, 7 were unaccompanied minors at the time of departure. At the end of 2012 there were 351 unaccompanied minors in specially designated reception centers. Most of them came from Afghanistan (155) or Somalia (79)</p> <p>7. In Norway we do not use waiting zones. Asylum applicants with a final rejection of their application can stay in an open reception centers/ housing until they leave the country or are returned. Norway has one detention center allocated for foreigners without legal stay, among these are former asylum seekers with a final rejection on their application.</p>
--	--	--