

BSR IMPT Project: The Expert seminar in Copenhagen on 15/16th June 2010: Children in the asylum system; Information management to prevent trafficking

Opening of the seminar

Ms Bente Ingvarsen, Director for Domestic Programme, Save the Children Denmark (SC-DK)

Bente Ingvarsen welcomed the participants and introduced the work of SC-DK, which was among the first actors in raising the agenda of children at risk of trafficking in a Danish context. Taking a lead role in highlighting the issue, SC-DK has been involved in a range of initiatives: a national action plan; research; seminars and facilitation of information sharing forums among stakeholders. The rights of asylum seeking children is a central focus area for SC-DK, Ms. Bente Ingvarsen concluded.

Introduction to the BSR IMPT project

Mr. Lars Lööf, Head of Children's Unit, Council of Baltic Sea States, Secretariat

Lars Lööf introduced the BSR IMPT Project (Baltic Sea Region Information Management to Prevent Trafficking) and referred to the Steering Group consisting of SC-DK, Caritas Lithuania and Tartu Child Support Centre, Estonia.

Lars Lööf emphasized that information is a very powerful tool; with the focus on children's rights and focus on protection, information constitutes the basic platform. However, there are quite few cases as such on identified children as victims of trafficking. The gap between the official figures (maybe one or two children a year per country) and what might be the reality is important when we are talking about prevention. The variety in numbers among different actors is not a question of right or wrong, it is due to people being in different positions in the system – our perception is framed by our professional approach and the institutions and contexts we are part of. The BSR IMPT Project will map existing information structures, look into how and by whom it is managed and further, it aims to identify information bits, 'side information', that is not currently collated by the actors but that is potentially imperative in assuring prevention and protection. Information flows between regions within a country, from the capital to the countryside as well as between countries therefore obviously become a key issue.

Lars Lööf concluded by informing participant that brief reports from each of the three expert seminars will be made available at the website. The first expert seminar was conducted in Vilnius in March 2010, addressing the issue of young people in prostitution. This expert seminar is the second and the third and last expert seminar will take place in Tallinn on the 14th and 15th of September 2010, focusing on forced labour, begging and trafficking for exploiting young people in criminality. Finally a comprehensive and final report, including a consolidated review of information management in the Baltic Sea region, will be completed and available in December 2010.

Presentation of the SCEP network

Lise Bruun, Separated Children in Europe Programme (SCEP), SC-DK

Separated Children in Europe Programme (SCEP), started in 1997 as a joint initiative between International Save the Children Alliance and UNHCR. It has later developed into an NGO network in both EU member states and non-EU member states, basically assuring a platform for national and EU/European advocacy for the realisation of the rights of separated children – improving standards in all policies, practices and services, based on three points of entry: (i) international protection of separated children, (ii) well-being and developmental rights of separated children and (iii) participation and empowerment of separated children.

Lise Bruun referred to “The Statement of Good Practice”¹ – a document providing an overview of policies and practices relevant to all separated children (not only asylum seekers) with references to international and regional human rights principles. Since the categorisation may become an issue when developing a rights based approach Lise Bruun quoted the SCEP definition: “Separated children are children under 18 years of age who are outside their country and separated from parents or legal and customary primary care giver”. Some may be accompanied, however not necessarily by adults capable of resuming responsibility for their care. This further relates to a new EU Council decision on unaccompanied minors. The EU Council will, for the first time, take as their starting point the wider pool of children in migration: “regardless of whether they are asylum seekers, victims of trafficking or illegal migrants, to guarantee that minors are treated as such until proven otherwise.”²

Lise Bruun presented a few figures indicating that in 2009 there were 15,000 new arrivals of asylum seeking separated children, estimates give the number of migrant children in Italy to be 5-10,000; in Spain: 6-8,000 and in Greece 6,000. Identification and registration of separated children varies from country to country and there are no documented numbers of how many children that are victims of trafficking.

Linked to comments on the issue of numbers, the question of age assessment was discussed. However, as methods in determining the actual age of a person have margins of 2 to 4 years, participants at the seminar basically agreed that the focus on the rights of the child should be the point of entry.

Particular findings:

What kind of information: SCEP facilitates important and often scarce information on rights and

¹ http://www.separated-children-europe-programme.org/separated_children/good_practice/index.html

² http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/114887.pdf

policy issues related to separated children. Moreover, in sketching standards like in “Statement of Good Practice”, SCEP offers guidance to other players. SCEP has tried to set up information work based on case examples, which unfortunately turned out not to work.

Information bearers: The organizations being part of the SCEP network each process information into their national/local networks, hence bridging between transnational, national and local levels. A well managed website works as a bearer of information.

How to make it useful: Information is published on the website www.separated-children-europe-programme.org and further disseminated via a newsletter. Moreover the “Statement of Good Practice” is an attempt to share best practices.

Young people in asylum centres. A look at the situation that have given cause for concern

Mr. Thomas Gittrich, Bundesfachverband UMF, Germany:

In 2009 Germany registered 2850 arrivals of separated children, but estimates are that in reality it is many more. Main countries of origin are Afghanistan, Iraq, Nigeria and Somalia. Initially children stay in reception centres, a stay planned not to exceed 3 months, however they may stay as long as 9-20 months. After that they are moved into various care homes.

Centres and the care systems are over-packed and it raises a number of concerns. For instance, young people suffer from high levels of trauma without being offered psychological support resulting in a lot of aggression and even suicide attempts. Centres overfilled by 2-300% will often be the case. Access to normal life for children is impossible as there is no school provision, so basically children hang around without structure and meaningful activities. However, Thomas Gittrich stressed, one good thing is the efforts to get the children into ordinary institutional care together with German children, although this is not an opportunity in all cities. Germany as a number of other countries assigns legal guardians for separated children. The guardian system is under discussion due to stories claiming that some guardians have up to 250 children, the official maximum being no more than 30 for fulltime guardians in organisations and a proposed . limit of 50 for guardians working within the child protection system.

Children disappear from centres and care homes for various reasons: Some are heading for other countries, e.g. Scandinavia, but arriving in Sweden for instance, some will be sent back to Germany. Almost all Afghan children have come to Europe through Greece which questions the relevance of the Dublin convention. So far no one has been returned to Greece from Germany; however for the children it is a stressful situation as they do not know whether or if a return might be initiated.

The Dublin II convention was discussed with the emphasis on the fact that children have special rights: they CAN be returned but DO NOT HAVE to return. However, despite this wording it seems like Dublin II in some countries is being implemented and generally enforced. . Children who disappear to go to another country are in fact at risk when arriving in a new country to be sent back to Greece

Also in Germany access to the asylum system depends on age. A particular problem occur with Afghan children, as the majority carry a birth certificate which is not accepted by German authorities, why a number of cases go to family court for a decision on age.

A discussion arose regarding situations where children are put in detention and a major concern raised was that these cases are not always registered or reported. This has obvious links to the issue of migration and trafficking. Likewise, it seems that a number of children are automatically sent back immediately when trying to cross the border illegally. Hence their case will not be registered.

Particular findings:

What kind of information: Lack of registration of some arriving separated children and children being sent back without further procedures at the border might lead to children and cases never becoming officially tried and the rights of the child being ignored. Another concern was children disappearing as they fear being sent back according to Dublin II. The reception system is overstretched in many countries, something that is a concern since the individual child's situation will not be adequately assessed and information that may relate to exploitation or trafficking may be overlooked.

Information bearers: Social workers in centres, especially asylum centres and institutions are vital informants. Border guards that make decisions on turning children away at the border and those assisting in returning children to first destination country in the EU according to Dublin II are also important informants.

How to make it useful: In a federal system like Germany, exchange of information between the authorities at inter-state level need to be improved in order to consolidate national, official figures on: Number of children among asylum seekers, number of children in custody, the numbers running away, numbers sent back from borders. In other countries, the information on asylum seeking separated children are part of the information exchange on a regular basis but in other countries this happens on a more ad hoc basis. Figures, migration flows and studies on why children from a specific country or ethnic group migrate and become separated asylum seekers should be part of how the situation in a country is assessed.

Unaccompanied asylum seeking young persons and the possible risk of exploitation

Ms. Beatrice Berotiene, Refugee reception centre, Lithuania

In the Lithuanian Refugee Reception Centre which is a governmental institution, there are right now 7 minors, four of these of Vietnamese origin. In the centre the children live side by side with families that have been granted asylum, however the unaccompanied children are in a separate building.

The minors receive legal assistance, free accommodation and guardianship. They attend local school (with extra tuition), and are provided with free medical and social services. The centre cooperates with local child protection services as some have psychological problems. Last year the centre received 6 unaccompanied children, this year 7. A new phenomenon is children coming from Vietnam without any documents. At times children try to escape from the centre, for instance 2 boys who escaped were later found in Poland and taken back to the centre. Some of these minors are victims trafficked for sexual exploitation or forced labour.

As the majority are teenagers, the centre focus on the specific teenager challenges. They can stay in the centre until they are 18 – hereafter various services are provided to support their social integration. The centre collaborates with NGOs in providing apartment, language training and health insurance for instance. Further they are offered post-secondary education and training, hoping that such training will help them with ‘education for life’. Even if they go to other countries at a later stage, the education enables them in their struggle to find better life opportunities.

A discussion revealed a lot of information that was shared about Vietnamese unaccompanied children among the participants. Some voiced suspicion that in some cases local Vietnamese communities in the receiving countries covered for run-away children. The Vietnamese community in Poland, for example has been there for many years – and there have been ordinary reports of births as expected, but oddly enough, not a single death has been reported, which fuels the suspicion that personal documents are being recycled.

Particular findings:

What kind of information: Lithuania has a comprehensive provision of schooling, language training and post-school integration and settlement programme, including marketable vocational training – a package covering from arrival to adult citizenship.

Information bearers: Authorities, social workers and NGOs are all central information bearers.

How to make it useful: A coordination forum exists – however, it seems that a certain mistrust between sectors (official and NGOs) – a mistrust that should diminished in order to facilitate and qualify collaboration for the benefit of the children concerned.

Cases of trafficking

Ms. Mechtild Maurer, ECPAT, Germany

Annual reports on trafficking from the Bundeskriminalamt in Germany state that Germany never had a case of trafficking involving a minor below the age of 14, leading Germany to conclude that there is no such problem as trafficking of smaller children. However, according to Ms. Mechtild Maurer the critical issue is how information is being collected.

Since 2006, cases of trafficking will only be reported if they are connected to a major crime e.g. murder. Obviously, if approach and methods change new information will surface, resulting in new numbers. In Berlin, for example, a special unit has been set up looking into trafficking of children

leading to an increase of 20% in the numbers filed. Moreover, previously almost only women and girls were reported as being sexually exploited, now there is a tendency to also see boys. The violence around the sexual exploitation of boys has forced the police to set up monitoring systems in all major German cities. This also adds to available information.

If a child is identified as a victim of trafficking, the authorities will have to spend a lot of resources; therefore you can see cases defined as paedophilia (as an example of two 10 year old Nigerian boys) and not as trafficking. Or in the case of Romanian boys, who are being caught begging or stealing, that will be released within an hour and nobody will ask questions regarding potential trafficking criminality being involved. In Bavaria last year, there were only two cases of trafficking, assumed to be much too low. An explanation might be the reluctance to label a crime trafficking, instead cases are labeled as sexual abuse.

A discussion about how to mark and file trafficking as a crime took place with reference to a suggestion in Sweden to mark in a police file suspicion of trafficking in the same way as hate crimes and crimes related to honour related violence are presently marked and registered.³ The 'battle of the numbers' was again discussed stating that different stakeholders have different interests, hence scaling down or scaling up numbers should be expected. In Norway there is a shared understanding of the nature of such differences and a system mirroring it in that reporting reflects data from various stakeholders on the basis of an agreed set of common indicators. The issue of mistrust between authorities and NGOs or private organisations working with child protection was raised with examples from Lithuania. Moreover the important issue of confidentiality of social workers was discussed as a challenge because reporting on individual children to the police might not take place.

Particular findings:

What kind of information: Information found is defined by who is looking. Acting upon knowledge acquired is not only a legal issue – it depends on the amount of financial resources required, authorities might be discouraged and will try to find alternative labels to trafficking as the latter is expensive to investigate and generally difficult to handle.

Information bearers: Different stakeholders have different motives in ensuring higher or lower numbers for e.g. political or financial reasons, further mistrust between authorities and social oriented organizations will influence the behaviour of information bearers. It implies that information bearers act according to particular professional interests and this should be recognised.

How to make it useful: It is important to discuss such practices and strategies of various professionals openly, otherwise the sharing of information, and the outcome meant to benefit the child, is seriously hampered.

³ If there is a case of violence and there is suspicion that the motive is related to e.g. racism, the police has to register and report on this.

Unaccompanied asylum seeking children, protection services, reception centres

Mr. Casper Smidt, Project Coordinator, Danish Red Cross Anti-Trafficking Project

Danish Red Cross houses 419 unaccompanied minors in 7 asylum centres. Casper Smidt accounted for an incredible increase over the last 1½ years; for two years the number was around 20 and centres were closed down. Now a new centre is opened every six weeks. When accommodated in the centres minors are offered a package of services: Housing, school, psychological support, appointed social worker for each child, various activities and volunteer support, legal advice and alike. Provisions are all funded by the Danish government.

Danish Red Cross operates with three 'security levels' in the asylum centres depending on how the individual child's situation is assessed:

- Security level 3 (lowest): Minors are given basic attention and provision.
- Security level 2 (intermediate): The child is given particular attention by staff, and presence is checked 6 times a day. At municipal level, it can be decided to monitor the child's communication (e.g. letters, emails, telephone).
- Security Level 1 (highest): The child is under constant surveillance by centre staff and police might increase patrolling.

Five children have been identified as victims of trafficking in Denmark during 2009 but only 2 of these were prosecuted due to the fact that for the rest, the crime of trafficking had been committed outside the country on their way to Denmark. According to Casper Smidt, depending on how one uses the indicators, as many as 15 cases of minors could be defined as victims of trafficking in Denmark.

Possible trafficking for the purpose of exploitation in criminality is on the rise: Roma groups cross borders in big numbers these years, and minors are sent here to commit crimes, for which they are punished quite hard with 15-40 days in prison for e.g. shoplifting. Another new tendency is that West African and North African boys are involved in drug criminality, functioning as couriers caught carrying and selling cocaine and cannabis.

Participants shared information on the link between drug criminality and trafficking. It was concluded that there is a challenge to ensure that young perpetrators of also very severe crimes like crimes related to drugs, are treated as possible victims of trafficking when they are involved in serious drug crimes and present a very destructive lifestyle. Moreover, stories of organised crime gangs forcing minors to commit bank robberies while threatening their younger brothers and sisters were shared.

A discussion took place whether a country has an obligation under international law to protect the victim when the crime of trafficking has not taken place in the specific country. It was clear from the discussion that there are different interpretations of this in the different countries present.

Ethics were discussed, e.g. linked to the question whether one can argue for locking up children in closed institutions to prevent further harm and if this is in the best interest of the child? Participants agreed that a generalised answer is probably not applicable. The legal basis differs from country to country.

Particular findings:

What kind of information: Children placed in the asylum system face different conditions and procedures, some of which are questionable in terms of their ethical and/or rights based bearing. Social work procedures seem to be replicated without much individual assessment.

Information bearers: Centre staff apparently possess a big amount of knowledge. Participants discussed whether a kind of international network could ensure making this prominent pool of information more easily accessible.

How to make it useful: Centre staff professionals have lots to share – there are examples that they have ‘googled’ and found each other across borders, but no formal networks are established so far.

Migration authorities and their views of trafficking of children in connection with migration

Ms. Gunnel Svedberg, Swedish Board of Migration

Gunnel Svedberg started by referring to an ongoing project investigating children at risk of trafficking in the Nordic countries initiated by UNICEF and the Innocenti Centre in Italy. She continued by accounting for a Swedish initiative aiming at increased cooperation between agencies, authorities and NGOs in fighting trafficking and protecting victims of trafficking. The project under the EU Equal programme, started in 2001 and involved both public authorities and NGOs. The project eventually produced a national manual/tool (in Swedish only) including various laws, different authorities, agencies and social institutions.

The children passing national borders should be monitored carefully and investigated thoroughly: Questions like Who bought the ticket? or Are there any adults accompanying the child? should be looked at carefully. Identifying trafficking requires among other measures establishing family relations where DNA testing may serve as a tool in order to secure correct family relations. Reactions to trafficking should be prompt and clear: It is important to signal that we will not accept e.g. children in the streets and similar practices. Official figures on victims of trafficking of human beings in Sweden are as follows: in 2004, 7 cases, in 2005, 27 cases, in 2006, 31 cases, in 2007, 17 cases and in 2008, 14 cases.

Children are also in Sweden registered in reception centres. 844 minors arrived without guardian in Sweden last year and only last week 392 asylum seekers came to Sweden, including 40 unaccompanied children.

The experts raised several questions including the issue of culture: There are huge cultural differences, so how do we ensure that our Western view will not mislead us when assessing a

child's situation? Going with a cousin to another country or begging in the streets to help out when parents are poor might be fully valid and legitimate in the culture, where the child originates.

Once again the issue of figures was discussed and again emphasis was put on the fact that there are very few official cases of trafficking involving children prosecuted in the different countries. Converting suspicions into numbers seems quite a challenge. Moreover, the role of the municipalities in taking care of children at risk of trafficking was discussed as a number of participants pointed to the difficulties for the municipalities due to lack of resources and missing out on sufficiently trained social workers. Pros and cons were further put forward regarding migrant children staying in the care of a family of their choice where there is no daily external monitoring. The experts also discussed the praxis of placing children in foster families with the same ethnic background and how this may be protective or not.

Particular findings:

What kind of information: Reflection is needed regarding the best options for care – reception centres, municipal care institutions or family care. Further culturally significant customs need to be taken into account.

Information bearers: 'Culture holders' should be part of investigating good practices concerning care.

How to make it useful: An exchange of documented experiences with various forms of practices concerning care systems for migrant children could be processed across borders for mutual learning.

Challenges in collecting information for national referral mechanism

Ms. Hanne Mainz, Danish Centre against Human Trafficking (CMM)

The Danish Centre (CMM) has been operating since 2007 as part of the implementation of the Danish strategy on combating human trafficking. The centre is a governmental unit within the Service Board under the Ministry of Social Affairs. The Centre coordinates the social dimension of the national action plan, knowledge management linked to trafficking and their outreach encompasses all victims of human trafficking, including minors. The aim is to ensure that human rights are respected, including that victims are treated as victims, not as criminals. More specifically, tasks include for instance to initiate, improve and develop best practices and procedures; to develop indicators; to evaluate social action; to collate, compile and disseminate knowledge about trafficking; to run a Hotline service and Drop In centres including medical assistance and accommodation and moreover together with IOM to prepare for safe returns.

The centre is a reference point for other actors. The centre is in daily contact with police and Migration authorities, as with municipalities and a number of organizations providing social services. The Centre only deals with certain identification cases – if a person is in the country

illegally, it is migrant authorities that establish whether it is trafficking or not. However, if the case is about an EU citizen, this is the responsibility of the Danish Centre.

Coordination of social outreach and assistance is a core task facilitated through a National reference Group and 6 regional groups covering all of Denmark. All actors involved take part in coordination and enables flows of information between stakeholders. CMM considers it an achievement to have brought various sectors together, e.g. social workers and the police with very different cultures and priorities.

A discussion took place regarding the so-called reflection period, the length being different from country to country, in Denmark it is 100 days. Only few persons in the Danish context make use of it. Returns were likewise discussed, as it presents a real challenge to arrange for safe returns of minors - it can be difficult to find 'safe' family or it is difficult to cooperate with social institutions in countries of origin.

The challenge of how to compile and qualify various kinds of information from different stakeholders was discussed. One way of handling this is to set up thematic sub-working groups on specific topics like prostitution, the au pair system, cleaning companies and areas with particular risk of trafficking.

Once again the question was raised whether or not a state is responsible towards victims of trafficking if the crime has taken place in another country. This apparently is an area that needs clarification. Related to this were the issues of costs involved in protection and the setting up of a safe return.

Particular findings:

What kind of information: The Centre compiles information from a broad variety of sources, therefore has the opportunity to 'cover the issue' in a Danish context.

Information bearers: The Centre represents a coordination structure with full coverage, also at local level – hence in principal it compiles knowledge from the entire pool. To this should be added the Hotline, providing add on knowledge from those whose voices will otherwise often be excluded.

How to make it useful: Interchange of information between various actors seems to be effective (Denmark is a small country, one should add, not necessarily applicable elsewhere). To establish sub-groups working in depth with certain issues enhances the quality of knowledge, assumed this will become more useful for some.

Discussions and conclusions: Recommendations and gaps where more knowledge is necessary

Morten Hjorth Jahnsen, Save the Children Denmark

Summing up from the two days seminar on migrant children and children in the asylum system at risk of exploitation and possible victims of trafficking, Morten Hjorth Jahnsen pointed to some of the important information sources and information channels:

- The numbers; how to get the figures and facts on children victims of trafficking? Many have described the different interests from different stakeholders. There is a need to ensure trust between sectors and to avoid duplicate reporting.
- Differences between the various countries in identification procedures seem a challenge.
- Disappearances of children from asylum centres seems to be a major problem. What is happening to the children when disappearing? Disappearances may at times be related to the Dublin II convention, in some cases children disappear to avoid being sent back to first receiving country.
- The asylum centres are under pressure. Inadequate resources to assist the unaccompanied children lead to inadequate fulfilment of rights.
- International law related to national procedures: Follow international commitments, is a country mandated to assist a child victim if the crime of trafficking took place in another country?
- Problems of children in 'false families' - should DNA be used for identification? What do we know about these children? Are the social authorities able to monitor?
- Assessing the best interest of the child when planning a safe return is a challenge, how?
- We need to know more about street children and migrant children living in the streets.
- Minors staying within ethnic minorities, for instance Vietnamese communities in Lithuania and Poland, we lack knowledge about the pull and push factors, likewise mechanisms to establish whether there are links to trafficking.
- Is detention in centres protection or violation of the child? Can you lock up children to protect them?
- Age assessment has a bearing on various rights issues – further interesting how it fluctuates whether it is sometimes useful to be younger than ones real age and in other cases advantageous being older.
- Discussion about the distinction between children and teenagers especially regarding asylum seekers, where there are hardly any small children.
- Children exploited for drug crime and robberies: How do we manage this when we talk about hard crime vis-à-vis possible cases of trafficking?
- Information about the same individuals moving from country to country: There is a need for better information processes across borders, in order to combine, test and share

information to be made useful. However, cases based purely on suspicions are difficult and probably questionable to share.

Closing words and future actions in the BSR IMPT project

Mr. Lars Lööf, Head of Children's Unit, CBSS Secretariat

Most information bearers at this seminar come from the asylum seeking sector. Do you see other stakeholders in your countries that could contribute with information?

Question on safe return might be an issue to be discussed. The role of IOM in assisting in return of victims (identified and possible) of trafficking might be discussed in light of the need for assessments and longer term follow up in country of origin.

The third expert seminar will take place in Tallinn in September 2010. As mentioned, there will be brief reports from each of the three expert seminars and a final project report will be launched in Autumn 2010.

Annex 1

Seminar programme

Programme

*Child trafficking – children in migration – children in the asylum system
- Information and intelligence management -*

Tuesday the 15th of June

- 9.00 – 9.30** **Coffee and registration**
- 9.30** **Welcome Ms. Bente Ingvarsen**, Director for Domestic Programme, Save the Children Denmark.
- 9.45 – 10.00** **Introduction to the BSR IMPT project. Mr Lars Lööf**, Head of Children’s Unit, Council of the Baltic Sea States, Secretariat.
- 10.00 – 10.45** **Challenges in protection of children in migration.** Introduction to the discussion by **Ms. Lise Bruun**, the Separated Children in Europe Programme/Save the Children Denmark.
- 10.45 – 11.00** **Coffee**
- 11.00 – 12.30** **Young people in asylum centres. A look at situations that have given cause for concern.** Introduction to the discussion by **Mr. Thomas Gittrich**, Bundesfachverband UMF, Germany.
- 12.30 – 13.30** **Lunch**
- 13.30 – 15.00** **Unaccompanied asylum seeking young persons and the possible risks of exploitation.** Introduction to the discussion by **Ms Beatrice Bernotiene**, Refugee reception centre, Lithuania. Additional introduction by **Ms Mechthild Maurer**, ECPAT Germany.
- 15.00 – 15.15** **Stretch of legs and coffee/fruit**
- 15.45 – 17.00** **Unaccompanied asylum seeking children – Protection services, reception centres.** Introduction to the discussion by **Mr. Casper Smidt**, Danish Red Cross.
- 19.00** **Dinner**

Wednesday the 16th of June

- 9.30 – 10.30** **Migration authorities and their view on risks of trafficking of children in connection with migration.** Introduction by **Ms. Gunnel Svedberg**, Swedish Board of Migration.
- 10.30 – 10.45** **Coffee**
- 10.45 – 11.30** **Challenges in collecting information for national referral mechanisms.** Introduction by **Ms Hanne Mainz**, Danish Centre against Human Trafficking.
- 11.30 – 12.15** **Discussion and conclusions. Recommendations and gaps where more knowledge is necessary.** Discussion moderated by **Mr Morten Hjorth Jahnsen**
- 12.15** **Closing words and future actions in the BSR IMPT project.** **Mr Lars Lööf**, Head of Children’s Unit, CBSS Secretariat.
- 12.30** **Lunch**
- Departure**