

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), selection of relevant and recent passages from published reports related to Denmark

fra.europa.eu

15 October 2020, Vienna

References to Denmark marked in **bold**. NB: any footnotes in the original texts have been omitted from this overview. Furthermore, many reports contain relevant graphs and figures, which haven't been included in this document.

Contents

Data Explorers and Tools.....	3
Annual Reports.....	3
Fundamental Rights Report 2020.....	3
2. Equality and non-discrimination.....	3
3. Racism, xenophobia and related intolerances.....	3
6. Information society, privacy and data protection.....	4
7. Rights of the Child.....	4
9. Developments in the implementation of the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities.....	5
Fundamental Rights Report 2019.....	5
3. Equality and non-discrimination.....	5
4. Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance.....	6
6. Asylum, visas, migration, borders and integration.....	6
7. Information society, privacy and data protection.....	6
8. Rights of the Child.....	7
9. Access to justice.....	7
10. Developments in the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.....	8
Thematic Reports.....	8
Business and human rights – access to remedy (October 2020).....	8
Antisemitism: Overview of antisemitic incidents in the European Union 2009 – 2019 (September 2020).....	9
Strong and effective National Human Rights Institutions – challenges, promising practices and opportunities (September 2020).....	9

What do rights mean for people in the EU? - Fundamental Rights Survey (June 2020).....	10
A long way to go for LGBTI equality (May 2020).....	11
Criminal detention conditions in the European Union: rules and reality (December 2019).....	12
Beyond the peak: challenges remain, but migration numbers drop (March 2019).....	12
Experiences and perceptions of antisemitism – Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU (December 2018).....	13
Hate crime recording and data collection practice across the EU (June 2018).....	13
Migration to the EU: five persistent challenges (February 2018).....	14
Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey - Main results (December 2017)...	14

Data Explorers and Tools

In addition to the relevant passages from recent FRA publications that are presented in this submission, valuable information can be found in the **data explorers** on FRA's website (available at <https://fra.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/data-and-maps>), which allows the comparison of results from some of FRA's research for all EU Member States, including **Denmark**:

- [Forced return monitoring systems – State of play in EU Member States](#) (last updated July 2020)
- [EU LGBTI Survey data explorer](#) (last updated May 2020)
- [Minimum age requirements related to rights of the child in the EU](#) (last updated October 2018)
- [Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey \(EU MIDIS II\) data explorer](#) (last updated December 2017)
- [Mapping child protection systems in the EU](#) (last updated August 2015)
- [Mapping victims' right and support in the EU](#) (last updated April 2014)
- [Violence against women survey data explorer](#) (last updated March 2014)

In addition to the data explorers, the FRA website also offers the [European Union Fundamental Rights Information System \(EFRIS\)](#). EFRIS is a Human Rights Gateway, bringing together data and information from existing human rights databases, and enables viewing and analysis of relevant assessments of fundamental rights in the EU.

Annual Reports

Fundamental Rights Report 2020

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/fundamental-rights-report-2020>

2. Equality and non-discrimination

"The **Danish** Ministry of Children and Education and the Danish Film Institute have funded a project of LGBT-**Denmark** and "*Ungdomsbyen*", which develops educational material focusing on gender, body and sexuality. The programme is called LARM ('noise'), an acronym for equality, recognition, rights and citizenship. The material aims to help pupils and teachers alike tackle the issues of gender, body and sexuality, as well as LGBTI+ rights and sexual orientation. It particularly focuses on minorities, family life and diversity in society and the classroom." (p.46)

3. Racism, xenophobia and related intolerances

"At national level, various court decisions further clarified that the right to freedom of expression and speech does not protect online hate speech. They condemned incitement to hatred and violence. In **Denmark**, the Eastern High Court considered some discriminatory video statements by a politician and founder of the far-right wing party Hard Line, recorded in front of the residence of an activist of African descent. The court found that these were not protected by freedom of speech. It concluded that the statements were not part of an objective political debate, because of their character and where they were expressed." (p.65)

“In 2019, several EU projects funded by the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme 2014-2020 developed multilingual tools and guidance for policymakers at national, regional and local level to address hate crime. These include:

- Network of Cooperation against Hate (NEw CHapter) – **Denmark**, [...]
 - o A manual of good practices against hate, with focus on youth
 - o NEw CHapter platform, listing tools to combat hate speech

For more information, see the website of NEw CHapter: NEtwork of Cooperation against Hate.”
(p.69)

6. Information society, privacy and data protection

“The rising awareness of the GDPR affected the workload of data protection supervisory authorities (SAs). They are the enforcers of data protection at national level. Under the GDPR’s new consistency and cooperation mechanism, these authorities are, according to the European Commission, “key drivers to the consistent applications of the new rules” across all Member States. In 2019, all SAs noticed high increases in the numbers of complaints, evaluations and investigations. SAs from **Denmark**, Finland and Sweden, for instance, reported between 150 % and 300 % more initiated or processed cases.” (p.144)

“Potential issues of discrimination and privacy emerged in certain public sectors, such as employment, education, migration and welfare. In **Denmark**, the Minister of Employment introduced a draft bill on active employment efforts. It presents a “digital clarification and dialogue tool” that job centres and unemployment funds can use. Algorithms that the public administration uses have already raised some concerns, specifically a test analysis measuring an individual’s risk of becoming long-term unemployed. The **Danish** Data Protection Agency stated that this tool complies with the relevant requirements of the GDPR, as it will only support decision-making by case handlers. However, the **Danish** supervisor also stated that it would be important to regularly evaluate the tool’s use to ensure the continued relevance of the variables used and to ensure that using the tool continues to be relevant and justified.” (p.148)

“Eighteen Member States have not updated their legal framework since the invalidation of the Data Retention Directive. Among them, **Denmark**, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg and the Netherlands have pending legislative reforms of the current data retention scheme, most of them on hold until the CJEU sheds new light on this issue [...].” (p.155)

7. Rights of the Child

“Compared to 2017, AROPE rates [(at risk of poverty or social exclusion EU indicator)] increased in 2018 – slightly but perceptibly – in some Member States with generally low AROPE rates. In Belgium, **Denmark**, Finland, France, Slovakia, Sweden and the United Kingdom, data show an increase of 0.7 to 2.5 percentage points” (p.167)

“The Procedural Safeguards Directive is legally binding on all EU Member States except **Denmark** and Ireland. Still, in **Denmark**, a new law on juvenile justice entered into force in January 2019, aimed at strengthening procedural rights of children. Among other things, it establishes a Juvenile Delinquency Board. The board is competent to decide on targeted individual social measures for children and juveniles aged 10 to 17 who are suspected of (ages 10-14) or sentenced for (ages 15-17) serious criminal offences. The board hearings do not constitute or replace a criminal process and the

board cannot impose criminal sanctions. Rather, in dialogue with the child or the juvenile and the custody holders and other resource persons, the board decides on social measures with the aim of preventing the child or the juvenile from following a criminal path.” (pp.170-171)

“Most Member States have set 14 years as the age of criminal responsibility. A few Member States have set it at 15 years: Czechia, **Denmark**, Finland, Poland and Sweden.” (p.171)

Other Member States have started consultations on the [Audiovisual Media Services] directive or drafted legislative amendments, such as **Denmark**, Finland, Ireland, Latvia, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom.” (p.173)

9. Developments in the implementation of the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities

“In 2020, **Denmark** is also introducing the concept of the right to reasonable accommodation in early childhood education and care.” (p.220)

Fundamental Rights Report 2019

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2019/fundamental-rights-report-2019>

3. Equality and non-discrimination

“National actions plans to improve the security, welfare and equal opportunities for LGBTI persons were adopted in Belgium, **Denmark**, Luxembourg, Portugal, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.” (p.67)

“**Denmark** amended its Criminal Code to ban wearing in public clothing that conceals the face. This would make it illegal for Muslim women to wear burkas and niqabs in public.” (p.71)

“Research carried out in Austria, **Denmark**, Slovakia and the United Kingdom consistently shows that a significant number of LGBT people are still reluctant to be open at work regarding their sexual orientation and/or gender identity; frequently experience discriminatory situations ranging from jokes and insults to harassment, non-promotion or being fired; and tend not to report these situations. Moreover, trans persons indicate that they experience discrimination at comparably higher rates and are less likely to report such incidents.” (p.74)

“Education also featured prominently in studies on discrimination. It drew attention from equality bodies and public authorities in Belgium, Cyprus, **Denmark**, the Netherlands and Portugal.” (p.75)

“[...] a study on the situation of children with disabilities in private schools carried out by the **Danish** Institute for Human Rights found, among other things, that children with disabilities at private schools are 31 % more likely to move to a public school than classmates without a disability. The study recommends that the Ministry of Education ensure inspections of how private schools comply with the prohibition of discrimination, including in cases of exclusion, and that the **Danish** Parliament introduce a legal obligation to provide reasonable accommodation to children with disabilities in the educational system.” (p.75)

4. Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance

“The municipality of Copenhagen in cooperation with the associations Horesta and **Denmark’s Restaurants and Cafés** (*Danmarks Restauranter og Caféter*), representing **Danish** restaurants, cafés and nightclubs, among others, has developed a training course for bouncers, security guards and other staff at nightclubs, bars and restaurants. The course provides tools to help the participants deal with situations in which guests may experience discrimination, avoid these situations completely, and de-escalate any potential conflicts.” (p.90)

“Equality bodies are crucial in helping ethnic minorities to access justice and seek redress. Yet, overall, only 46 % of the 5,803 respondents of African descent involved in FRA’s EU-MIDIS II survey said they knew of at least one equality body in the country they live in, with notable differences between countries, as reported in the FRA publication *Being black in the EU*. The highest levels of awareness of such bodies are in Ireland (67 %), the United Kingdom (65 %) and **Denmark** (62 %) [...]” (p.96)

6. Asylum, visas, migration, borders and integration

“Five EU Member States (Austria, **Denmark**, France, Germany and Sweden) as well as Norway continue to check people crossing internal borders within the Schengen area, as exceptionally allowed by the Schengen Borders Code (Regulation (EU) No. 2016/399).⁵⁹ Such controls may negatively affect the exercise of different Charter rights, such as the freedom to conduct a business (Article 16), the right to respect for private and family life (Article 7), or citizens’ right to free movement under Article 45 of the Charter.” (p.135)

7. Information society, privacy and data protection

“At national level, most research and analysis [in the area of artificial intelligence] launched in 2018 focused on the economic opportunities for each country: seven Member States [...] dedicated their initiatives to the evaluation of the impacts on the industry or the labour market; six Member States (Austria, **Denmark**, Finland, France, Sweden and the United Kingdom) on the need to reinforce research and education; and 13 Member States focused on the impact of AI on dedicated sectors [...]” (p. 158)

“Some Member States, however, were notable exceptions, and conducted in-depth analyses of the potential ethical impacts of artificial intelligence. These included **Denmark**, Finland, France, Germany, Poland and the United Kingdom. [...] In **Denmark**, the **Danish** Expert Group on Data Ethics (SIRI Commission) delivered nine recommendations to the **Danish** government on how to empower consumers and tech-workers as well as on how to make data ethics a competitive advantage for businesses. The **Danish** government is translating the recommendations into a range of concrete policy initiatives, e.g. 1) the establishment of a data ethics council with the task of advising the government on data ethical questions, 2) the cooperation with industry bodies to explore the possibility of creating a national seal for digital security and responsible data use that will increase transparency and make it easier for consumers to choose companies that live up to certain security and ethics standards, and 3) a new requirement that the largest **Danish** companies disclose their data ethics policies as part of their annual management reports. Furthermore, the SIRI Commission’s fourth thematic report on AI, media and democracy dealt with the ethical implications and dilemmas of AI. The report recommended, among others, that privacy by design should be applied in AI innovation, that companies, organisations and authorities should develop ethical principles for dealing with data with more safeguards than the legislative requirements, that targeted work should be initiated to reduce problematic bias in data, and that equality issues should be considered in the development and design of AI services and systems.” (p.158)

“In Austria, **Denmark**, Finland, Germany and the United Kingdom, new research centres will expressly include legal issues and/or ethics in their mandate. [...] In **Denmark**, CREDI (Centre for Law and Digitisation) was established in 2018 with the aim of assessing the legal aspects of the digital society and analysing the links between technology, digitalisation and law.” (p.159)

“Both legislation and case law in Member States regarding data retention and access still remain very diverse. Some Member States made efforts during 2018 to align their law with the judgments of the CJEU. [...] In the Netherlands and **Denmark**, legislative initiatives were pending at the end of 2018 to address the issues raised by the CJEU.” (p. 163)

8. Rights of the Child

“The AROPE rate [(the percentage of children at risk of poverty or social exclusion)] in 2017 ranges from around 15 % for children in Czechia, **Denmark**, Finland and Slovenia to more than 30 % in Spain, Lithuania, Hungary and Italy, 36 % in Greece, and almost 42 % in Bulgaria and Romania.” (p. 179)

“At the international level, 2018 was the first year the Committee on the Rights of the Child took decisions based on the individual complaints framework established in the Third Optional Protocol to the CRC.⁴⁸ Fifteen EU Member States have now ratified the protocol (Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, **Denmark**, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain).” (p.183)

“Two of the three decisions that the committee took during 2018 concerned children in migration. In the case of *I.A.M. (on behalf of K.Y.M.) v. Denmark*, the committee held that the State had violated the girl’s rights to protection from all forms of violence (Article 19 of the CRC) and to have her best interests (Article 3 of the CRC) be a primary consideration. The case concerned the decision to deport a girl to her country of origin, where she could face the risk of female genital mutilation.” (p.183)

“Even though all EU Member States provide for legal aid for child suspects/offenders without an explicit minimum age requirement, in the majority of Member States (17) legal aid is dependent on income requirements. Belgium, Bulgaria, **Denmark**, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Romania, Sweden and the United Kingdom provide legal aid for children without any income requirements.” (p.187)

9. Access to justice

“Although **Denmark** is not bound by the Victims’ Rights Directive, on 1 April 2018 new legislation improving the rights of victims of sexual violence entered into force there. The legislation removes the statutory limitation for criminal liability in cases of sexual abuse of children, and abolishes the time limit for claims for compensation based on breaches of statutory obligations by public authorities towards persons under the age of 18 in connection with a sexual offence. In addition, the legislation increases compensation of victims in cases of sexual crimes by a third, and two thirds in rape cases. It also introduced a requirement of a minimum of DKK 150,000 in compensation in cases of severe sexual abuse.” (p.207)

“In 2018, several Member States took measures to align their legislation with the [Istanbul] convention requirements. [...] Relevant legislative initiatives are currently pending in **Denmark** and Finland.” (p.210)

“The **Danish** legislature amended the **Danish** Criminal Code to require courts to increase sanctions by a third in cases of female genital mutilation. This amendment came in the wake of a controversial case in which the High Court of Western **Denmark** imposed a sentence of nine months’ imprisonment on parents who had arranged the circumcision of their daughters. On 2 May 2018, the Supreme Court increased the punishment to one-and-a-half years’ imprisonment.” (p.210)

“Certain negative developments outraged the public in a number of Member States. In **Denmark**, on 14 September 2018, the district court in Herning acquitted four men of rape (appeal pending). The woman who reported the rape claimed that she had been drugged and abused; however, the jury was unable to conclude that the men knew she did not consent. The Danish Criminal Code, section 216, currently criminalises intercourse forced by use of violence, threats of violence or coercion, rather than on the basis of a lack of consent. Various actors have argued that the provision currently leads to too many acquittals, and should be reformed.” (pp. 211-212)

10. Developments in the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

“Several Member States took the opportunity to go beyond the minimum standards set out in the [Web Accessibility] directive in their transposition legislation. Similar proposals to include private schools and day-care services were made during parliamentary discussions of the proposed transposition legislation in **Denmark**. However, these suggestions were rejected and do not feature in the bill adopted by the parliament unanimously in May.” (p.228)

“In cases where strategies are not in place, disabled persons’ organisations (DPOs) and persons with disabilities took action to demand them. In September, 60 organisations, including the **Danish** Institute for Human Rights and Disabled People’s Organisations **Denmark**, sent a letter to the Minister of Children and Social Affairs, encouraging the minister to produce a national disability action plan. The letter calls for an action plan that would cover all types of disability, is based on the CRPD, contains measurable goals and produces a body of statistical data in the area of disability.” (p.232)

Thematic Reports

Business and human rights – access to remedy (October 2020)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/business-human-rights-remedies>

“Across the EU-27, 54 % of the respondents indicate that the last time they experienced consumer fraud was when ordering online, over the internet or by email, while 28 % have experienced consumer fraud in a shop. The results vary significantly among EU countries – for instance, in **Denmark**, France and Germany, at least two thirds of instances of consumer fraud happen when ordering online, while in Bulgaria and Greece more than 60 % happen when buying something in a shop. These results could reflect differences in online penetration and consumer habits in EU countries, but the research methodology could also influence them, as in 10 Member States respondents were asked to fill out the questionnaire online.” (p. 32)

“Since 2013, 15 of the 27 EU Member States have adopted NAPs on business and human rights, namely Belgium, Czechia, **Denmark**, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden. Other Member States, such as Greece, Latvia

and Portugal, are in the process of adopting one or have committed to doing so.” (p. 88)

Antisemitism: Overview of antisemitic incidents in the European Union 2009 – 2019 (September 2020)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/antisemitism-overview-2009-2019>

This annual overview provides an update of the most recent figures on antisemitic incidents, covering the period 1 January 2009 – 31 December 2019, across the EU Member States, where data are available. Data for **Denmark** can be found on page 38.

"[...] among the EU-27, the highest values of comfort with having a Jewish person as a neighbour are found in **Denmark**, Luxembourg, Sweden and the Netherlands." (p.9)

"Other countries that provided information to FRA but have not been listed by the IHRA as countries that have adopted or endorsed the IHRA [(International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance)] definition are Croatia, **Denmark** and Estonia. In Estonia, the IHRA definition has been discussed and endorsed by the relevant national institutions as a valuable tool and all relevant officials have signalled their readiness to use the definition as appropriate. [...] In **Denmark**, as a part of the national action plan currently under development, a national definition of antisemitism will be adopted. In this context, the IHRA working definition is expected to form the basis of the national definition." (p.93)

Strong and effective National Human Rights Institutions – challenges, promising practices and opportunities (September 2020)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/strong-effective-nhris>

"Among the institutions covered in this report, 15 seek to ensure pluralism through the composition of their decision-making collegial bodies – the commission-type NHRIs. Figure 9 provides an overview by country and institution. Pluralistic representation is further enhanced in some of these institutions through additional advisory bodies. Such bodies can have a broader scope, as in the case of **Denmark** and the Netherlands, or a more targeted one, for example in Belgium and the United Kingdom, where advisory bodies are established to deal with issues related to disabilities." (p. 49)

"The findings of FRA's questionnaire sent to NHRIs show that almost all institutions address their annual reports to parliaments; however, these reports are not always subject to parliamentary discussion, which limits their visibility and impact. Such a discussion is obligatory only in the case of 12 NHRIs [...]. In six NHRIs [...] a discussion of NHRI reports is not obligatory but usually takes place in practice. In **Denmark**, reports – if they are to be discussed by parliament – are considered by a standing committee, not in a plenary session." (p. 56)

"All NHRIs monitor follow-up and implementation of recommendations to some extent. NHRIs covered by this report publish data and information on the acceptance of their recommendations by relevant authorities, for instance through follow-up on opinions (France), projects (the Netherlands) or special reports (North Macedonia). More frequently, this information is included in annual reports or other communication tools, for example in Austria, Cyprus, **Denmark**, Finland, Greece, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia and Slovenia." (p. 67)

“NHRIs’ experience shows that national authorities may consult NHRIs when preparing or reviewing their SDG strategies, policies and action plans (e.g. Romania); include NHRIs in bodies that observe SDG implementation (Slovakia); include them in stakeholder consultations when preparing their voluntary national reporting, issuing general opinions, highlighting the human rights standards and the most important recommendations for the SDGs (Hungary); or establishing collaboration between statistical offices and NHRIs (**Denmark**, Hungary and Scotland).” (p. 86)

“FRA enquired about the extent to which NHRIs covered by this report have the powers to intervene in proceedings before constitutional or equivalent level courts at national level. The aim was to clarify whether an NHRI has this potential, in law or practice and, if in law, if it is explicit or even an obligation under the NHRI’s mandate. In 11 of the 30 countries, no mandates for intervention in constitutional court proceedings existed. The NHRIs in three countries had the potential to do so in practice (Belgium, **Denmark**, France and Hungary).” (p. 87)

What do rights mean for people in the EU? - Fundamental Rights Survey (June 2020) <https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/fundamental-rights-survey-trust>

“One in four people (27 %) in the EU think that, in their country, judges are ‘never’ or ‘rarely’ able to do their job free from government influence. The results range from 47 % in Croatia to 11 % in both **Denmark** and Finland.” (p. 15)

“Nonetheless, some two in three people (68 %) in the EU ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ with the statement ‘Some people take unfair advantage of human rights’. Agreement ranges from 90 % in Malta, 82 % in Croatia and 81 % in Bulgaria, to 57 % in Italy, 60 % in **Denmark**, and 61 % in Luxembourg, Romania and Sweden.” (p. 21)

“When asked whether ‘everyone in their country enjoys the same basic human rights’, about half (52 %) of people in the EU-27 ‘strongly agree’ or ‘tend to agree’ that this is the case. However, the results differ markedly between EU Member States (Figure 2). Highest levels of agreement with this statement can be found in the Netherlands and Sweden (both 79 %), **Denmark** (78 %) and Luxembourg (72 %). The lowest agreement is found in Cyprus (12 %), Croatia (23 %), Hungary and Spain (both 34 %), and Malta (35 %).”

“In some of the countries with the highest shares of people believing that everyone in the country enjoys the same basic rights, a particularly high percentage also say that human rights abuses happen elsewhere – that they are a problem in some countries but not really a problem in their country. The highest percentage of people in the EU who ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ with this statement is in **Denmark** and Luxembourg (both 67 %), followed by Austria (61 %), Sweden and Poland (both 54 %) (Figure 4).” (p. 24)

“When presented with the negative statement “Human rights are meaningless to me in everyday life”, one in five people in the EU-27 said that they ‘strongly agree’ or ‘tend to agree’. Meanwhile, 64 % ‘tend to disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’ with the statement. Agreeing with this statement is much more common in some EU Member States – 39 % in Slovakia, 33 % in Romania, and 32 % in both Latvia and **Denmark**.” (p. 27)

“On average, the majority of people in the EU (60 %) ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ that “mainstream parties and politicians do not care about people like me” (Figure 13). The results are almost the same for women (59 %) and men (60 %). In the survey, this view comes across most often in Croatia,

France, North Macedonia, Romania and Slovakia. On the other hand, **Denmark**, Finland and Sweden have the lowest shares of people who ‘agree’ or ‘agree strongly’ with this statement.” (p. 38)

“The results for the EU-27 do not differ based on gender (women – 59 %, men 60 %), and examined at the country level, the differences between women and men are small in most countries. Notable exceptions from this are **Denmark** and Finland, where a higher percentage of men say that mainstream parties and politicians don’t care about ‘people like me’. In **Denmark**, 36 % of men have this view, compared with 24 % of women, while the results in Finland are 38 % for men and 26 % for women.” (p. 39)

“The lowest concern for political intimidation is indicated in Portugal, **Denmark** and Cyprus. An analysis of sociodemographic characteristics – such as gender and age – does not show major differences between various socio-demographic profiles in terms of fearing political intimidation.” (p. 41)

“Examined from a different perspective, the results show that in **Denmark**, Finland and Sweden, 30 % of people or more in each country think that judges are always able to do their job without government influencing them.” (p. 42)

“People in **Denmark** and the Netherlands show the lowest levels of such concern in the EU, with just under one in five believing that a person who belongs to the political party in power would have better chances of being hired or promoted (Figure 19).” (p. 45)

A long way to go for LGBTI equality (May 2020)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/eu-lgbti-survey-results>

A country sheet with the results for **Denmark** is available at:

https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/lgbti-survey-country-data_denmark.pdf

(also annexed to this submission)

“The highest share of respondents who are very open about being LGBTI is found in **Denmark** (45 %) and the Netherlands (43 %).” (p.25)

“In 12 survey countries, 10 % or less of respondents say that they never avoid holding their same-sex partner’s hands in public. In seven countries, between 20 % and 26 % of respondents say they would never avoid such behaviour. The number is highest in Luxembourg (26 %), followed by Malta (25 %), Czechia and Finland (both 24 %), Austria and **Denmark** (both 22 %), and Sweden (20 %).” (p.25)

“Overall, the LGBTI survey shows that life satisfaction of LGBTI respondents across the EU averages 6.5. Gay men and lesbian women have the highest average satisfaction levels at 6.7. Trans and intersex respondents have the lowest: both 5.6. There are considerable country differences. For example, respondents living in the Netherlands, **Denmark** and Austria are on average more satisfied with their lives (7.1).” (p.28)

“The highest proportion of LGBTI respondents raising children with a partner are found in **Denmark** (21 %), Ireland (20 %), the Netherlands (19 %) and Sweden (19 %). In all of these countries, same-sex couples have a legal right to adopt children.” (p. 30)

“The share of respondents who felt discriminated against when looking for work differs between countries. In the EU, the shares of respondents who felt discriminated against were highest in

Greece (19 %), Cyprus (18 %) and Bulgaria (17 %). They were lowest in **Denmark** and Sweden (both 5 %), as well as in Finland and the Netherlands (both 6 %).” (p.32)

“The share of respondents who felt discriminated against at work is consistently higher than those who felt discriminated against when looking for a job. However, this share also varies between countries. [...] The lowest proportions did so in Czechia, Finland and the Netherlands (all 13 %), as well as in **Denmark** and Luxembourg (both 14 %).” (p.32)

“Reporting rates of hate-motivated harassment to the police are low across all EU Member States. They range from 6 % in the United Kingdom, Malta and **Denmark**; 2 % in Cyprus, Czechia and Luxembourg; to 1 % in Slovakia.” (p.46)

“Overall, one in three respondents (33 %) indicated that they often or always avoid certain places or locations for fear of being assaulted, threatened or harassed because of being LGBTI. Meanwhile, 36 % said they avoid them on rare occasions, and 31 % that they never avoid them (Figure 21). The results show large differences between Member States. For example, 40 % or more of respondents in Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia, Lithuania, Hungary and France indicate that they often or always avoid certain places or locations for fear of being assaulted, threatened or harassed. By comparison, under 20 % of respondents do so in **Denmark**, Luxembourg, Austria and Finland.” (pp. 48-49)

Criminal detention conditions in the European Union: rules and reality (December 2019)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2019/criminal-detention-conditions-european-union-rules-and-reality>

“Access to showers and hot water is regulated in 26 EU Member States. Two Member States (Germany and **Denmark**) have no specific regulation on access to showers in place.” (p.24)

“FRA’s research findings show that 24 EU Member States (all but Belgium, Czechia, **Denmark** and Germany) have laws or rules and regulations in place establishing at least the general minimum national standards with regard to access to sanitary facilities – in particular to toilets.” (p.24)

“**Denmark** and Germany do not explicitly regulate the issues of access to sanitary facilities in their national legislation, but they do follow certain minimum conditions.” (p.25)

Beyond the peak: challenges remain, but migration numbers drop (March 2019)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2019/beyond-peak-challenges-remain-migration-numbers-drop>

“In addition, in 2018, at least Austria, **Denmark**, Italy, Hungary and Sweden introduced various restrictions regarding the residence permits granted to beneficiaries of international protection. France, on the other hand, extended the validity of residence permits for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection from one to four years.” (p.19)

“The **Danish** Parliament adopted an amendment to the Danish Aliens Act, restricting the granting of permanent-residence permits for foreigners who actively interfered with the clarification of their identity while applying for a residence permit.” (p.19)

“In 2016, Austria and **Denmark** introduced a three-year waiting period for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection before they can reunite with their families. In 2018, Austria, **Denmark** and Germany introduced even further restrictions.” (p.20)

“The **Danish** government proposed a bill that would allow immigration authorities to postpone the processing of family reunification cases for up to four months in case of a sudden increase of requests.” (p.20)

Experiences and perceptions of antisemitism – Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU (December 2018)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/experiences-and-perceptions-antisemitism-second-survey-discrimination-and-hate>

A country sheet with the results for **Denmark** is available at:

https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2019-2nd-survey-on-discrimination-and-hate-crime-against-jews-in-eu-ms-country-sheet-denmark_en.pdf

(also annexed to this submission)

Hate crime recording and data collection practice across the EU (June 2018)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/hate-crime-recording-and-data-collection-practice-across-eu>

This report provides detailed information on hate crime recording and data collection systems across the EU, including any systemic cooperation with civil society. Data for **Denmark** can be found on pages 41 – 42.

“The comparative analysis of the legal framework shows that 13 Member States (Austria, Cyprus, **Denmark**, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Romania, Spain and Sweden,) treat bias motivation as a general aggravating circumstance; 7 provide for specific aggravating circumstances regarding certain substantive offences (Belgium, Bulgaria, Greece, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia); 3 have a combination of both general and specific (Croatia, the Czech Republic, United Kingdom); and 5 have no such provision (Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland).” (p. 103)

“Twenty-two Member States have included “sexual orientation” as a protected characteristic: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, **Denmark**, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom.” (p. 103)

“In addition, five Member States include an open-ended clause as a complement to the protected grounds explicitly mentioned. This makes it possible to also consider as hate crimes offences with bias motivation that target other characteristics. This is the case in the Czech Republic (“or other similar hatred”); **Denmark** (“or the like”); Finland (“or by similar grounds”); Slovenia (“or any other circumstances”); and Sweden (“or other similar circumstances”).” (p.106)

Migration to the EU: five persistent challenges (February 2018)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/five-persistent-migration-challenges>

“At the end of 2017, sufficient reception capacity was available in many EU Member States – for example, in Austria, Bulgaria, **Denmark**, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, and Slovakia.³⁵ Bulgaria, for example, had previously faced issues with overcrowding. The lower number of arrivals prompted the closure of reception centres in some EU Member States. Closures were reported in **Denmark**, Finland, Germany, Hungary and Sweden.” (p. 8)

“In most EU Member States, reception places for unaccompanied children were sufficiently available due to a drop in new arrivals. Several child reception facilities closed down in Austria, **Denmark**, Finland, the Netherlands and Sweden. Children had to move to other locations, resulting in a change of their known environment, including schools and guardians; interruptions in the provision of mental health care; and difficulties for their wellbeing and integration prospects.” (p. 14)

“In **Denmark** and in the Netherlands, some unaccompanied children stayed in adult facilities. In two cases in **Denmark**, child siblings were separated and placed into different accommodation centres when one of them turned 17.” (p.14)

“EU law regulates family reunification for refugees – but not for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection – in the Family Reunification Directive (2003/86/ EC). Legal and practical barriers to family reunification for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection were a great concern for unaccompanied children in several EU Member States. [...] In Austria and **Denmark**, family reunification for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection was only granted after three years.” (p. 16)

“Asylum seekers and returnees must as a rule be placed in specialised detention facilities. Inadequate conditions were observed in certain detention and/or pre-removal facilities in Bulgaria, **Denmark**, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy and Spain.” (p.19)

“The **Danish** Helsinki Committee for Human Rights deemed the conditions at the departure centre Kærshovedgård worse than in prison and the Association of Immigration Lawyers plans to challenge the legality of the conditions.” (p.19)

Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey - Main results (December 2017)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2017/second-european-union-minorities-and-discrimination-survey-main-results>

A country sheet with the results for **Denmark** is available at:

https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2019-eu-midis-ii-summary-results-country-sheet-denmark_en.pdf (also annexed to this submission)