

The table summarizes the replies provided by EU Member States for the questions no. 10-13¹ from the questionnaire on National Rapporteur or Equivalent Mechanism

10. Would you welcome stronger support in the field of coordination of anti-trafficking activities on the EU level?
 10.1. If yes, please describe what kind of support you consider to be the most important? (E. g. coordination of the preventative activities in source countries).
11. Would you welcome the establishment of a network of National Rapporteurs or equivalent institutions on the EU level?
 11.1. What should the network deal with?
 11.1.1. Regular meetings and information exchange.
 11.1.2. Coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries.
 11.1.3. Any other suggestions?
 11.2. How often should the network hold the meetings?
12. Would you welcome any kind of EU Rapporteur or equivalent mechanism as well?
13. Do you have some recommendations, lessons learned, best practice, suggestions for countries, which have not as yet established the National Rapporteur or equivalent mechanism?

	EU MS	Question no. 10	Question no. 11	Question no. 12	Question no. 13
1.	A U S T R I A	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Austria considers it as extremely important to set-up coordination and cooperation mechanisms at EU level in order to ensure common standards for combating THB across the EU.</p> <p>The Network should be chaired by an EU Coordinator, not Rapporteur (a Rapporteur is an independent body while a Coordinator "coordinates" national and EU policies).</p>	<p>Regular meetings of National Rapporteurs and Coordinators should take place in order to better coordinate national Anti-THB policies.</p> <p>Regular meetings should also deal with these aspects and (in a further step) it could be considered to start a dialogue of the network with representatives of source countries.</p> <p>After standardizing THB data collection on EU level, the network should discuss analyzed data on THB including trafficking flows and trends in EU MS.</p>	<p>The Network should be chaired by an EU Coordinator, not Rapporteur (a Rapporteur is an independent body while a Coordinator "coordinates" national and EU policies).</p>	

¹ Working Document by the Czech Republic, Multidisciplinary Group on Organized Crime, Brussels, 1th December, 2008.

			Depending on current challenges and tasks 2 to 4 times per year (min. one meeting per EU presidency).		
2.	B E L G I U M	<p>In our view, the issues with regards to which we have most expectations concern questions such as sanctions for coacceptants in the field of trafficking of human beings on a European level, the establishment of "hotline" systems (what is the experience from abroad) or even the evaluation of the impact of preventive campaigns, especially in countries of origin.</p> <p>The export of the consensus on the minimum common denominator of sentences outside the EU is also an important principle of basic international harmonization. Finally, we have to bear in mind questions linked to measures which aim to reduce demand for easily exploitable persons. International cooperation, and especially possibilities of seizure abroad, should be reinforced.</p>	<p>We can consider the establishment of a network as a positive measure, however, we would need to clarify, first of all, what we understand by the term national rapporteur and their mission. Furthermore, the same questions should be clarified with regards to national coordinators. A national rapporteur is not specifically a national coordinator (and vice versa). Whom do we want at the table? National rapporteurs, national coordinators, or both at the same time? And why? Moreover, how is the "national rapporteur" understood in other countries?</p>	<p>Wouldn't such a mechanism double the efforts of the one established by the Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime and on the Financing of Terrorism (Warsaw, 16 May 2005)?</p>	<p>It is important to entrust the mission of the national rapporteur or an equivalent mechanism to an institution or instance which has a certain autonomy, whose missions include evaluation of policies and which can receive the information necessary to execute its missions.</p> <p>Belgium is prepared to bring useful contributions to the conference which will be held on 30 and 31 March in Prague on one of the following subjects figuring in this questionnaire: elaboration of national reports; evaluation methods of policies of pursuit; coordination of policies relating to the fight against trafficking in human beings; establishment of a "national referral mechanism" within the framework of coordination of actors.</p>

3.	B U L G A R I A	<p>The National Commission finds the support in the field of coordination of anti-trafficking activities on EU level as highly needed.</p> <p>Involvement of the countries of destination in the prevention activities - joint informational campaigns between countries of origin and destination.</p> <p>Joint researches and dissemination of information on the latest trends and tendencies regarding human trafficking in countries of origin and destination.</p> <p>Concrete address of the roots of the problem – the demand for sexual services and cheap labor in the destination countries and the recruitment in the countries of origin.</p>	<p>We support the establishment of a network of National Rapporteurs or equivalent institutions on EU level because we believe that the cooperation between countries of origin and countries of destination and the sharing of information is crucial for the successful counteraction of human trafficking within the EU borders.</p> <p>The network should deal with all the issues mentioned in the questionnaire plus Bulgaria would also suggest:</p> <p>Prevention activities in countries of destination;</p> <p>Development of a funding mechanism that can be used for the purposes of cooperation between countries and the prevention of the problem.</p> <p>We suggest the meetings to be scheduled at least twice a year. Considering the main goals (exchange of experience and networking) and the effectiveness/efficiency of the meetings, they could be scheduled quarterly.</p>	<p>The need for establishment of an EU Rapporteur or equivalent mechanism must be assessed very precisely. As long as there is established expert group within the European Commission, the OSCE Rapporteur on THB and a newly established expert group for monitoring of the implementation of the EC Convention – GRETA, the functions of this EU Rapporteur and the relations with other similar structures must be precisely specified.</p>	<p>Considering our experience, the mechanism must be established on the highest possible state level in order to ensure the state involvement in the counteraction of the problem. We would also suggest that in the process of implementation of the national anti-trafficking policy, the experience and professional expertise of the non-governmental organizations have to be used.</p>
4.	C Y P R U S	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Co-ordination of activities concerning the countries of origin, transit and other destination countries.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Regular meetings and information exchange.</p> <p>Coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries.</p> <p>The network shall hold the meetings 2-3 times yearly and when important international or other developments call for a meeting.</p>	<p>Given the fact that Trafficking of Human Beings is a form of organized crime, operated by networks within broader geographic areas not limited by country borders, we consider that the establishment of an EU Rapporteur or equivalent mechanism would consist a positive development.</p>	<p>We consider very important the fact that the establishment of the mechanism is governed by specific legislation. Furthermore, the participation of all State competent Authorities as well as NGOs within this mechanism, the clearly specified competencies and responsibilities, the specified co-operation and co-ordination procedures and finally the legally established reporting to the higher governmental and parliamentary institutions are key factors to the successful accomplishing of the aim of combating THB.</p>

5.	C Z E C H R E P U B L I C	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Support in building channels for cooperation both in EU MS territory and with source countries, exchange of information, data and best practice, call together regular meetings.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Regular meetings in order cooperate and better coordinate anti-trafficking policies, exchange of best practice. Joint preventative campaigns in both source and destination countries.</p> <p>Exchange of results of researches.</p> <p>Identification and joint reaction to the actual trends.</p> <p>Needs and task shall be defined in details by the members of network.</p> <p>Regular meetings, preferably twice a year.</p>	<p>Yes – in terms of together and support for regular meetings of the network, arch over activities of network.</p>	<p>The experience of European Migration Network establishment could be used for the inspiration.</p>
6.	E S T O N I A		<p>Maybe. Depends on how it would be done. Would be probably a good opportunity for exchanging best practices and also information, evaluation methods etc.</p> <p>Regular meetings and information exchange.</p> <p>Probably coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries too.</p> <p>Exchange of research, information, analysis, evaluations of the practices/developments, comparison of legislation in each country.</p> <p>The network shall hold the meetings 2 a year.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>But would it evaluate the work of the EU Group of Experts of national policies/situations? What would be the task of the EU rapporteur? Also compared to GRETA for example?</p>	<p>In case of a small country, it is not practically possible to have a special bureau for a national rapporteur on THB. It is rather important to have a network and someone who coordinates the network, for exchanging information and having a good informal contact with the people. However, there is sometimes not enough resources for conducting analysis or combining the work of coordination and evaluation. Last but not least – there does not seem to be a problem of the independence of dependence of the position.</p>
7.	F R A N C E	<p>Yes, support from European institutions is very useful in the field of THB.</p> <p>France is committed to implementing the works currently underway in the field of THB (application of the European Action Plan, revision of the 2002 framework</p>	<p>Yes, France welcomes the establishment of a European network of National Rapporteurs.</p> <p>France agrees that the network should deal with regular meetings and information exchange and that it should ensure coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries.</p>	<p>Yes, the establishment of a "European" Rapporteur for the purpose of fighting THB would be judicious. Such an institution could particularly take on the coordination of different national rapporteurs and the</p>	

		decisions on the fights against THB and the 2003 framework decisions on the fight against sexual exploitation of children). France also calls for the establishment of a European database concerning THB as well as an active search for EU funding of member states.	France suggests formulating a good practices guide. And members of the network should meet at least once a year.	animation of the "European network of national rapporteurs".	
8.	F I N L A N D		Yes, but coordinate with OSCE and CoE. Regular meetings and information exchange. Coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries. - would be useful but rather the role of Governments than NRs. Twice a year, for instance.	Not sure a new mechanism is needed. Clear focal point in existing EU institutions is nevertheless necessary.	
9.	G E R M A N Y	Yes. As a first step, Germany would very much appreciate regular reports on core data on trafficking in human beings after the model of the BKA-situation report described in the introductory remark.	Yes. As the first step Germany would support regular meetings and information exchange as a task. The network should meet up to two times a year.	Yes, in order to chair the network meetings.	
10.	H U N G A R Y	Yes. Building channels of cooperation with non-EU countries.	Yes. Regular meetings and information exchange. Coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries. Minimum every year.	In a longer run.	
11.	IR LA ND		Ireland's view is that existing co-operation mechanisms should be first evaluated to assess their effectiveness or any changes to their remit before further structures are developed.		No.
12.	L A T V I A	Yes. Latvia welcomes stronger support in the field of coordination of anti-trafficking activities on the EU level and at the same time believes that established mechanism of coordination is well developed. Coordination of the preventive activities at the EU level both in source and destination countries could be the most important support.	Latvia welcomes a proposal on the establishment of a network of National Rapporteurs or equivalent institutions on the EU level, because it will provide more effective mechanism for /model of exchange of information, reporting, cooperation, networking, monitoring of the situation on an ongoing basis towards the identification, development and implementation of concrete activities that have an impact at national and regional level.	The possibility/necessity of establishment any kind of EU Rapporteur or equivalent mechanism should be further discussed and the assessment of added value of such mechanism should be carried out.	

13.	LI TH UA NIA	Yes. Information Exchange, Regular meetings, joint projects etc.	Yes. Regular meetings and information exchange. Coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries. Once per year.	No.	
14.	LU XE MB OU RG	Yes. Luxembourg is persuaded that a general discussion on the different aspects of the problem will be necessary to determine the domains which could fall under coordination.	This is an idea which it will be interesting to discuss further.		
15.	M A L T A	Yes. This is a heinous crime which needs to be tackled with stronger co-operation using best practices. Immediate sharing of information with other countries. Cross border investigations.	We would have no objections to the establishment of such a network, on the understanding that this would not actually oblige Member States to appoint a National Rapporteur. Sharing of information with law enforcement agencies. It might be appropriate to hold meetings on a quarterly basis.	This proposal would certainly be worth looking into.	There are no recommendations to put forward at this point.
16.	N E T H E R L A N D S	Yes. The Netherlands would like to see a more prominent role of the EU in bringing together all the different aspects of human trafficking (immigration, human rights, cooperation external policy, safe return of victims to countries of origin, law enforcement, prevention and victim support etc). A clear description of each others responsibility and role in addressing human trafficking is necessary. A new EU Action Plan could be a good instrument for this. In this action plan emphasis could be on stimulating operational cooperation between law enforcement agencies by stimulating better use of the EU instruments such as COSPOL, Europol (EIS, AWF, OCTA), Eurojust (JITS), Cpol and cooperation with Frontex. Furthermore	Yes (include the OSCE rapporteur). Exchange of information and best practices. As different rapporteurs might have different mandates, joint EU activities might be complicated. Leave it to the Rapporteurs what frequency might be useful and appropriate	No. In order to have a successful EU rapporteur or mechanism all EU member States should have established at national level a Rapporteur or equivalent mechanism. Furthermore we would like to avoid duplication with the OSCE rapporteur Human Trafficking.	Emphasized could be the independency of the National Rapporteur, no operational tasks, good access to available information and multidisciplinary expertise (law enforcement, judicial, immigration, victim assistance, labour regulations, science etc).

		<p>more EU cooperation of ILO's (Immigration Liaison Officers) could be explored. Specific EU emphasis on the different aspects and international cooperation of labour exploitation. Regarding prevention ideas could be discussed to prevent victims from human trafficking coming from third countries entering the EU and explore possible administrative measures that could play an important role in combating human trafficking.</p> <p>Increased cooperation between member states in a safe return of victims of trafficking to countries of origin (explore EU risk assessments, more cooperation in returning victims to countries of origin). Closer cooperation with countries of origin or transit (Ukraine, Western Balkan, West Africa etc.).</p>			
17.	P O L A N D	<p>It seems to be necessary to establish EU platform of exchanging information and experiences about trafficking in human beings (a special group of experts would meet three Times per year).</p> <p>- both preventive actions in the source and destination countries</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Regular meetings and information exchange</p> <p>Coordination of joint preventive activities in source countries.</p> <p>Organizing exchange of Police and Border Guard's officers to gain knowledge about investigation issues and their cooperation with institutions that help victims.</p> <p>Twice a year.</p>	No.	
18.	P O R T U G A L	<p>Yes. In terms of common and share indicators on THB.</p> <p>The comparability of data is quite important to design as effective as possible (considering differences amongst countries), a common action against THB or even to know more about the phenomena.</p> <p>Also in establish a common understand of the phenomena, namely in actions concerning prevention and integration of victims.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Regular meetings and information exchange</p> <p>Coordination of joint preventive activities in source countries.</p> <p>At least twice a year.</p>		According to the proposals from Porto's Declaration.

19.	R O M A N I A	Yes.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Regular meetings and information exchange.</p> <p>Coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries.</p> <p>Establishment of common core criteria for the collection of data and evaluation of the trafficking in persons, drafting recommendations for actions to be undertaken by the EU Member States. At least once every six-month (in coordination with the EU Presidency).</p>	Yes.	
20.	S L O V A K I A	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Provision of subsidies and coordination of preventive actions, as well as enhancement of international cooperation at information exchange on victims, perpetrators and trends of THB.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Regular meetings and information exchange. Coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries.</p> <p>Twice a year.</p>	We do not consider it necessary.	
21.	S L O V E N I A	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Naturally, coordination is vitally important. Slovenia believes that National Coordinators or Rapporteurs should cooperate at the EU level. This is the only way that enables equal level of communication. We would welcome any support in the sense of increasing incentive to cooperation between National Coordinators, i.e. through a coordination mechanism at the EU level. (Perhaps a special working group within the Council of the European Union would be an appropriate form - THB would deserve such attention). It needs to be emphasized that THB field is mainly limited to the IWG and discussed only within the latter.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Regular meetings and information exchange.</p> <p>Coordination of joint preventative activities in source countries.</p> <p>Quarterly.</p>	Yes.	
22.	S W E D E N	No.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>A NR should have the authority to establish cooperation with other NR on Trafficking in Human Beings. Such cooperation could include discussion and development of joint research measures to prevent and suppress trafficking in</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>There is no need for an EU Rapporteur. There are already different functions within the EU including Europol, the EU Commission TRB Expert Group</p>	The OSCE has been working on the issue or establishing National Rapporteurs and there is a lot to learn from their experiences.

			<p>human beings, data sharing about prevention measures, victim protection and repatriation, prosecutions, joint information campaigns, and about law enforcement initiatives. The NR should also be expected to liaison with regional and international initiatives against TRB, including with the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Trafficking in Persons, especially in Women and Children, the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, and other appropriate United Nations bodies, in order to exchange information and, in appropriate cases, collaborate on joint activities.</p>	<p>and the Council of Europe GRETA that carry out some or the necessary functions.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--