



**THE CHANGING INFLUX OF ASYLUM SEEKERS IN 2014-2016:
MEMBER STATE RESPONSES**

HUNGARY

2017



**Co-funded by the Asylum, Migration and
Integration Fund of the European Union**



**Title: The changing influx of asylum seekers in 2014-2016:
Member State responses**

Member State: HUNGARY

Year: 2017

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



The European Migration Network (EMN) is co-ordinated by the European Commission with National Contact Points (EMN NCPs) established in each EU Member State plus Norway.



**Co-funded by the Asylum, Migration and
Integration Fund of the European Union**

EMN FOCUSED STUDY 20

The changing influx of asylum seekers in 2014-2016: Member States

responses Top-line "Factsheet" (National Contribution)

National contribution (one page only)

Overview of the National Contribution – introducing the study and drawing out key facts and figures from across all sections of the Focussed Study, with a particular emphasis on elements that will be of relevance to (national) policymakers.

This EMN study aims to offer an overview of the changes to the Hungarian strategies, approaches and measures in response to increases or decreases to the influx of asylum seekers over the period 2014-2016. The study focuses on numerous aspects impacted by changing influxes, through policy changes and operational measures taken by state and non-state entities acting on behalf of the responsible authorities. This includes border control, the asylum application process, the contents of protection, financing of measures, and crisis governance measures (both ad-hoc and structural).

During the temporal scope of this study Hungary thoroughly revised its national asylum system and border control: fence was erected along the southern border, increased police and military presence was administered along the southern border, transit zones were established along the southern border that meant to serve as exclusive points for the influx to submit asylum claims and stay during the asylum status determination procedure, accelerated asylum procedures were introduced, daily quota of entries into the transit zones were adopted, integration measures of asylum applicants and beneficiaries of international protection were curtailed and accommodation arrangements and receptions services were geographically re-allocated following fluctuations of the influx. The governmental objective of these measures was to control irregular crossings and limit the administrative burden on the asylum system. While the incoming flow to Hungary got significantly reduced by the second half of the period 2014-2016, the measures designed in response to the high influx were not dismantled and plans to such effect are not known. Hungary argues that the measures are necessary to remain prepared for future changes in migratory trends.

Most legal measures drafted in the context of high daily influx were initiated by the Prime Minister's Office, while implementation was assigned to the Police, the Ministry of Defence or the Office of Immigration and Nationality.

Hungary declined to take part in EU efforts to redistribute responsibility of receiving and processing asylum seekers. The Hungarian government disagrees with the scheme and contends that it is an ineffective measure that encourages migratory movements and breaches national sovereignty.

The Hungarian response is essentially led by state actors. NGOs and aid organizations were involved in wider reception services, accommodation arrangements, and capacity-building for personnel of authorities and direct integration assistance for asylum applicants.

The governmental measures during the 2015 peak of the influx were financed by the national budgetary reserve and additional budget allocations to the Ministry of Interior.

Regarding future preparedness, Hungary considers its national system as adequate means to handle any potential increase in the number of asylum claims, while the Government argues for better response at the EU level.

Among the challenges experienced, the transit nature of the country for the westward migration and the difficulties in identifying persons in need of protection as part of mixed migration flows were registered in this study. Overall, however, the Government of Hungary argues to have found effective solutions.

Section 1: Overview of national context

This section will briefly outline the developments in Member State policies adopted in the timeframe 2014-2016 to manage a changing influx of asylum applicants. Please note that information about actual measures taken (structural or ad-hoc) are covered in Section 2 instead.

Q1. Brief overview of legislative changes and policies announced and/or introduced to address or manage fluctuations in the number of asylum applications or better control of migration flows over 2014-2016. Please specify when these changes happened and what the goal of each change introduced) was.

Border control

September 15 2015: A number of border laws were put into effect that aimed at controlling the flow of migrants to Hungary and reducing the number of irregular entries (Act CXL of 2015 on the amendment of certain Acts related to the management of mass migration);

A first barbed-wire fence along the 175 km long border section with Serbia was completed;

Damaging or climbing over the fence became a criminal offence punishable with imprisonment;

Transit zones, the only place where migrants can legally enter the country and where asylum claims are to be assessed, were established as part of the fence in Tompa and Röske (Article 71/A of the Asylum Act);

State of emergency was declared in two southern regions that gave the authorities greater powers and allowed them to shut down roads and speed up asylum court cases.

Plans were announced to build a fence at the border with Romania – to date this has not been implemented.

October 16 2015: A barbed-wire fence was completed along the border with Croatia and aimed at controlling the migrant flow and reducing the number of irregular entries.

March 9 2016: State of emergency was declared nationwide and allowed for increased deployment of police officers and soldiers to the border, after neighbouring countries (Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia) introduced new measures to limit the number of arriving migrants. According to the Hungarian Government the declaration of the state of emergency nationwide is necessary due to the unknown effects the closure of the migration route through the Balkans will have on migration flows (Government decree 41/2016)

July 5 2016: Legal amendments were implemented that allow for Hungarian police to escort back asylum seekers and irregular migrants apprehended within 8 km of the Serbian-Hungarian or Croatian-Hungarian border to the external side of the border fence and aimed at reducing irregular entry (Act XCIV of 2016 on the amendment of necessary modification in order to the broad application of the border procedures).

December 15 2016: It was decided that border protection bases would be set up so that 3,000 soldiers could be stationed there instead of being transported from a single point continuously. Units concerned can therefore be deployed much more swiftly should any changes occur. This was done in preparation for a prolonged migration crisis and aims at making Hungary's border protection efforts more effective.

Reception centres/accommodation arrangements and other housing

October 17 2014: Government decision was made to open a temporary reception centre at Nagyfa with the capacity of 300. (The centre opened on January 2015.) On **March 4 2016** a government decision was made to suspend the operation of the reception centre. (The centre closed down in May, 2016.)

December 31 2015: Debrecen Reception Centre – the open centre with the largest capacity - was closed down (Government decree 1724/2015).

April 11 2016: Newly built asylum detention centre in Kiskunhalas opened. In 2016 there were often periods when there were more asylum seekers detained than in open reception centres. The

opening of the facility was necessary due to the increasing influx of migrants (Government decree 219/2015).

May 2 2016: A temporary tent camp opened in Körmend to alleviate the pressure caused by the migration situation.

June 1 2016: The maximum period of stay in open reception centres following the recognition of refugee status or subsidiary protection was reduced from 60 days to 30 days. The measure was taken by the Government of Hungary in order to avoid the "economic migrants" to apply for asylum in Hungary. (Act XXXIX of 2016 on the amendment of certain acts relating to migration and other relating acts).

July 1 2016: Asylum detention centre in Kiskunhalas was extended with an open reception centre with a maximum capacity of 200. It was gradually filled by the end of July and it ran with almost full capacity during the summer (Government decree 219/2015).

December 31 2016: Bicske Reception Centre – the open centre closest to Budapest and with the best reception conditions – was closed down.

Wider reception services

June 1 2016: The automatic eligibility period for basic health care services following recognition of refugee status or subsidiary protection was decreased from 1 year to 6 months. Basic medical care which is not available at reception facilities for asylum seekers can be accessed at medical facilities financed by local municipalities at the asylum seeker's place of residence. The measures were taken in order to avoid having "economic migrants" apply for asylum in Hungary (Act XXXIX of 2016 on the amendment of certain acts relating to migration and other relating acts).

Registration process of the asylum seekers

September 15 2015: Transit zones became the only place where asylum-seeking migrants can legally enter the country and where asylum claims are to be registered and assessed. This measure seeks to strengthen the Schengen borders, thereby reduce the number of unidentified people entering the European Union (Act CXL of 2015 on the amendment of certain Acts related to the management of mass migration).

September 15 2015 - November 2 2016: The Immigration and Asylum Office has gradually decreased the number of migrants entering the transit zones from 100 entries/transit zone every day to 10 entries/transit zone on weekdays.

Asylum procedure

August 1 2015: Hungary designated a list of safe countries of origin and safe third countries through Government Decree 191/2015 - including Serbia – making it harder for migrants arriving through the southern border to gain asylum in Hungary. It enables the Hungarian authorities to refuse to examine the merit of asylum claims of those who crossed the Serbian-Hungarian border. Since **April 1 2016** Turkey is considered as a safe country of origin and safe third country.

August 1 2015: The Asylum Act was amended to introduce an accelerated border procedure where the Office of Immigration and Nationality (today: Immigration and Asylum Office) has to pass a decision on asylum applications within 15 days (Act CXXVII of 2015 on the amendment of acts relating to the establishment of a temporary border fence and migration).

September 15 2015: The asylum procedure at the border – a specific type of admissibility procedure – was introduced and states that the procedure can only be initiated if the applicant submitted her or his claim in a transit zone. The admissibility procedure was further shortened and the asylum authority has had to deliver a decision in maximum 8 calendar days. It was also decided that rejected asylum seekers will be expelled immediately and banned entry and stay for 1 or 2 years. The aim of the measure taken is to make the asylum procedures faster and more efficient (Act CXL of 2015 on the amendment of certain Acts related to the management of mass migration).

May 2016: The Office of Immigration and Nationality (today: Immigration and Asylum Office) began to issue Dublin decisions on return to Greece again. In **December 2016** the practice changed again and no more Greece Dublin transfer decisions are issued.

Law enforcement

August 18 2015: a government decision was made to establish a new subdivision (Hungarian National Police Border Patrol Action Department) under the Rapid Response Police Unit to protect the Hungarian-Serbian border. On the 10th of August, 2016 another government decision was made to extend the division with additional 3,000 policemen. The purpose of the measure was to strengthen the already existing border control system and to reduce the number of irregular entries.

September 21 2015: A law was passed allowing for the Hungarian Defence Forces to execute border protection tasks and for the use of non-lethal force against migrants (Act CXLII of 2015 on the amendment of certain laws with regard to the more effective protection of the state border of Hungary and to mass immigration).

Integration of asylum applicants

April 1 2016: The monthly cash allowance of free use for asylum seekers (EUR 24/month) and the school-enrolment benefit provided to child asylum seekers were terminated. At the same time, the previous limit of 80 hours per month for working hours of inhabitants at open reception facilities was removed. The measures were taken in order to avoid the "economic migrants" to apply for asylum in Hungary, and to provide the same welfare services for beneficiaries of international protection as provided for Hungarian nationals, as their legal status is the same. (Government decree 62/2016).

Integration of beneficiaries of international protection

June 1 2016: The integration support scheme for recognised refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection that was introduced in 2013 was terminated without an alternative measure being put in place. The measure was taken in order to avoid the "economic migrants" to apply for asylum in Hungary (Act XXXIX of 2016 on the amendment of certain acts relating to migration and other relating acts).

June 1 2016: The duration of Hungarian IDs issued to refugees was reduced from 10 years to 3 years, and in the case of persons with subsidiary protection, it was reduced from 5 years to 3 years. Refugee and subsidiary protection statuses are also to be reviewed every 3 years. The measure was taken in order to avoid the "economic migrants" to apply for asylum in Hungary (Act XXXIX of 2016 on the amendment of certain acts relating to migration and other relating acts).

July 1 2016: The period during which family members of recognized refugees can apply for family reunification under preferential conditions was reduced from 6 months to 3 months after the sponsor has been recognized as a refugee. The measure was taken in order to avoid the "economic migrants" to apply for asylum in Hungary (Government decree 113/2016).

Q2. To what extent is the concept of a change in asylum applications (either a significant increase or decrease) defined in your (Member) State (e.g. in legislation, policies and/or plans)? How is it determined what a significant influx is? Please also mention the responsible authority.

The amendment of the Act LXXX of 2007 on Asylum introduced the concept of state of crisis caused by mass immigration on the 21st of September, 2015. As the Act CXLII of 2015 on the amendment of certain laws with regard to the more effective protection of the state border of Hungary and to mass immigration states:

"Government responses to mass migration of foreigners in the current Hungarian legal environment cannot be given (only with considerable delays). It is therefore appropriate to introduce the concept of 'state of crisis caused by mass immigration', which requires some legislative provisions to be amended. The crisis situation may be ordered by the government by

the initiation of the commissioner of the police (national or county-level) and the director of the asylum authority at the request of the minister. Ordering a state of crisis will lead to deviations from the general rules of the legal system.” The crisis situation may be introduced if any of the following conditions is met:

Number of asylum seekers arriving in Hungary in a month reaches the daily average of 500, or

Number of asylum seekers arriving in Hungary in two consecutive weeks reaches the daily average of 750, or

Number of asylum seekers arriving in Hungary in a week reaches the daily average of 800, or

Number of asylum seekers in the transit zones in a month reaches the daily average of 1000, or

Number of asylum seekers in the transit zones in two consecutive weeks reaches the daily average of 1500, or

Number of asylum seekers in the transit zones in a week reaches the daily average of 2000, or The immigration situation directly threatens the public security of a settlement.

The state of crisis caused by mass immigration is ordered in a government decree after the official request of the Minister of Interior based on the recommendation of the Commissioner of the Hungarian Police (national or county level) and the Director General of the Immigration and Asylum Office.

Q3. Did your (Member) State experience significant changes in the influx of asylum applicants before 2014 (2000 onwards e.g. the increased influx related to the war in former Yugoslavia)? If so, what measures were introduced to enhance the preparedness of your Member State as a response to these changes in the influx of asylum applicants? Please consider previous experiences of influx when defining the fluctuations over 2014-2016 *and substantiate your answer below, giving also an overview of the baseline of your Member State in reference to migration flows and the definition of preparedness used in your Member State.*

Between 2000 and 2002 the number of asylum seekers arriving in Hungary reached the average of 8,000 persons in a year (7,801 in 2000, 9,554 in 2001 and 6,412 in 2002). This influx was the continuation of the tendencies of the late 1990s, which was due to the Kosovo bombings (the majority of the arrivals were citizens of the successor states of Yugoslavia), and the war in Afghanistan. In 2003 the rate of arrivals decreased to one third compared to the previous year. In the upcoming decade, from 2003 to 2012 the number of asylum seekers was an average of 2,500 arrivals per year. The relatively low number of asylum applications did not require special measures to be taken to enhance the preparedness. However, in the year 2013 the number of asylum applications increased by 876% (total 18,900 asylum applications were submitted). This intensively growing rate continued in 2014, as described in this study.

Even so, there were some significant changes in the Hungarian legal and institutional framework regarding asylum policies. In 2000 the Office of Immigration and Nationality was established under the Ministry of Interior. The structure and organization of the Office of Immigration and Nationality is regulated by the Enforcement Decree of the Minister of Justice and Law 52/2007. The Act II of 2007 on the entry and stay of the third country nationals as well as the Act LXXX of 2007 on Asylum was adopted. The Act on Asylum sets down the basic principles and the most important guidelines to follow in the area of asylum in line with the relevant EU directives. All EU-harmonized protection regimes, namely refugee status, subsidiary and temporary protection were duly transposed into Hungarian asylum legislation, creating three different statuses. The first Migration Strategy and the seven-year strategic document related to Asylum and Migration Fund established by the European Union for the years 2014-20 was adopted by the Ministry of Interior in 2013. The possibility of asylum detention was introduced in Hungary in July 2013 (amendment of the Act LXXX. of 2007 in the government decree 101/2013). According to this legislation, asylum detention can only be ordered based on legally defined grounds that must be clearly listed in the detention decisions. In line with the new legislation three asylum detention facilities were set up in 2013 in Békéscsaba with a capacity of 185, in Debrecen with a capacity of 182 and in Nyírbátor with a capacity of 105. From the 1st of January, 2008 the Reception Centre in Bicske

functioned as a pre-integration centre for recognized refugees or people under subsidiary protection, until the facility closed on the 31st of December, 2013. On the 1st of March, 2011 a semi-open community shelter was opened in Balassagyarmat with a capacity of 170 persons. It functions as a designated place where third-country nationals may be ordered to stay if they are released from detention, however, the grounds for their detention still exist. From the 31st of August, 2011 the Károlyi István Children's Centre in Fót provides shelter for unaccompanied minors, as it is also a child protection facility provided for children in the custody of the state. An open camp with a capacity of 204 persons was opened on the 1st of August in Vámoszabadi. This was a necessity due to the growing number of asylum seekers arriving in Hungary in 2013.

Q4. Did your Member State experience a significant fluctuation in number of asylum applications (both increase and decrease) in the years 2014, 2015 and/or 2016? Could you please specify and explain the period(s) in which there was such a fluctuation, and the nature of the fluctuation (increase/decrease)? Please make a distinction between a fluctuation in the sense of an increase and a decrease of asylum seeker numbers. Please indicate: Yes / No. If yes, please fill out the field below and continue with question 6. If no, please go to question 5.

177,135 asylum seekers came to Hungary in 2015, which represented a significant **314% increase** from the 42,777 applications registered in 2014. In 2016 this number dropped to 29,432. The increase from 2014 to 2015 can broadly be explained with the onset of the European migration crisis and is in line with trends in most EU Member States. The building of the border fence and stricter asylum laws and policies implemented in 2015 and 2016, outlined in Q1 above, collectively contributed to the decrease in 2016. More details can be found in the bullet point below.

Between July and September 2015 109,175 migrants arrived to Hungary and prompted the government to implement stricter border control. Following the building of the border fence and the adoption of the border laws in September 2015 **the influx dropped significantly**; between October 2015 and January 2016 there was a **steady flow** of less than 1,000 migrants per month. This figure began to **increase** again steadily between February and June 2016 - averaging 4,411 migrants per month. From July to December 2016 the average **decreased** again to 1,157 migrants per month. This correlates with the increasingly strict policies that have been adopted as time has gone on - including but not limited to a difficult and complex asylum procedure, increased law enforcement involvement and cuts to integration measures.

Q5. If your Member State did not experience a significant fluctuation over 2014-2016 in the number of asylum applications, please elaborate how and if the absence of such a fluctuation has impacted national policies and approaches. Note: only to be filled out if the answer to question Q4 was no

N/A

Q6. To what extent was cooperation at national level (i.e. between national organisations and authorities) strengthened over the period 2014-2016 in response to the changing influx in asylum applicants coming to your Member State? How was this achieved?

The Hungarian Ministry of Interior considers the cooperation between the Hungarian Police and the Office of Immigration and Nationality highly effective. The two state authorities signed a cooperation agreement on the 6th August, 2013.

Charity Council: An important platform to coordinate direct assistance services and aid distribution is the Charity Council. It was established on the 4th of August, 2000 with the purpose of coordinating the use of certain things confiscated by law for charitable purposes in the public interest. From July 2015 the members of the Charity Council are the only eligible entities to carry out humanitarian aid activities in the transit zones on a regular basis. The members of the Charity Council shall consult with each other as well as the responsible State Secretariat on a weekly basis and if necessary, jointly initiate legislative amendments. Members of the Charity Council: Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta, Hungarian Red Cross, Caritas Hungarica,

Hungarian Reformed Church Aid, Hungarian Interchurch Aid and Hungarian Baptist Aid. President of the Charity Council: Minister of State for Church, Nationality and Civil Society Relations.

Q7. To what extent did your Member State consult with other Member States during the period 2014-2016 specifically in regards to dealing with a changing influx? If consultation was followed by cooperation approaches, please explain in which domains cooperation between Member States was most effective? Please elaborate on such cooperation and its impacts. If relevant, a reference to relocation agreement can be included.

The Hungarian Ministry of Interior has highlighted the close cooperation among the Visegrad countries regarding migration, in particular irregular migration and refusing distribution mechanisms, relocation and resettlement.

Q8. To what extent did measures taken in neighbouring Member States (or other EU Member States in general) have an effect on your Member State's policies and practices, even if your Member State did not experience a change in the influx? Please refer to both increase and decrease.

Hungary declined to take part in EU efforts to redistribute responsibility for receiving and processing asylum seekers. The Hungarian government disagrees with the scheme and contends that it is an ineffective measure that encourages migratory movements and breaches national sovereignty.

The immediate impact of the fence along the Serbian border was to block illegal entry to Hungary and deflect the flow to Croatia. When Croatia began to lead migrants to its border with Hungary, Hungary started the construction of a second fence along its border with Croatia on September 18 2015.

Hungary extended a nationwide state of emergency on March 9 2016 due to mass migration - the day after Slovenia announced the closure of its border crossings for those who do not have valid EU entry visas. The government justified the measure on the basis that the closure could result in unforeseen consequences and also deployed an additional 1,500 troops and police officers on its border with Serbia.

The Hungarian government warned that Greece was incapable of protecting its borders from the increased flow of migrants. Hungary proposed increased border controls as the main solution to the influx and specified that it would protect EU borders. Hungary has repeatedly stated that other Member States must intervene if a Member State is not able to protect its own borders.

Prime Minister Viktor Orbán contends that Chancellor Angela Merkel's open-door refugee policy contributed to the large influx of migrants coming to the EU.

Prime Minister Viktor Orbán vetoed the part of the proposed EU-Turkey statement from March 2016 that would have established a mandatory and direct resettlement of migrants from Turkey to the EU.

Section 2: Overview of the national responses over 2014-2016

The purpose of this second section is to provide a detailed overview of the responses of the Member States to the fluctuations of number of asylum applications over the period 2014 to 2016. This Section should be completed only by Member States who experienced a change in the influx of asylum applications.

2.1 MEASURES TAKEN, THEIR IMPACT AND RESPONSES TO THE CHANGING INFLUX IN MEMBER STATES THAT EXPERIENCED A CHANGE IN THE INFLUX OF ASYLUM APPLICANTS

Q9. Please indicate in the table below which specific areas were impacted by a change in the influx of asylum applicants in your (Member State) that your Member State identified. Please specify further in the column 'Explanation' whether information provided relate to an increased or to a decrease in the influx. Additional details on the measures are requested in the tables below under question 10. Therefore please only briefly highlight all measures taken.

| Area | Directly impacted (yes/no) | Time period (when) | Very brief explanation on the basis of short titles (how and what the impact was, including whether it concerned an increase/decrease) |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|
| 1. Border control (please specify if it refers to external border control, temporary control at internal borders and/or police controls in border areas) | Yes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. September 15 2015 2. September 15 2015 3. October 16 2015 4. March 9 2016 5. July 5 2016 6. December 15 2016 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Increase</u>: A 175 km long barbed-wire fence was built along the border with Serbia and diverted the flow to Croatia. 2. <u>Increase</u>: Damaging or climbing over the fence became a criminal offence punishable with imprisonment. 3. <u>Increase</u> in arrivals through Croatia: Fence built along the Hungarian-Croatian border. 4. <u>Increase</u>: State of emergency declared nationwide. 5. <u>Increase</u>: Law adopted that allows HU police to escort back asylum seekers apprehended within 8 km of the border to the external side of the border fence. 6. <u>Decrease</u>: Border protection bases to be introduced. |
| 2. Reception centres / accommodation arrangements and other housing | Yes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. October 17 2014 2. September 15 2015 3. December 31 2015 4. April 11 2016 5. May 2 2016 6. June 1 2016 7. July 1 2016 8. December 31 2016 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Increase</u>: Temporary reception centre opened in Nagyfa. 2. <u>Increase</u>: Transit zones established in Tompa and Röszke where asylum-seekers are accommodated. 3. <u>Decrease</u>: Debrecen reception centre closed down. 4. <u>Increase</u>: Asylum detention centre opened in Kiskunhalas. 5. <u>Increase</u>: Temporary camp opened in Körmend. 6. <u>Increase</u>: The maximum period of stay in open reception centres following the recognition of refugee status or subsidiary protection was reduced from 60 days to 30 days. 7. <u>Increase</u>: Open reception centre opened in Kiskunhalas. 8. <u>Decrease</u>: Bicske reception centre closed down. |
| 3. Wider reception services (social services, health services), rights | Yes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. September 15 2015 2. June 1 2016 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Increase</u>: Asylum procedure established in the transit zones - limited access to services. 2. <u>Increase</u>: The eligibility period for basic health care services following recognition of refugee |

| afforded to applicants | | | status or subsidiary protection decreased. |
|--|-----|--|--|
| 4. Registration process of the asylum seeker | Yes | <p>1. September 15 2015</p> <p>2. September 15 2015 - November 2 2016</p> | <p>1. <u>Increase</u>: Transit zones became the only place for asylum-seekers to enter the country and register and where asylum claims are processed.</p> <p>2. <u>Decrease</u>: The immigration authorities have gradually decreased the number of entries to each transit zone.</p> |
| 5. Asylum procedure (at first and second instance) | Yes | <p>1. August 1 2015</p> <p>2. August 1 2015</p> <p>3. September 15 2015</p> <p>4. May 2016</p> | <p>1. <u>Increase</u>: Hungary designated a list of safe countries of origin and safe third countries.</p> <p>2. <u>Increase</u>: An accelerated border procedure was introduced.</p> <p>3. <u>Increase</u>: The asylum procedure was established at the transit zones; the admissibility procedure was further shortened to max. 8 calendar days.</p> <p>4. <u>Increase</u>: The Office of Immigration and Nationality began to issue Dublin decisions on return to Greece again.</p> |
| 6. Infrastructure, personnel and competencies of the responsible authorities | Yes | <p>1. 2014 onward</p> | <p>1. <u>Increase</u>: As a result of the increasing migration and asylum pressure on Hungary the number of the incoming Dublin requests drastically increased since the year 2013. Due to the increased workload the staff of the Dublin Unit within the Office of Immigration and Nationality was reinforced (EMN Annual Report on Asylum and Migration 2015 – National Report Hungary).</p> |
| 7. Law enforcement | Yes | <p>1. August 18 2015</p> <p>2. September 21 2015</p> <p>3. March 9 2016</p> | <p>1. <u>Increase</u>: the Hungarian National Police Border Patrol Action Department was established to strengthen the police presence on the Hungarian-Serbian border.</p> <p>2. <u>Increase</u>: Hungarian Defence Forces called on to execute border protection tasks.</p> <p>3. <u>Increase</u>: State of emergency declared nationwide; increased deployment of police officers and soldiers to the border.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|
| 8. Integration of asylum applicants | Yes | 1. April 1 2016 | 1. <u>Increase</u> : Monthly cash allowance and school benefit were terminated. |
| 9. Integration of beneficiaries of international protection | Yes | 1. June 1 2016 2. June 1 2016 3. July 1 2016 | 1. <u>Increase</u> : Integration support scheme was terminated. 2. <u>Increase</u> : The validity period of Hungarian IDs issued to refugees and persons with subsidiary protection was reduced. 3. <u>Increase</u> : The grace period for family reunification was reduced to 3 months. |

Q10. Fill out the table below on specific elements of the measures indicated in the previous table. Note that numerous questions are simply to establish the typology of the measure, and only the selected options need to be indicated (such as rows a) and b)). Further details are provided from row c), with a general explanation in row e).

Please copy the entire table below to provide an overview of additional measures. There is no limit for numbers of measures to be included, as long as they are coherent with the requested information.

Measure 1.1

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Border control</u> | A 175 km long barbed-wire fence was built along the border with Serbia and diverted the flow to Croatia. |
| Year and month the measure was established | September 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: Other, please specify | Other: construction of physical barrier along a section of EU external border |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To protect external borders by creating a physical barrier against irregular border crossings. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended duration: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | A 175 km long barbed-wire fence was built along the border with Serbia and diverted the flow to Croatia. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | N/A |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | N/A |
| Other | |

Measure 1.2

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Border control</u> | Damaging or climbing over the fence became a criminal offence punishable with imprisonment. |
| Year and month the measure was established | September 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Act CXL of 2015 on the amendment of certain Acts related to the management of mass migration</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To protect external borders by enforcing a physical barrier against irregular border crossings. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended duration: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | Damaging or climbing over the fence became a criminal offence punishable with imprisonment. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 1.3

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Border control</u> | Fence built along the Hungarian-Croatian border. |
| Year and month the measure was established | October 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase in migrants coming from Croatia |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: Other, please specify | Other: construction of physical barrier along a section of EU internal border |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To control the influx of migrants and reduce the number of irregular entries |

| | |
|---|---|
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended duration: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | Fence built along the Hungarian-Croatian border on a 41km stretch, where Hungary and Croatia are not divided by a river |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | N/A |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | N/A |
| Other | |

Measure 1.4

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Border control</u> | State of emergency declared nationwide. |
| Year and month the measure was established | March 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Government decree 41/2016</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | According to the Hungarian Government the declaration of the state of emergency nationwide is necessary due to the unknown effects the closure of the |

| | |
|---|--|
| | migration route through the Balkans will have on migration flows. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: 6 months. Actual: extended until March 2018 |
| Key elements of the measure | State of emergency declared nationwide and allowed for increased deployment of police officers and soldiers to the border, after neighbouring countries (Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia) introduced new measures to limit the number of arriving migrants. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Government of Hungary |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Hungarian Defence Forces and Hungarian police, Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 1.5

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Border control</u> | Law adopted that allows HU police to escort back asylum seekers apprehended within 8 km of the border to the external side of the border fence. |
| Year and month the measure was established | July 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Act XCIV of 2016 on the amendment of necessary</u> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <u>modification in order to the broad application of the border procedures</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To control the influx of migrants, reduce the number of irregular entries, and enable the option to enter through official checkpoints and claim asylum in accordance with international and European law. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | Law adopted that allows HU police to escort back asylum seekers apprehended within 8 km of the border to the external side of the border fence. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 1.6

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Border control</u> | Border protection bases to be introduced. |
| Year and month the measure was established | December 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Decrease |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |

| | |
|---|--|
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: Other, please specify | Other: New bases set up to allow for swift deployment |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | In preparation for a prolonged migration crisis and aims at making Hungary's border protection efforts more effective. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: permanent. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | Decided that border protection bases would be set up so that 3,000 soldiers could be stationed there instead of being transported from a single point continuously. Units can therefore be deployed much more swiftly should any changes occur. The defence forces help the police with the protection of the border as necessary. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | N/A |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | N/A |
| Other | |

Measure 2.1

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Reception centres/accommodation arrangements and other housing</u> | Temporary reception centre opened in Nagyfa. |
| Year and month the measure was established | October 2014 |
| Typology of measures | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | N/A |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The opening of the facility was necessary due to the increasing influx of migrants. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: Approx. 15 months (closed in March 2016) |
| Key elements of the measure | Government decision was made to open a temporary reception centre at Nagyfa with the capacity of 300. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | N/A |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | N/A |
| Other | |

Measure 2.2

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Reception centres/accommodation arrangements and other housing</u> | Transit zones established in Tompa and Röske where asylum-seekers are accommodated. |
| Year and month the measure was established | September 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | <u>Legislative instruments: Act CXL of 2015 on the amendment of certain Acts related to the management of mass migration</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | Aimed at controlling the flow of migrants to Hungary and reducing the number of irregular entries by providing access to asylum. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | Transit zones established in Tompa and Röszke as part of the fence along the Hungarian-Serbian border. This is the only place where migrants can legally enter the country and where asylum claims are to be assessed |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 2.3

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Reception centres/accommodation arrangements and other housing</u> | Debrecen reception centre closed down. |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Year and month the measure was established | December 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Decrease |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Government decree 1724/2015</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To adjust reception centre capacities according to a decrease in arrivals. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Permanent |
| Key elements of the measure | Debrecen reception centre - open centre with the largest capacity closed down. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Government of Hungary |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Human Capacities and Ministry for National Economy |
| Other | |

Measure 2.4

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Reception centres/accommodation arrangements and other housing</u> | Asylum detention centre opened in Kiskunhalas. |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Year and month the measure was established | April 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Government decree 219/2015</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The opening of the facility was necessary due to the increasing influx of migrants |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: May 2017 |
| Key elements of the measure | Asylum detention centre opened in Kiskunhalas. In 2016 there were periods when there were more asylum seekers detained than in open reception centres. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Government of Hungary |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Hungarian police, Director of the Bács-Kiskun County Government Office |
| Other | |

Measure 2.5

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Reception centres/accommodation arrangements and other housing</u> | Temporary camp opened in Körmend. |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| Year and month the measure was established | May 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | N/A |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To alleviate the pressure caused by the migration situation. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: Approx. 11 months (Closed down in April 2017) |
| Key elements of the measure | Temporary camp opened in Körmend. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | N/A |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | The Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Other | |

Measure 2.6

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Reception centres/accommodation arrangements and other housing</u> | The maximum period of stay in open reception centres following the recognition of refugee status or subsidiary protection was reduced from 60 days to 30 days. |
| Year and month the measure was established | June 2016 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative measures: <u>Act XXXIX of 2016 on the amendment of certain acts relating to migration and other relating acts</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The measure was taken by the government in order to avoid having "economic migrants" apply for asylum in Hungary. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended and actual: permanent |
| Key elements of the measure | The maximum period of stay in open reception centre following the recognition of refugee status or subsidiary protection was reduced from 60 days to 30 days. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 2.7

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Reception centres/accommodation arrangements and other housing</u> | Open reception centre opened in Kiskunhalas. |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Year and month the measure was established | July 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Government decree 219/2015</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The extension was necessary due to the increasing influx of migrants. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | The asylum detention centre in Kiskunhalas was extended with an open reception centre with a maximum capacity of 200. It was gradually filled by the end of July and it ran with almost full capacity during the summer. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Government of Hungary |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Hungarian police, Director of the Bács-Kiskun County Government Office |
| Other | |

Measure 2.8

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not | Bicske reception centre closed down. |
|---|--------------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| apply: <u>Reception centres/accommodation arrangements and other housing</u> | |
| Year and month the measure was established | December 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Decrease |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | N/A |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To accommodate for a decrease in migrant arrivals. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended and actual: permanent |
| Key elements of the measure | Bicske reception centre closed down. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | N/A |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | The Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Other | |

Measure 3.1

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Wider reception services</u> | Asylum procedure established in the transit zones - limited access to services. |
| Year and month the measure was established | September 2015 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Act CXL of 2015 on the amendment of certain Acts related to the management of mass migration</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To control the influx of migrants, reduce the number of irregular entries, and enable the option to enter through official checkpoints and claim asylum in accordance with international and European law. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | Asylum procedure established in the transit zones - limited access to services. The transit zone is where immigration and asylum procedures are conducted and where buildings required for conducting such procedures and housing migrants and asylum seekers are located. Asylum seekers are allowed to leave the transit zones and go to Serbia. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 3.2

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Wider reception services</u> | The eligibility period for basic health care services following recognition of refugee status or subsidiary protection decreased from 1 year to 6 months. |
| Year and month the measure was established | June 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Act XXXIX of 2016 on the amendment of certain acts relating to migration and other relating acts</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The measure was taken in order to avoid having "economic migrants" apply for asylum in Hungary. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended and actual: permanent |
| Key elements of the measure | The eligibility period for basic health care services following recognition of refugee status or subsidiary protection decreased from 1 year to 6 months. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 4.1

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: Registration process of the asylum seeker | Transit zones became the only place for asylum-seekers to regularly enter the country and where asylum claims are processed. |
| Year and month the measure was established | September 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | <u>Legislative instruments: Act CXL of 2015 on the amendment of certain Acts related to the management of mass migration</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | Aimed at controlling the flow of migrants to Hungary and reducing the number of irregular entries by providing access to asylum. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | Transit zones became the only place for asylum-seekers to regularly enter the country and where asylum claims are processed. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |

| | |
|-------|--|
| Other | |
|-------|--|

Measure 4.2

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: Registration process of the asylum seeker | The immigration authorities have gradually decreased the number of entries to each transit zone. |
| Year and month the measure was established | September 2015 - November 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Decrease |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure then changes |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Soft measures</u> (handbooks, circulars, policy guidance) | Soft measure |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | Aimed at controlling the flow of migrants to Hungary and decreasing the administrative burden |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | When the transit zones opened (September 15 2015) the officials of the Office of Immigration and Nationality could process 100 applications every day in each transit zone. Between March 2016 and November 2016 the number of persons entering the transit zones was limited to approx. 20-30 migrants/day. On November 2 2016 the number was reduced to 10 entries/ weekday to each transit zones. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Office of Immigration and Nationality |

| | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Authorities implementing measures | Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Other | |

Measure 5.1

| | |
|---|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: Asylum procedure (first and second instance) | Hungary designated a list of safe countries of origin and safe third countries, including Serbia, making it harder for migrants arriving through the southern border to gain asylum in Hungary. |
| Year and month the measure was established | August 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Government Decree 191/2015</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To make sure that migrants stop moving further when in countries where their lives are no longer in danger and thus relieve the migratory pressures on Hungary. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended and actual: permanent |
| Key elements of the measure | Hungary designated a list of safe countries of origin and safe third countries, including Serbia, making it harder for migrants arriving through the southern border to gain asylum in |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Hungary. It enables the Hungarian authorities to refuse to examine the merit of asylum claims of those who crossed the Serbian-Hungarian border. The burden of proof lies with the asylum seeker to rebut the presumption that such a country is safe. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Government of Hungary |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | The Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Other | |

Measure 5.2

| | |
|---|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: Asylum procedure (first and second instance) | The Asylum Act was amended to introduce an accelerated border procedure where the Office of Immigration and Nationality (today: Immigration and Asylum Office) has to pass a decision on asylum applications within 15 days. |
| Year and month the measure was established | August 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Act CXXVII of 2015 on the amendment of acts relating to the establishment of a temporary border fence and migration</u> |
| Other elements | |

| | |
|---|--|
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To facilitate faster processing of asylum claims and provide effective protection to genuine asylum seekers and faster return for "economic migrants". |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | The Asylum Act was amended to introduce an accelerated border procedure where the Office of Immigration and Nationality (today: Immigration and Asylum Office) has to pass a decision on asylum applications within 15 days. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 5.3

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: Asylum procedure (at first and second instance) | The asylum procedure at the border – a specific type of admissibility procedure – was introduced and states that the procedure can only be initiated if the applicant submitted her or his claim in a transit zone. |
| Year and month the measure was established | September 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |

| | |
|---|--|
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Act CXL of 2015 on the amendment of certain Acts related to the management of mass migration</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | Aimed at making the asylum procedure faster and more efficient. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | The asylum procedure at the border – a specific type of admissibility procedure – was introduced and states that the procedure can only be initiated if the applicant submitted her or his claim in a transit zone. The admissibility procedure was further shortened and the asylum authority has had to deliver a decision in maximum 8 calendar days. It was also decided that rejected asylum seekers will be expelled immediately and banned entry and stay for 1 or 2 years. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 5.4

| | |
|--|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: Asylum procedure (at first and second instance) | The Office of Immigration and Nationality began to issue Dublin decisions on return to Greece again. |
| Year and month the measure was established | May 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Soft measures</u> (handbooks, circulars, policy guidance) | Soft measure |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | To act in accordance with the Dublin Regulation and transfer an asylum seekers to the responsible Member State. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: until December 2016 |
| Key elements of the measure | The Office of Immigration and Nationality began to issue Dublin decisions on return to Greece again. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | The Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | The Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Authorities implementing measures | The Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Other | |

Measure 6.1

| | |
|---|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Infrastructure, personnel and competencies of the responsible authorities</u> | Due to the increased workload the staff of the Dublin Unit within the Office of Immigration and Nationality was reinforced. |
| Year and month the measure was established | 2014 onward |
| Typology of measures | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Resources</u> (staff or financing) | Resources |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The purpose was to alleviate some of the administrative pressure following an increase in Dublin requests. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | As a result of increasing migration and asylum pressure on Hungary the number of incoming Dublin requests drastically increased since the year 2013. Due to the increased workload the staff of the Dublin Unit within the Office of Immigration and Nationality was reinforced. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | N/A |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | N/A |
| Other | |

Measure 7.1

| | |
|---|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Law enforcement</u> | A government decision was made to establish a new subdivision (Hungarian National Police Border Patrol Action Department) under the Rapid Response Police Unit to protect the Hungarian-Serbian border. |
| Year and month the measure was established | August 2015 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Resources</u> (staff or financing) | Resources |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The purpose of the measure was to strengthen the already existing border control system and to reduce the number of irregular entries. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | A government decision was made to establish a new subdivision (Hungarian National Police Border Patrol Action Department) under the Rapid Response Police Unit to protect the Hungarian-Serbian border. On the 10th of August, 2016 another government decision was made to extend the division with additional 3000 policemen. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | N/A |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | Ministry of Interior |
| Authorities implementing measures | Hungarian police |
| Other | |

Measure 7.2

| | |
|---|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Law enforcement</u> | A law was passed allowing for the Hungarian Defence Forces to execute border protection tasks and for the use of non-lethal force against migrants |
| Year and month the measure was established | September 2015 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Act CXLII of 2015 on the amendment of certain laws with regard to the more effective protection of the state border of Hungary and to mass immigration</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The purpose of the measure was to strengthen the already existing border control system and to reduce the number of irregular entries. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: as long as daily arrivals remain high. Actual: still in force |
| Key elements of the measure | A law was passed allowing for the Hungarian Defence Forces to execute border protection tasks and for the use of non-lethal force against migrants |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Members of Parliament |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Hungarian Defence Forces and Hungarian Police |

| | |
|-------|--|
| Other | |
|-------|--|

Measure 7.3

| | |
|---|--|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Law enforcement</u> | State of emergency declared nationwide; increased deployment of police officers and soldiers to the border. |
| Year and month the measure was established | March 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | New measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Ad-hoc |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Government decree 41/2016</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | According to the Hungarian Government the state of emergency nationwide is necessary due to the unknown effect the closure of the migration route through the Balkans will have on migration flows. Increased numbers of police officers and soldiers are necessary to ensure proper protection. |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended: 6 months. Actual: extended until March 2018 |
| Key elements of the measure | State of emergency declared nationwide; increased deployment of police officers and soldiers to the border. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Government of Hungary |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Authorities implementing measures | Hungarian Defence Forces, Hungarian Police, Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 8.1

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Integration of asylum applicants</u> | The monthly cash allowance of free use for asylum seekers (EUR 24/month) and the school-enrolment benefit provided to child asylum seekers were terminated. |
| Year and month the measure was established | April 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Government decree 62/2016</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The measure was taken in order to avoid the "economic migrants" to apply for asylum in Hungary, and to provide the same welfare services for beneficiaries of international protection as provided for Hungarian nationals, as their legal status is the same |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended and actual: permanent |
| Key elements of the measure | The monthly cash allowance of free use for asylum seekers (EUR 24/month) and the school-enrolment benefit provided to child asylum seekers were terminated. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Government of Hungary |

| | |
|---|---|
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | The Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Other | |

Measure 9.1

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Integration of beneficiaries of international protection</u> | The integration support scheme for recognised refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection that was introduced in 2013 was terminated without an alternative measure being put in place. |
| Year and month the measure was established | June 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: Act XXXIX of 2016 on the amendment of certain acts relating to migration and other relating acts |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The measure was taken in order to avoid the "economic migrants" to apply for asylum in Hungary |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended and actual: permanent |
| Key elements of the measure | The integration support scheme for recognised refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection that was introduced in 2013 was terminated without an alternative measure being put in place. |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 9.2

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Integration of beneficiaries of international protection</u> | The duration of Hungarian Ids issued to refugees was reduced from 10 years to 3 years, and in the case of persons with subsidiary protection, it was reduced from 5 years to 3 years. |
| Year and month the measure was established | June 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Act XXXIX of 2016 on the amendment of certain acts relating to migration and other relating acts</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The measure was taken in order to avoid having "economic migrants" apply for asylum in Hungary |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended and actual: permanent |
| Key elements of the measure | The duration of Hungarian Ids issued to refugees was reduced from 10 years to 3 years, and in the case of persons with subsidiary protection, it was reduced from |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 5 years to 3 years. Refugee and subsidiary protection statuses are also to be reviewed every 3 years. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Prime Minister's Office |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | Ministry of Interior |
| Other | |

Measure 9.3

| | |
|--|---|
| Please select the area corresponding to those highlighted in Q9 by removing the lines that do not apply: <u>Integration of beneficiaries of international protection</u> | The period during which family members of recognized refugees can apply for family reunification under preferential conditions was reduced from 6 months to 3 months. |
| Year and month the measure was established | July 2016 |
| Typology of measures | |
| Measure following an increase or decrease in numbers | Increase |
| New measure or change to an existing measure | Change to an existing measure |
| Structural or ad-hoc (temporary) measure | Structural |
| Type of measure: <u>Legislative instruments</u> | Legislative instruments: <u>Government decree 113/2016</u> |
| Other elements | |
| General aim of the measure (what was intended)? | The measure was taken in order to avoid having "economic migrants" apply for asylum in Hungary |
| Intended and actual duration of the measure | Intended and actual: permanent |

| | |
|---|--|
| Key elements of the measure | The period during which family members of recognized refugees can apply for family reunification under preferential conditions was reduced from 6 months to 3 months after the sponsor has been recognized as a refugee. |
| Authorities involved in drafting the measure | Government of Hungary |
| Authorities involved in proposing and approving of each measure | N/A |
| Authorities implementing measures | The Office of Immigration and Nationality |
| Other | |

Q11. To what extent were any of the measures put in place by non-state entities mandated by a government authority via funding or project/by law/by measure?

Please elaborate further.

| Area | Extent of involvement of non-state entities (if yes, to what extent) |
|--|---|
| Border control (<i>please specify if it refers to external border control, temporary control at internal borders and/or police controls in border areas</i>) | No |
| Reception centres / accommodation arrangements and other housing | Member organizations of the Charity Council distribute aid (e.g. clothes, hygiene products, food and toys for children) in Röszke and Tompa, as well as in the reception centres in Kiskunhalas, Nagyfa, Vámosszabadi, Debrecen and Bicske. |
| Wider reception services (social services, health services), rights afforded to applicants | Member organizations of the Charity Council organize programs for children and provide interpretation services in Röszke and Tompa, as well as in the reception centres in Kiskunhalas, Nagyfa, Vámosszabadi, Debrecen and Bicske. Similarly, the Hungarian Red Cross (a member organization of the Charity Council) provided psycho-social support and first-aid to the people in the 'Collection point' at Röszke in the summer of 2015. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>The Cordelia Foundation provided bio-psycho-social support for asylum seekers, with special focus on traumatized individuals.</p> <p>In 2014, Menedék – Hungarian Association for Migrants offered psychological support to children in the Reception Centre in Debrecen. Menedék also targeted families through family support services and counselling in order to ensure that parents are able to support their children, as well as to help them to solve problems arising in the family.</p> <p>Artemisszio Foundation organized free-time activities and programmes for asylum seekers in the Reception Centre in Vámoszabadi.</p> |
| Registration process of the asylum seeker | No |
| Asylum procedure (at first and second instance) | No |
| Infrastructure, personnel and competencies of the responsible authorities | <p>Artemisszio Foundation organized intercultural trainings for health care professionals, educators and teachers, professionals in public services, social services and law enforcement. The training was open to all professionals working in an intercultural environment, including those working with asylum seekers.</p> <p>Menedék – Hungarian Association for Migrants also organized intercultural and capacity-building trainings for professionals working with migrants. They included child protection professionals, health care workers, intercultural mediators, teachers, trainers, civic guards. Although the trainings were not asylum-specific, these trainings were also open to professionals working with asylum seekers.</p> |
| Law enforcement | No |
| Immediate integration measures for asylum applicants | <p>In 2014, Menedék - Hungarian Association for Migrants worked with children in the Reception Centre in Debrecen to facilitate their integration in the public educational system in Hungary. Towards this end, Menedék organized daily workshops for asylum-seeker children in the Reception Centre to develop their learning skills, socialization and social competences.</p> |

Q12. In view of the impact of the fluctuations of the influx on local authorities, how and to what extent were local authorities impacted by measures taken by the national government/authorities responsible? To what extent local authorities were able to influence this process? While it is beyond the scope of the study to be able to describe and

analyse impacts on all different local authorities concerned, please elaborate on how national measures taken generally impacted on regional or local authorities.

| Area | Impact on local authorities | Influence on the process |
|--|--|--------------------------|
| Border control (<i>please specify if it refers to external border control, temporary control at internal borders and/or police controls in border areas</i>) | Due to the increase of the number of illegal border crossings (especially after the completion of the barbed-wire fence) relevant judicial proceeding in the District Court of Szeged significantly increased. | |
| Reception centres / accommodation arrangements and other housing | As a temporary tent camp opened in Körmend in May 2016, the mayor of Körmend requested the increase of police presence in the town, as well as additional support from the armed forces if needed. Moreover, the mayor stated that the video surveillance system needs to be upgraded. | |
| Wider reception services (social services, health services), rights afforded to applicants | <p>Due to the increase of asylum seekers and migrants arriving in Budapest the Municipality of Budapest set up temporary transit zones next to the three major railway stations (Nyugati Railway Station, Déli Railway Station, Keleti Railway Station) where basic hygiene services (restrooms and shower facilities), as well as drinking fountains were provided. (August 2015)</p> <p>Due to the increase of asylum seekers arriving in Szeged the Municipality of Szeged provided basic hygiene services (restrooms and shower facilities) as well as storage containers for the volunteers near the railway station. (June 2015)</p> | |
| Registration process of the asylum seeker | | |
| Asylum procedure (at first and second instance) | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Infrastructure, personnel and competencies of the responsible authorities | Due to the increased number of migrants arriving in Budapest the Municipality of Budapest alongside with the Centre for Budapest Transport operated two transfer buses between the three major railway stations (from August 2015 to September 2015). Townships near the Serbian border requested assistance in waste management and fire services due to the increased number of migrants crossing the border. | |
| Law enforcement | Increased police presence was needed in Budapest around the major railway stations (June-September 2015) | |
| Integration measures for asylum applicants | | |

2.2 SCALING DOWN OR DISMANTLING MEASURES FOLLOWING A DECREASE IN NUMBERS OF ASYLUM APPLICATIONS

Q13. Many Member States experienced a decrease in the influx of asylum applications in the third and fourth quarters of 2016, while several Member States experienced a more irregular decrease at certain intervals after the period 2014-2016. If your (Member) State experienced a decrease in asylum applications, were any changes made to (the scope of) previously adapted or introduced measures? *This question seeks to understand if and how measures adopted during the previous increase were changed. Please elaborate on the process on how the assessment was made (by the government) to scale down the scope of measures.*

Hungary continues to implement very restrictive policies and has not rolled back these measures despite a decrease in asylum applications. Asylum laws and policies are instead becoming increasingly strict. The greatest changes made to the scope of previously adopted measures relate to camp structures: Hungary planned to close most of its reception centres and camps in March 2016, leaving only two temporary camps in the town of Körmend and Szentgotthárd that could host 700 migrants. MP Lajos Kósa said the country only needed two centres. At the time, Hungary had six reception centres, housing about 1,200 migrants. This plan was not implemented. The centre in Nagyfa was closed in August 2016, while Bicske, the closest reception to Budapest, was closed in December 2016. As of 31 December 2016, four open reception centres and one home for unaccompanied children were still operational, including Balassagyarmat, Kiskunhalas, Körmend and Vámoszabadi – all located in smaller towns and further away from the capital.

Q14. To what extent did the decrease result in adapting or abolishing/dismantling measures taken in periods of increase?

The decrease has not led to adapting or abolishing measures taken in the periods of increase. The Hungarian government has instead opted to introduce increasingly strict asylum policies and laws as outlined in Q1. The government argues that the pressure on Hungarian borders will not cease in the next few years despite the decrease and that the migration crisis will last until its causes are removed.

Q15. To what extent did the decrease lead to a shift in political and administrative prioritisation of measures taken (e.g. from asylum procedure to integration and or return)?

The Hungarian Ministry of Interior terminated state-provided integration support to beneficiaries of international protection as of 01st June 2016. The measure is justified by the experience of the Office of Immigration and Nationality that the so-called "integration contracts" were abused by beneficiaries: large majority left Hungary upon receiving the first payment.

Q16. To what extent did the decrease lead to measures (and/or debate) about maintaining established admission, housing and integration capacities as well as preserving gained expertise (e.g. regularly training of former staff; maintaining infrastructure; increasing capacities within other admission procedures such as resettlement, relocation, humanitarian admission)?

The Hungarian Ministry of Interior has highlighted the measure detailed under Q15 as well as the construction of transit zones.

Section 3: Effectiveness of the measures taken

This phase concerns the period after the implementation of new practices and ad-hoc measures and their follow-up. Only Member State who implemented national measures in response to a fluctuation of the influx are required to reply. Please copy the entire table below for all the measures listed in Q10.

Q17a. Please indicate the impacts and effectiveness of each measure mentioned above.

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Measure 1.1 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Irregular border crossings to Hungary decreased |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Irregular border crossings decreased and the administrative burden on the asylum system lightened because the influx was controlled |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Migrant flow was diverted to Croatia who then assisted migrants in reaching the Hungarian-Croatian border |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 1.2 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Irregular border crossings decreased |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Irregular border crossings decreased |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Migrants find new routes and means of travel |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |
|--|--|-----|

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Measure 1.3 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Irregular border crossings decreased |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Irregular border crossings decreased and the administrative burden on the asylum system lightened because the influx was controlled |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Migrant flow was diverted to alternative routes |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Measure 1.4 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | The influx of migrants was controlled and the number of irregular entries reduced |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The influx of migrants is being controlled and the number of irregular entries reduced. The external borders of the EU are protected while access to asylum is provided |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | The state of emergency was continuously prolonged |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Measure 1.5 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Number of migrants escorted back to the other side of fence increased |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The influx of migrants was controlled and the number of irregular entries reduced. |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects | Migrants find alternative routes and means of travel |

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| | (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 1.6 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Hungary's border protection efforts are more responsive |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Expected effect: Units can be deployed much more swiftly should changes occur in the migration situation |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | N/A |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 2.1 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Tension in other facilities resulting from the overcrowdedness reduced |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Increased reception capacity is available for the authorities |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | N/A |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Measure 2.2 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | The flow of migrants was controlled and the number of irregular entries reduced by providing access to asylum. |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The flow of migrants was controlled and the number of irregular entries reduced by providing access to asylum. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Migrants attempt other routes and means of travel. Limited access to reception services and integration opportunities. |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Measure 2.3 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Reception centre capacities were adjusted according to a decrease in arrivals: migrants had to be transferred from Debrecen to a new facility |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | One less reception centre was available to accommodate for migrants |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Other facilities may lack the infrastructure and capacity |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Measure 2.4 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Increased capacity to accommodate for larger numbers of migrants |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Increased capacity to accommodate for larger numbers of migrants |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | There were often periods when there were more asylum seekers detained than in open reception centres |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 2.5 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | The pressure caused by the migration situation was alleviated - there was more space to accommodate for new arrivals |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The pressure caused by the migration situation was alleviated - there was more space to accommodate for new arrivals |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | The temporary camp may lack infrastructure and capacity |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Measure 2.6 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Integration opportunities are curtailed |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Beneficiaries of international protection decide to leave the territory of Hungary |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Beneficiaries of international protection wishing to integrate into the Hungarian society face increased challenges |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 2.7 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Increased capacity to accommodate for larger numbers of migrants |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Increased capacity to accommodate for larger numbers of migrants |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | The facility may lack necessary infrastructure and capacity |

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Measure 2.8 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Reception centre capacities were adjusted according to a decrease in arrivals: migrants had to be transferred from Bicske to a new facility |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | One less reception centre was available to accommodate for migrants |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | There was a higher burden on the capacities of other centres |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 3.1 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | The influx of migrants was controlled, the number of irregular entries reduced and the option to claim asylum is available |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The influx of migrants was controlled, the number of irregular entries reduced and the option to claim asylum is available |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Limited access to reception services |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 3.2 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Integration opportunities of beneficiaries of international protection curtailed |
|--------------------|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Beneficiaries of international protection decide to leave the territory of Hungary |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Beneficiaries of international protection wishing to integrate into the Hungarian society face increased challenges |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Measure 4.1 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | The influx of migrants was controlled, the number of irregular entries reduced and the option to claim asylum is available |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The influx of migrants was controlled, the number of irregular entries reduced and the option to claim asylum is available |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Migrants face long waiting times to have access to the Hungarian asylum system |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Measure 4.2 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | The influx of migrants was controlled, number of asylum applications reduced. |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The influx of migrants was controlled, number of asylum applications reduced, burden on the asylum system reduced. |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Migrants face long waiting times to have access to the Hungarian asylum system |

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 5.1 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Migrants who had been in countries where their lives are no longer in danger were sent back there and thus relieved the migratory pressures on Hungary |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Migrants who had been in countries where their lives are no longer in danger were sent back there and thus relieved the migratory pressures on Hungary |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Migrants find ways of avoiding registration before coming to Hungary and increasingly rely on the services of smuggling networks |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 5.2 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Asylum procedures are faster |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Border procedures became more efficient and there was less pressure on the asylum system as a whole. |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | N/A |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Measure 5.3 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Asylum procedure became faster |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Asylum procedure became faster and there was less pressure on the system as a whole. |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | N/A |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Measure 5.4 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Hungary acted accordance with the Dublin Regulation and transferred asylum seekers to the responsible Member State. Less pressure on the Hungarian asylum system as a result. |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Hungary acted accordance with the Dublin Regulation and transferred asylum seekers to the responsible Member State. Less pressure on the Hungarian asylum system as a result. |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected/unforeseen effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | N/A |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Measure 6.1 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Increased capacity to deal with Dublin files |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Increased capacity to deal with Dublin procedure requests |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | N/A |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |
|--|--|-----|

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 7.1 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | The already existing border control system was strengthened. |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The already existing border control system was strengthened. |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | N/A |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Measure 7.2 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | The already existing border control system was strengthened. |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The already existing border control system was strengthened. |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | N/A |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Measure 7.3 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | The already existing border control system was strengthened. |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | The already existing border control system was strengthened. |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | N/A |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |
|--|--|-----|

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Measure 8.1 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Integration opportunities of asylum seekers curtailed |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Integration opportunities of asylum seekers curtailed |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Beneficiaries of international protection wishing to integrate into the Hungarian society face increased challenges |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Measure 9.1 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Integration opportunities of beneficiaries of international protection curtailed |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Integration opportunities of beneficiaries of international protection curtailed |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Beneficiaries of international protection wishing to integrate into the Hungarian society face increased challenges |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Measure 9.2 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Integration opportunities of beneficiaries of international protection curtailed |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Integration opportunities of beneficiaries of international protection curtailed |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Beneficiaries of international protection wishing to integrate into the Hungarian society face increased challenges |

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Measure 9.3 | Immediate impact (in the first days or weeks after its implementation) | Less family reunification in the territory of Hungary |
| | Medium or longer term effect (a month or longer after its implementation) | Integration opportunities of beneficiaries of international protection curtailed |
| | Collateral or side effect(s) and unexpected effects (effects not initially considered when the measure was implemented) | Beneficiaries of international protection wishing to integrate into the Hungarian society face increased challenges |
| | Was the measure evaluated for effectiveness? If so, by whom? | N/A |
| | What was the outcome of the evaluation? | N/A |

Q17b. Did the changing influx of asylum applicants prompt changes in national approaches for other types of migration, e.g. economic migration or family reunification? The question seeks to establish whether the increased number of asylum applications brought about changes in other policy areas, such as for example a stricter approach to family reunification, or reduced labour immigration quotas.

Family reunification: The amendment of the Act II of 2007 on the entry and stay of the third country nationals reduces the period during which family members of recognized refugees can apply for family reunification under preferential conditions from six months to three months after the sponsor has been granted asylum. The government decree 113/2016 (V. 30.) entered into force on the 1st of July, 2016.

Resettlement and relocation: Hungary participated in several resettlement and relocation mechanisms in the early 2010s. A reference to resettlement is included in the Act LXXX of 2007 (7. § (5)). The Hungarian Government announced its decision to become a resettlement country in October 2010 and confirmed its commitment through a pledge submitted to the Ministerial Conference organized by UNHCR in Geneva in December 2011. Hungary launched the programme in 2013. Hungary also participated in the EU Pilot Project on Intra-EU Relocation from Malta (EUREMA), where in the first phase pledged to relocate 8-10 persons, and in the second phase pledges to relocate 5. However, Hungary decided not to participate in the EU relocation programme that was adopted by the EU Justice and Home Affairs Council in September, 2015. The decision was taken by majority vote, with the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia voting against and Finland abstaining. Moreover, following the decision, Hungary and Slovakia took legal action over EU's mandatory migrant quotas at the European Court of Justice. Prime Minister Viktor Orbán argued the quota system would "redraw Hungary's and Europe's ethnic, cultural and religious identity, which no EU organ has the right to do". In parallel, Hungary hasn't made a pledge to the European Resettlement Scheme.

Labour immigration: The Hungarian government is working on solving the critical labour shortage, which is becoming an increasing problem in certain sectors and professions in the country, by recruiting skilled guest workers to Hungary from countries outside the European Union, mainly from neighbouring countries like Ukraine and Serbia. As the Minister for National Economy, Mihály Varga stated in July, 2016: in sectors, where currently Hungarian labour force is not available, it

is unavoidable to replace them with third-country nationals whose cultural and historical traditions and backgrounds are similar to Hungarians. In order to facilitate this recommendation, the government defined the group of third-country nationals which is exempted from the labour market related part of the authorization process (government decree 113/2016). Moreover, the government promised to reduce the tax burden on companies that bring in third-country nationals in certain positions. As of September, 2017 only about one third of the quota for guest workers (which is 59,000) has been filled. Sectors worst hit by the labour shortage in Hungary include the tourism and hospitality industry, catering, construction, retail, healthcare and IT sector, with currently 60,000 unfilled positions.

Section 4: Financing of the implemented measures, other resources, and administrative burden Q18a.

How were the implemented national measures financed? (i.e. on the basis of an emergency budget passed in parliament, additional budget allocation by the responsible ministry/authority, budgetary contributions from multiple authorities, a budgetary contribution key)

The barbed-wire fence on the Hungarian-Serbian and on the Hungarian-Croatian borders were financed from the national budgetary reserve in 2015 (exact numbers are unknown). Other costs related to the state of crisis caused by mass immigration were financed by additional budget allocation to the Ministry of Interior (65,188,300,000 HUF in 2015, 60,977,600,000 HUF in 2016). This contains the additional costs of the Police, the Counter Terrorism Centre, the National Directorate General for Disaster Management, the Office of Immigration and Nationality, the Special Service for National Security, the Constitution Protection Office, the relevant county-level Directorates of Water Management, the National Protective Service, and the Hungarian Prison Service.

Q18b. Was the financing plan of ad-hoc measures different from the financing of already existing and structural measures for national asylum policies/national asylum system?

How? Please elaborate.

The financing plan of the ad-hoc measures shows a great difference from the already existing measures. The former relied on the national budgetary reserves or re-allocation of budgetary lines (i.e. direct financing), while the latter operates through long-term strategies, well-documented priorities and budgetary allocations (i.e. tenders for EU grants).

Financing already existing measures: The National Migration Strategy was published in 2013, and covers the period of 2014-2020 (The Migration Strategy and the seven-year strategic document related to Asylum and Migration Fund established by the European Union for the years 2014-20). It is in accordance with the principles and regulations of the European Union. The document was adopted by the government decree 1698/2013 (X. 4.). The Strategy defines the activities financed by the national Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund and the resources required. The total value of the activities to be funded from the AMIF is 11,115,100,000 HUF. The use of the amount is as follows: Amount allocated for visa policy purposes: 11,600,000 HUF (e.g. supporting the visa liberation processes of neighbouring countries)

Amount allocated for activities related to regular migration: 256,000,000 HUF (e.g. attracting investors and highly skilled migrants, developing the effectiveness of administrative procedures, taking actions against abuse of legal migration channels)

Amount allocated for activities related to irregular migration: 4,388,700,000 HUF (e.g. increasing effectiveness of the fight against irregular migration, improving capacity, establishing and operating aliens detention facilities, prioritising voluntary return, implementing deportations)

Amount allocated for activities related to international protection: 1,916,300,000 HUF (e.g. promoting relocation and resettlement policies, ensuring an appropriate quality of reception conditions)

Amount allocated for integration purposes: 4,542,500,000 HUF (e.g. drafting and implementing a strategy for the integration of third-country nationals in Hungary, promoting intercultural education and dialogue, assisting integration into the labour market)

Financing ad-hoc measures: The barbed-wire fence on the Hungarian-Serbian and on the Hungarian-Croatian borders were financed from the national budgetary reserve in 2015 (exact

numbers are unknown). Other costs related to the state of crisis caused by mass immigration were financed by additional budget allocation to the Ministry of Interior (65,188,300,000 HUF in 2015, 60,977,600,000 HUF in 2016). This contains the additional costs of the Police, the Counter Terrorism Centre, the National Directorate General for Disaster Management, the Immigration and Asylum Office, the Special Service for National Security, the Constitution Protection Office, the relevant county-level Directorates of Water Management, the National Protective Service, and the Hungarian Prison Service.

Q19. Did the fluctuation of the influx bring an increase/decrease in the administrative burden for national authorities responsible of asylum applicants? If yes, how did your Member State deal with that? *Please consider as administrative burden the recruitment of additional personnel, additional trainings, changes in procedures, etc.*

The administrative burden for Hungarian authorities significantly increased. Hence, the border procedure applicable in the transit zones was introduced.

Q20. To what extent did the adoption of additional measures directly result in an increase in staff/human resources at national (ministry, national services) or local level? *You can report on one or two case studies if differences are significant among large numbers of local municipalities.*

Regarding the Ministry of Interior as the main regulatory body, there has been no significant change in staff/human resources.

Section 5: The way forward - future preparedness

This Section is relevant for all Member States and Norway, including those countries that did not experience significant fluctuations in the number of asylum applications.

Q21. Following the fluctuations between 2014 and 2016, did your Member State put in place any new structural (emergency planning) mechanisms to adapt to the (possible) changing influx of asylum applicants in the future? Yes / **No** *Please substantiate your answer below.*

The Government of Hungary considers the already established border control measures, the conditions permitted by the state of emergency caused by mass immigration and expedited asylum procedures as adequate means to handle any potential increase in the number of asylum claims. These measures have been described in detail in this study.

Q22a. Please elaborate to what extent the experience over 2014-2016 helped the government (national, regional, local level) to be prepared for any future changing influx in asylum applications, such as for 2017? *Please elaborate.*

The Hungarian Ministry of Interior has highlighted the establishment of transit zones and the construction of the fence as a way to control administrative burdens and help prepare for any future changing influx of asylum applications.

Q22b. Have any potential future measures been planned? Are new measures under consideration? *Please elaborate.*

Hungary is in the process of transforming its reception conditions for unaccompanied and separated children. There has been one designated institution, the Károlyi István Child Protection Centre in Fót which will be closed by the summer of 2018. The Government's objective is not to accommodate all unaccompanied and separated children in one larger facility, but in several smaller ones. On 30th August 2017, the Government has decided to extend the state of crisis caused by mass migration by 6 months, until 7 March 2018. This suggests that the Government intends to keep all the aforementioned measures in force.

Section 6: Good practices and lessons learnt

Section 6.1 examines the existing challenges and obstacles for the design and implementation of specific policies to adapt to changing influx of asylum applications.

Section 6.2 aims to highlight any good practices of the (Member) States that have successfully implemented and managed fluctuations of influx of asylum applicants. This section can include also lessons learnt from the practical implementation of specific policies and measures.

6.1. CHALLENGES AND OBSTACLES FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF SPECIFIC POLICIES TO ADAPT TO CHANGING INFLUX OF ASYLUM APPLICANTS

Q23. What are the main challenges and/or obstacles that your Member State had to overcome in designing strategies, structural mechanisms and measures to adapt to the influx of asylum applicants?

One of the challenges repeatedly argued by Hungary (for example, in the EMN Annual Report on Asylum and Migration 2015 – National Report Hungary) is the “shortcomings of the European asylum rules, the problems arising from the lack and delay of effective joint action, keeping in mind at the same time that common European solutions meeting the needs of all should be elaborated as soon as possible for the medium and long term management of the situation”. The Government of Hungary, therefore, felt the need to adopt national-level legislation to address these systematic challenges.

Furthermore, Hungary has also raised the challenging task of providing protection to those who are genuinely in need of it in the context of mixed migration flows. This is the justification of the Government to introduce additional measures to enhance the protection of the Serbian-Hungarian and Croatian-Hungarian border and amend its legislation with the aim to accelerate the asylum procedure (EMN Annual Report on Asylum and Migration 2015 – National Report Hungary).

This challenge is further exacerbated by the fact that Hungary is a transit country for the westward migration, which has the effect to short duration of stay of asylum-seekers. This has led to the authorities to administer several changes to the reception and integration legislations (EMN Annual Report on Asylum and Migration 2016 – National Report Hungary).

Additionally, the effective identification of potential third-country-national victims of human trafficking is challenging. For that reason – as stated in Hungary’s National Anti-Trafficking Strategy – it is planned to hold trainings for 600 experts working in the field of victim identification, including those authorities dealing with third country nationals. It will be financed by the Internal Security Fund (EMN Annual Report on Asylum and Migration 2016 – National Report Hungary).

6.2. GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNT

Q24. Did or will your Member State undertake a national evaluation of the policies and measures implemented over 2014-2016? If it already took place, please elaborate on the findings.

No information is available on such plan.

Q25. Could you identify good practices in your Member State with regards to ensuring flexibility and adaptability of the national asylum system and associated services in order to deal with a changing influx of asylum applicants? If yes, please elaborate.

The Hungarian Ministry of Interior has described the cooperation between the Police and the Immigration Authorities as exemplary.

Q26. What are the key lessons learnt by key national authorities involved over the period 2014-2016? Please elaborate and add as many rows as needed.

| Lesson learnt | Responsible authority/stakeholder |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. N/A | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |
| 4. | |