**Input by civil society to the**

**2022 Asylum Report**

Dear Colleagues,

The production of the *Asylum Report 2022* is currently underway. The annual [Asylum Report series](https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-knowledge/asylum-report) present a comprehensive overview of developments in the field of asylum at the regional and national levels.

The report includes information and perspectives from various stakeholders, including experts from EU+ countries, civil society organisations, UNHCR and researchers. To this end, we invite you, our partners from civil society, academia and research institutions, to share with us your reporting on developments in asylum law, policy or practice in 2021 (and early 2022) by topic as presented in the online survey.

Please note that the Asylum Report does not seek to describe national systems in detail but rather to present key developments of the past year, including improvements and challenges which remain. Your input can cover practices of a specific EU+ country or the EU as a whole. You can complete all or only some of the sections.

All submissions are publicly accessible. For transparency, 2022 contributions will be published on the EUAA webpage. For reference, contributions to the 2021 Asylum Report by civil society organisations can be accessed [here](https://euaa.europa.eu/acknowledgements-0), under 'Acknowledgements'. All contributions should be appropriately referenced. You may include links to supporting material, such as analytical studies, articles, reports, websites, press releases or position papers. If your organisation does not produce any publications, please make reference to other published materials, such as joint statements issued with other organisations. Some sources of information may be in a language other than English. In this case, please cite the original language and, if possible, provide one to two sentences describing the key messages in English.

The content of the Asylum Report is subject to terms of reference and volume limitations. Contributions from civil society organisations feed into EUAA’s work in multiple ways and inform reports and analyses beyond the Asylum Report.

Your input matters to us and will be much appreciated!

**\***Please submit your contribution to the 2022 Asylum Report by **Monday, 21 February 2022.\***

# Instructions

Before completing the survey, please review the list of topics and types of information that should be included in your submission.

For each response, only include the following type of information:

* New developments and improvements in 2021 and new or remaining challenges; and
* Changes in policies or practices, transposition of legislation or institutional changes during 2021.

Please ensure that your responses remain within the scope of each section. Do not include information that goes beyond the thematic focus of each section or is not related to recent developments

# Contributions by topic

1. **Access to territory and access to asylum procedures (including first arrival to territory and registration, arrival at the border, application of the non-refoulement principle, the right to first response (shelter, food, medical treatment) and issues regarding border guards)**

The state of crisis has been continuously in effect since 9 March 2016 and is currently prolonged until 7 March 2022.

Third country nationals staying unlawfully on the territory of Hungary are removed to the Serbian side of the border fence by the Hungarian authorities without the right to seek asylum and without any procedure, registration or identification (Section 5(1b) of the Act on State Borders). According to the official statistics published by the Police on its website, there were 72787 such measures in 2021. (<http://www.police.hu/hu/hirek-es-informaciok/hatarinfo/illegalis-migracio-alakulasa?weekly_migration_created%5Bmin%5D=2021-01-01+00%3A00%3A00&weekly_migration_created%5Bmax%5D=2022-01-01+00%3A00%3A00> )

The European Commission brought action against Hungary, among others, for this legislation as well at the Court of Justice of the European Union (case no. C-808/18) in which it stated that: “moving third-country nationals staying illegally in Hungary to the other side of the border fence, without respecting the procedures and guarantees laid down in Article 5, Article 6(1), Article 12(1) and Article 13(1) of Directive 2008/115”. On 17 December 2020 Court of Justice of the European Union ruled in this case (case no. C-808/18) that these push-backs measures are in violation of EU law. (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A62018CJ0808>). On 8 October 2021, the ECtHR issued a judgement in the first case against Hungary involving a pushback, finding the breach of the prohibition of collective expulsions enshrined in Article 4 of Protocol 4 of the Convention (Shahzad v. Hungary, Appl. no. 12625/17). Despite these rulings, the Hungarian practice of illegal push-backs continues and in 2021 the number of push-back measures registered by the police reached its peak, by the total of over **72000** such measures. During these measures the excessive use of force is claimed regularly by third-country nationals the HHC has spoken to after their push-back to Serbia.

On 26 May 2020, the Government Decree 233/2020 introduced a new system for seeking asylum in Hungary. (Government Decree 233/2020. (V. 26.) on the rules of the asylum procedure during the state of danger declared in Hungarian: <http://njt.hu/cgi_bin/njt_doc.cgi?docid=219700.383485>. An unofficial English translation: <https://www.helsinki.hu/wp-content/uploads/Government-Decree-no.-233_2020-on-the-rules-of-the-asylum-procedure-during-the-state-of-danger.pdf>) According to the new system, those wishing to seek asylum in Hungary, except for a few exceptions noted below, must personally submit a “statement of intent for the purpose of lodging an asylum application” (hereafter: statement of intent) at the Embassy of Hungary in Belgrade or in Kiev. (Section 1 of Government Decree 292/2020 (VI. 17.)

Only people belonging to the following categories are not required to go through this process (Section 5 (1) of Government Decree 233/2020. (V. 26.) and Section 271 (1) of the Transitional Act.):

* Those having subsidiary protection status and are staying in Hungary
* Family members of refugees and those having subsidiary protection who are staying in Hungary (note that definition of family members is quite narrow, adult children being excluded)
* Those subject to forced measures, measures or punishment affecting personal liberty, except if they have crossed Hungary in an illegal manner.

Those who neither fall under the exempted categories nor are granted the special one-time entry permit at one of the embassies cannot request asylum in Hungary. The rejection is communicated to them through e-mail, containing no reasoning. There were several domestic court judgments founding that the lack of the most basic procedural guarantees, such as the disclosure of the reasoning behind the rejection decision, constitutes such a serious violation of procedural requirements that the asylum authority must conduct a new procedure at the end of which it must provide detailed justification of its decision. The asylum authority to date refuses to implement these judgments (HHC, No access to asylum for 18 months, Hungary’s dysfunctional embassy system in theory and practice, November 2021, <https://bit.ly/3nB6tTG>).

In 2021, according to the information provided by the asylum authority to the HHC in a freedom of information request, 55 statements of intent were submitted at the Belgrade Embassy and 8 applicants received the authorization to travel to Hungary and lodge an asylum application. These severe limitations to access the asylum procedure resulted in an all-time low number of asylum application submitted in 2021, with the overall number being 38 throughout the whole year.

Those (including legally staying) who nevertheless tried to apply for asylum at the NDGAP in Hungary were issued a refusal decision, stating that they applied for something that does not exist. In case of an Afghan applicant whose residence permit expired, the refusal decision followed by a push back to Serbia, a country where he has never been before (<https://bit.ly/3FNx5Hw>).

1. **Access to information and legal assistance (including counselling and representation)**

Information to potential asylum-seekers is practically non-existent. This is partly due to the amendments to the criminal code that entered into force on 1 July 2018, which, among others, specifically prohibits the preparation and distribution of information materials that would allow a person to initiate an asylum procedure who, as a result of the procedure, is not found to be in need of international protection (section 353/A. 1 and 5b of the Criminal Code) (see the English translation of the relevant section: <https://www.helsinki.hu/wp-content/uploads/T333-ENG.pdf>). On 16 November 2021, the Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU) found that this 2018 legislation breaches EU law. The CJEU made it clear: threatening people with imprisonment who assist asylum-seekers to claim asylum violates EU norms. (<https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2021-11/cp210203en.pdf> ) Despite this ruling, the Hungarian legislation still has not been revoked.

HHC’s clients regularly complain about the lack of accessible information on the asylum procedure in general and on their individual case in particular. The lack of effectiveness of the authority’s information provision is not a new problem, but prior to June 2017, the HHC had access to facilities where asylum seekers were placed to conduct human rights monitoring and to provide general legal counselling and information on the asylum procedure. The HHC is no longer able to conduct such activities (https://www.helsinki.hu/en/authorities-terminated-cooperation-agreements-with-the-hhc/) and no other civil society organization was allowed to provide such information, while the authority did not manage to improve the accessibility and/or quality of its own information provision.

The lack of available and accessible information on the asylum procedure has become an even more serious obstacle since the introduction of the new asylum system, whereby a statement of intent needs to be submitted either at the Belgrade or the Kiev Embassy of Hungary (see question 1). Information on the procedure on the respective embassy websites is hard to find and is only available in English and Hungarian. Applicants first need to email the embassy to get an appointment in order to be able to submit their statement of intent. Further on, despite several court judgments confirming the right to judicial remedy against the rejection of the intent, this information is not shared with the rejected applicants. The process lacks transparency and consideration for the situation of migrants, who may not necessarily understand English and could have difficulty with internet access. Filling out the statement of intent questionnaire without assistance can also be difficult due to the absence of interpretation and easily understandable explanation.

1. **Provision of interpretation services (e.g. introduction of innovative methods for interpretation, increase/decrease in the number of languages available, change in qualifications required for interpreters)**

In 2021, the HHC lawyers reported that the main problem was the interpretation through a videoconference. The connection was often very poor, sometimes breaking down completely, to the point that the decision had to be communicated to the applicant through a phone call. The sound over the videoconference was of very poor quality, almost not audible, with all the parties in need of speaking loudly in order to be heard. An additional difficulty reported by various applicants was that the use of videoconferencing made it more difficult for them to share their reasons for fleeing their countries, given that the interview touches upon very personal issues.

1. **Dublin procedures (including the organisational framework, practical developments, suspension of transfers to selected countries, detention in the framework of Dublin procedures)**

Since UNHCR’s call to suspend all Dublin transfers to Hungary in April 2017 ([https://www.unhcr.org/news /press/2017/4/58eb7e454/unhcr-urges-suspension-transfers-asylum-seekers-hungary-under-dublin.html](https://www.unhcr.org/news%20/press/2017/4/58eb7e454/unhcr-urges-suspension-transfers-asylum-seekers-hungary-under-dublin.html)), there were only 8 returns. All asylum seekers, including asylum seekers under the Dublin procedure, except minors below 14 years of age were held in transit zones until 21 May 2020, for the whole duration of the asylum procedure. In 2021, only one person was transferred to Hungary from Germany under the Dublin procedure and she was accommodated at one of the reception centres. In 2021, 23 people (who did not apply for asylum in Hungary) were detained due to the Dublin procedure (31/A(1)1a) and 19 were transferred to other Member States.

Under the current regulation in place, it is unclear whether a person transferred to Hungary could have access to asylum. If a person, who did not yet apply for asylum in Hungary, would be returned under the Dublin Regulation, he/she would have to apply for asylum upon return, but the current legislation in force does not allow for this possibility. “Dublin returnees” do not figure among the exceptions (stated under question 1), who are allowed to apply for asylum within the territory of Hungarian. However, according to the authority’s interpretation and the practice, applicants returned through the Dublin procedure have to declare upon arrival whether they intend to uphold their asylum application lodged in the transferring country, and if they do, the asylum procedure will commence.

1. **Special procedures (including border procedures, procedures in transit zones, accelerated procedures, admissibility procedures, prioritised procedures or any special procedure for selected caseloads)**

**Accelerated procedure**

The Asylum Act lays down an accelerated procedure, where the NDGAP is expected to pass a decision within the short timeframe of 15 days. (Section 47(2) Asylum Act.) In 2019 and in 2020, the accelerated procedure was not used.

As of 1 January 2021 a Gov. decree 570/2020. (XII. 9.) is in force and its Section 5 removes the possibility to ask for interim measure in order to prevent expulsion in case of violation of epidemic rules or when expulsion is ordered based on the risk to national security or public order. This can have serious consequence for people, who have been expelled prior to submitting their asylum application, as in case their asylum application is rejected in an accelerated procedure, the appeal does not have a suspensive effect and even if it is requested, it does not suspend the expulsion that was ordered prior to the asylum procedure. The HHC is aware of one such case, where an asylum applicant was rejected in an accelerated asylum procedure and was deported prior his appeal even reached the court. The rejection decision was communicated to the lawyer in an email when the applicant was already on the plane. The HHC submitted a complaint to the European Commission, which is still pending, but the Commission already indicated that based on initial analysis, it appears that the problem we raised may indicate a possible infringement of the Return Directive.

**Withdrawal or exclusion from international protection due to a threat to national security**

The Security agencies are not obliged to provide justification of their opinion why someone is considered a threat to national security and the data the opinion is based on is classified. Asylum seekers or persons with international protection considered a threat to national security and their legal representatives do not get any access to the reasons why they are considered a threat. Therefore they have no possibility to submit defense arguments when they are excluded from int. protection, their status is withdrawn or they are detained. The Classified Data Act provides for the possibility for the person concerned to request the concerning classified data from the special authorities. However, as per the experience of the HHC, as well as the statistics provided by the special authorities, there have been no cases when the access was granted (not even to the summary of the reasoning, as required by the CJEU and ECtHR jurisprudence). The Hungarian immigration authority does not have access to classified data either. Moreover, the opinion of the Hungarian security agencies on a national security threat is binding on the Asylum authority (Section 57(3) of Asylum Act). Therefore, it is questionable how Asylum authority actually performs a thorough and individual examination of a case, taking into account individual circumstances and the assessment of necessity and proportionality. The provisions and practice on exclusion based on national security grounds therefore remain not compliant with EU law (Hungarian Helsinki Committee: National Security Grounds for Exclusion from International Protection as a Carte Blanche: Hungarian asylum provisions not compliant with EU law, Information Update by the Hungarian Helsinki Committee, 20 December 2021, available at <https://bit.ly/3f7n6ls>). The Metropolitan Court submitted a set of preliminary reference questions to the CJEU on these issues (C-159/21). For more information see Comparative Report on Access to Classified Data in National Security Immigration Cases in Cyprus, Hungary and Poland, https://bit.ly/3lS4RUS).

As of 1 January 2022 a foreigner shall not be granted subsidiary protection/protection is withdrawn if there are reasonable grounds for believing that, prior to his or her admission by Hungary, he or she has committed an offence in his or her country of origin punishable in Hungary by a term of imprisonment of up to three years or more and there are reasonable grounds for believing that the applicant left his or her country of origin only in order to avoid the penalty for the offence. Although this amendment per se is not incompliant with the Qualification Directive, the Hungarian asylum provisions on exclusion from international protection due to serious crime are still not compliant with EU law (Preserved legal deficiencies post-CJEU Ahmed judgement: Hungarian asylum provisions on exclusion from international protection still not compliant with EU law, Information Update by the Hungarian Helsinki Committee, 7 April 2021, available at: https://bit.ly/3GdSA5k).

The NDGAP initiated the withdrawal of international protection status of 237 persons and issued a decision on withdrawal in the case of 349 persons in 2021, which is a huge increase compared to last year (59 withdrawal procedures were initiated in 2020).

1. **Reception of applicants for international protection (including information on reception capacities – increase/decrease/stable, material reception conditions - housing, food, clothing and financial support, contingency planning in reception, access to the labour market and vocational training, medical care, schooling and education, residence and freedom of movement)**

There is a community shelter, mainly for those under alien policing procedure, in Balassagyarmat with a capacity of 140. An open reception centre operates in Vámosszabadi for asylum-seekers and those who received protection and are thus eligible for free-of-charge stay for 30 days in an open reception facility, with a capacity of 210. Unaccompanied asylum-seeking children under the age of 14 and those unaccompanied children who received protection in the transit zone are placed in Fót in a childcare facility, with a capacity of 130.

Since the introduction of the “Embassy procedure” in May 2020, open reception centres lack residents except for the two families (8 people) who were allowed to enter Hungary and submit their asylum application. This has changed in August 2021, when following the Taliban take-over in Afghanistan, almost 500 people were flown to Hungary in the rescue operation. The families were accommodated in Vámosszabadi and Balassagyarmat. Both facilities have become overcrowded within a very short period of time. This shows that due to the closing of open reception facilities, Hungary lacks the reception capacity to respond to emergency situations and extraordinary events.

1. **Detention of applicants for international protection (including detention capacity – increase /decrease/stable, practices regarding detention, grounds for detention, alternatives to detention, time limit for detention)**

Based on the freedom of information request submitted to NDGAP, 2 asylum seekers were detained in formal asylum detention in 2021. 23 persons were detained for the purpose of Dublin transfer, but they were not asylum applicants in Hungary.

Through the previos years identified problems still persisted (i.e. no adequate conditions regarding persons with special needs, lack of individual assessment and justification of detention grounds, no effective judicial review, etc.).

1. **Procedures at first instance (including relevant changes in: the authority in charge, organisation of the process, interviews, evidence assessment, determination of international protection status, decision-making, timeframes, case management - including backlog management)**

As of 1 July 2019, the authority in charge of examining asylum applications is the National Directorate- General for Aliens Policing (NDGAP); its operations and staff are now regulated by the Act on Police. Apart from this, no significant changes were observed in the 2021.

Decision-making in asylum cases remains highly centralized and case workers conducting the interviews are not the ones making the decisions in the asylum applications themselves. Since the introduction of the “Embassy procedure” in June 2020, only 8 people were allowed to submit an asylum application. Due to the extremely low number of people allowed to initiate an asylum procedure, Hungary does not have a significant amount of backlog cases.

1. **Procedures at second instance (including organisation of the process, hearings, written procedures, timeframes, case management - including backlog management)**

The asylum procedure is a single procedure where all claims for international protection are considered. The procedure consists of two instances. The first instance is an administrative procedure carried out by the NDGAP. The second instance is a judicial review procedure carried out by Regional Courts, which are not specialised in asylum.

The applicant may challenge the negative NDGAP decision by requesting judicial review from the regional Administrative and Labour Court within 8 calendar days and within 3 calendar days in case of inadmissibility and in the accelerated procedure. The judicial review request does not have an automatic suspensive effect on the NDGAP decision in the regular procedure, but in practice the alien policing procedure never starts beforehand. In case of inadmissibility it will only have a suspensive effect if the application is declared inadmissible on “safe third country” grounds. In the accelerated procedure, the judicial review has suspensive effect only if the accelerated procedure is applied because the applicant entered Hungary irregularly or extended his or her stay illegally and did not ask for asylum within reasonable time although he or she would have had the chance to do so.

1. **Availability and use of country of origin information (including organisation, methodology, products, databases, fact-finding missions, cooperation between stakeholders)**

The NDGAP operates its own country of origin research department. The HHC has no knowledge of fact finding missions conducted by the NDGAP in 2021. Country of origin information is often not shared with the legal representatives prior to issuing the first instance decision.

1. **Vulnerable applicants (including definitions, special reception facilities, identification mechanisms/referrals, procedural standards, provision of information, age assessment, legal guardianship and foster care for unaccompanied and separated children)**

In Hungary, no protocol has been adopted to provide for uniform standards on age assessment examinations carried out by the police and the NDGAP. In September 2019 GRETA in its 2nd evaluation round recommended to the Hungarian authorities, inter alia, to review the age assessment procedures, taking into account the requirements of the UN CRC’s General Comment No. 6 and EASO’s practical guide on age assessment. To date this hasn’t taken place. (http://bit.ly/364g3D2 ). Also, there are no protocols to identify SGBV victims or to provide them with special services or care (IOM SGBV report 2019 http://bit.ly/39l28KM ). Based on the information provided by the NDGAP, there was only one asylum seeker subjected to age assessment in 2021 where the examination concluded that the asylum seeker was indeed a minor.

Since the closure of the transit zones, unaccompanied minors also fall under the Embassy procedure, which entails submitting their asylum application through the Kyiv/Belgrade Embassy. Although the vast majority of irregularly staying third country nationals get automatically pushed out of Hungary to Serbia in a summary procedure, there have been some rare exceptions, for the cases of unaccompanied minors that were injured when crossing the border – e.g. fell off the border fence or were beaten by the Police or military so severely that they needed to be hospitalised. For them, a guardian was appointed and following their release from the hospital, they were placed in a children’s home in Fót, near Budapest. In their case, the guardian could contact the embassy in Belgrade and ask for an appointment to submit the statement of intent.

1. **Content of protection (including access to social security, social assistance, healthcare, housing and other basic services; integration into the labour market; measures to enhance language skills; measures to improve attainment in schooling and/or the education system and/or vocational training)**

**No public integration services:** Since June 2016, the Hungarian state has completely withdrawn integration services provided to beneficiaries of international protection, thus leaving recognised refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection to destitution and homelessness. The capacity of non-governmental and church-based organisations to provide the necessary integration services such as housing, assistance with employment, Hungarian language classes or family reunification is seriously limited. Civil society and church-based organisations can provide such services only to a small number of beneficiaries, leaving many without any help.

**Withdrawal of protection:** The NDGAP initiated the withdrawal of international protection status of 237 persons and issued a decision on withdrawal in the case of 349 persons in 2021, which is a huge increase compared to last year. Nonetheless, since the seizure of power by the Taliban in Afghanistan in August 2021, the HHC is not aware of any decision where the NDGAP would have expelled anyone to Afghanistan as a result of the withdrawal proceeding.

**Detrimental impacts of the pandemic:** In the absence of public and targeted integration and support programs, the COVID-19 pandemic has seriously affected the integration of beneficiaries of international protection as the existing disadvantages with regard to education, access to the labour market or health care and housing have been amplified.

1. **Return of former applicants for international protection**

There is no new development compared to 2020.

1. **Resettlement and humanitarian admission programmes (including EU Joint Resettlement Programme, national resettlement programme (UNHCR), National Humanitarian Admission Programme, private sponsorship programmes/schemes and ad hoc special programmes)**

Hungary does not participate in humanitarian admission programmes or resettlements.

1. **Relocation (ad hoc, emergency relocation; developments in activities organised under national schemes or on a bilateral basis)**

Hungary does not participate in any type of relocation.

1. **National jurisprudence on international protection in 2021 (please include a link to the relevant case law and/or submit cases to the** [**EUAA Case Law Database**](https://caselaw.easo.europa.eu/Pages/default.aspx)**)**
2. **Other important developments in 2021**

Following the Taliban take-over in Afghanistan in August 2021, almost 500 former NATO co-workers and their families were flown to Hungary in the rescue operation. The families were first quarantined in the former transit zones at Röszke and Tompa, at the Hungarian-Serbia border, and then were accommodated in Vámosszabadi and Balassagyarmat even though they were subject to an alien policing (residence permit for the purpose of other, i.e. humanitarian purposes) and not an asylum procedure. Both facilities have become overcrowded, which resulted in problems in particular when people were using the bathrooms or praying. In Balassagyarmat, two families had to share a room, which in addition to the overcrowding, presented a cultural problem as well. In some rooms, children had to sleep on the floor as there were not enough beds for everybody.

Afghan families were given hygienic items and food in kind but had no opportunity to cook for themselves. This caused conflict and problems both in Vámosszabadi and Balassagyarmat, and was not resolved until the end of their stay in the facilities. To the knowledge of the NGO, the asylum authority justified their decision by arguing that the kitchens are not able to accommodate so many people at once. In Vámosszabadi several complaints were noted by the HHC in relation to the meals served to the residents. These problems were due to the obligation that people were not allowed to take food into their rooms, thus children had to be woken up in case they had fallen asleep. The HHC was also informed about a refugee with diabetes to whom no special diet was ensured.

The rescued Afghans received donations from the Hungarian Red Cross and many private persons as well as the U.S. Embassy in Budapest equipping them with the basic necessities, primarily with winter clothes. A group of volunteers organized a special winter clothes drive in both premises and paid regular visits to both Balassagyarmat and Vámosszabadi. In early September, the HHC attorneys noted complaints about the Wi-Fi connection both in Balassagyarmat and in Vámosszabadi (only plug-in cable internet was available) which made it hard for the refugees to keep contact with family members stuck in Afghanistan.

There were community activities organized by NGOs and volunteers outside the camps focusing on the children. During their stay in the reception centres, education for the children was not organized.

Despite the fact that the rescued families were not allowed to access the asylum procedure, the HHC closely followed the developments in their case and provided the opportunity for legal counseling and legal representation in both reception facilities (Balassagyarmat and Vámosszabadi). HHC staff and attorneys together with translators regularly visited both places. HHC was not allowed to enter the reception facilities, but the families were happy to receive assistance in nearby parks and the outside the centre. Altogether 21 families authorized the HHC to represent them.

The responsible authority in Hungary failed its obligation to provide information regularly with the help of translators on the procedure. During the legal counselling sessions held by HHC, the Afghan citizens shared that they were not sure what documents they signed and what procedure they were in. They did not know about their rights and obligations attached to the residence permit once they obtained that either. The Afghan families could stay in the reception facilities until the end of October when they were moved to Budapest by the assistance of the Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of the Malta (Maltese Charity) (see under Chapter on Housing).

Information on the move-out, their future legal status in Hungary and the assistance available in Budapest for the families was also rather scarce and left many families in uncertainty. Many families shared with the HHC, that this lack of information and uncertainty contributed to the fact that they decided to leave Hungary. For those who remained, the HHC organized two information sessions in Budapest in November and December to help them understand their legal status, their rights and the integration contract signed with the Maltese Charity.

References and sources

1. **Please provide links to references and sources and/or upload the related material in PDF format**
2. **Feedback or suggestions about the process or format for submissions to the Asylum Report**

Thank you for providing us with a Word format this year for the reporting.
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