

# European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, selection of relevant and recent passages from published reports related to Luxembourg

fra.europa.eu

29 June 2017, Vienna

References to Luxembourg marked with **bold**

## Contents

Data Explorers, tools and themes .....	3
Violence against women survey .....	3
LGBT Survey.....	3
Mapping child protection systems in the EU .....	3
Indicators on the right to political participation of people with disabilities .....	3
Mapping victims' right and support in the EU .....	3
Annual Reports .....	3
Fundamental Rights Report 2017 .....	3
1. Equality and Non-Discrimination .....	3
2. Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance.....	3
3. Asylum, visas, migration, borders and integration .....	3
4. Information society, privacy and data protection .....	4
5. Rights of the child .....	4
6. Access to justice including rights of crime victims .....	4
Fundamental Rights Report 2016 .....	5
1. Equality and Non-Discrimination .....	5
2. Racism, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance .....	5
3. Access to justice, including rights of crime victims .....	5
Thematic Reports.....	5
European legal and policy framework on immigration detention of children (June 2017) ...	5
Together in the EU - Promoting the participation of migrants and their descendants (March 2017).....	6
Violence, threats and pressures against journalists and other media actors in the European Union (November 2016) .....	6
Criminal detention and alternatives: fundamental rights aspects in EU cross-border transfers (November 2016).....	7

Rights of suspected and accused persons across the EU: translation, interpretation and information (November 2016) .....	7
Ensuring justice for hate crime victims: professional perspectives (April 2016).....	8
Protection against discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity and sex characteristics in the EU – Comparative legal analysis – Update 2015 (December 2015) .	8
Surveillance by intelligence services: fundamental rights safeguards and remedies in the EU (November 2015).....	10
Guardianship systems for children deprived of parental care in the European Union (October 2015) .....	10
Freedom to conduct a business: exploring the dimensions of a fundamental right (August 2015) .....	10
Severe labour exploitation: workers moving within or into the European Union (June 2015) .....	11

## Data Explorers, tools and themes

Violence against women survey

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/data-and-maps/survey-data-explorer-violence-against-women-survey?mdq1=country&mdq2=420>

LGBT Survey

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/data-and-maps/survey-data-explorer-lgbt-survey-2012?mdq1=country&mdq2=420>

Mapping child protection systems in the EU

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/data-and-maps/comparative-data/child-protection>

Indicators on the right to political participation of people with disabilities

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/data-and-maps/comparative-data/political-participation>

Mapping victims' right and support in the EU

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/data-and-maps/comparative-data/victims-support-services>

## Annual Reports

Fundamental Rights Report 2017

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2017/fundamental-rights-report-2017>

### 1. Equality and Non-Discrimination

“Legislation enacted in **Luxembourg** in June makes discrimination on the ground of ‘sex reassignment’ equivalent to discrimination on the ground of sex. In April 2015, the national equality body questioned the use of the term ‘sex reassignment’ rather than ‘gender reassignment’, maintaining that this terminology makes it unclear whether the law would apply only where there has been a medical or legal change in a person’s sex, or also when a person self-identifies with a gender other than that assigned at birth.” (p. 64)

“This is not the case in Portugal. In that country, married or cohabitating heterosexual or lesbian couples, as well as all women – irrespective of their civil status or sexual orientation – are entitled to assisted reproduction since June 2016. In February, it also became possible for same-sex couples in Portugal to jointly adopt children. As of the end of 2016, this was also the case in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France (for married couples), Ireland (for married couples), **Luxembourg**, Malta, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom.” (p. 67)

### 2. Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance

“In **Luxembourg**, the Court of Appeal fined a politician € 7,000 for inciting racial hatred by producing and disseminating pamphlets accusing immigrants of being responsible for the ‘destruction of the country’.” (p. 86)

### 3. Asylum, visas, migration, borders and integration

“Austria, Denmark, Greece, France, Ireland, Lithuania, **Luxembourg**, Malta and the Netherlands<sup>85</sup> are among the Member States that already provide educational support,

mainly language and basic introductory support, at reception and in the reception centres.” (p. 137)

“More than one third (10) of the Member States provided assistance measures to help parents and families of migrant refugee children integrate into school life in 2016. Some Member States set a clear path of support for migrant and refugee families to join school life and strengthen their role in the education of their children. Member States such as Austria, **Luxembourg**, Malta, the Netherlands and Portugal provide translated education material, extra language and multi-level support to parents of third-country national school children. They integrate such modules in the general induction and introductory courses and support programmes for newly arrived children of asylum seekers, refugees and other third country nationals.” (p. 139)

#### 4. Information society, privacy and data protection

“In **Luxembourg**, the government introduced a bill amending the data retention regime in accordance with Digital Rights Ireland and restricting the possibilities of retaining data to the grounds specifically listed in the bill. It was debated whether or not the bill contains a wider list of offences justifying retention beyond what is strictly necessary. (p. 164)

#### 5. Rights of the child

“**Luxembourg’s** legal framework grants extensive powers to the youth tribunal to place children in conflict with the law in institutional care (even abroad), and to transfer a child to a ‘disciplinary institution’ if the child behaves ‘badly’ (mauvaise conduite) or acts in a ‘dangerous manner’ (comportement dangereux). It is currently under revision. Based on existing legislation, 1,354 children were placed in alternative care in 2015/58 – for various reasons, most not involving conflict with the law – and almost two thirds of them were placed in settings that partly or entirely deprived them of liberty. The national human rights institution in Luxembourg adopted an opinion on the proposed bill, expressing great concern that the current practice of depriving children of their liberty is not used as a measure of last resort, and emphasising the need to revise the existing system.” (pp. 180-181)

#### 6. Access to justice including rights of crime victims

“The deadline for transposing Directive 2013/48/EU (right to access a lawyer) passed on 27 November 2016. Many Member States adopted the necessary measures to do so [...]

Draft legislative measures to transpose the directive are currently pending before the national parliaments of several other Member States: Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, **Luxembourg** and Lithuania. In the Netherlands, the Public Prosecution Service published policy guidance on how to implement suspects’ right to the assistance of a lawyer during questioning by the police or the Public Prosecution Service.” (p. 206)

“In its Fundamental Rights Report 2016, FRA called on Member States to sign, ratify and effectively implement the Istanbul Convention. In this respect, 2016 was a good year. The last three Member States signed the convention and two Member States ratified it. Several Member States – including Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, **Luxembourg** and Romania – established working groups to identify the precise legislative reforms needed to meet the requirements of the Istanbul Convention, and in Cyprus the government has commissioned studies to the same end.” (p. 209)

“Involving disabled persons’ organisation (DPOs) is essential for successful monitoring. Evidence from 2016 also highlights how that is often intertwined with issues of their resources. For example, DPOs frequently struggle to find the resources required to put together their own assessments of CRPD implementation. Those are known as shadow reports and sent to the

CRPD Committee alongside State party submissions. Luxembourg boosted such efforts by financial support from the country's National Disability Council to a leading DPO, enabling it to conduct interviews and legal analysis in preparation for its shadow report. ...

The CRPD Committee has scheduled four further reviews (Cyprus, Latvia, **Luxembourg** and the United Kingdom) for 2017, meaning that additional country specific guidance is forthcoming. This is likely to return to familiar themes of independence and resources, but the wider scope of the CRPD Committee's 2016 guidelines raises new questions for Article 33(2) bodies. Chief among these could be whether or not they have a mandate to conduct the full range of activities required to promote, protect and monitor the implementation of the CRPD." (p. 234)

## Fundamental Rights Report 2016

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/fundamental-rights-report-2016>

### 1. Equality and Non-Discrimination

"**Luxembourg's** Ministry for Equal Opportunities outlined the main points included in a draft bill amending the Labour Code: simplification of the procedure to obtain benefits when recruiting staff from the under-represented sex; clarification of the conditions for obtaining financial assistance in the framework of a specific programme targeting equal salaries between men and women; and inclusion of the principle of equal pay in the legislation. [...]

In Luxembourg, the legislature also began discussing a bill to amend the labour and criminal codes so that the principle of non-discrimination would apply to gender reassignment." (p. 67)

### 2. Racism, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance

"In the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, **Luxembourg**, the Netherlands, Spain and Sweden, national public campaigns and/or information websites were launched on living together without prejudice, racism and xenophobia; on increasing the reporting of racist and discriminatory incidents; and on victim support." (p. 81)

### 3. Access to justice, including rights of crime victims

"In *A. T. v. Luxembourg* (No. 30460/13), the ECtHR made reference to the Directive on the right to information in the context of addressing arguments on access to the case file. The case involved a person arrested under a European Arrest Warrant (EAW), and centred on the right to a fair trial under Article 6 of the ECHR in the course of criminal proceedings. The ECtHR found that the applicant's lack of access to the case file prior to his first appearance before the investigating judge did not violate Article 6, because the provision does not guarantee unlimited access to the file in situations where national authorities have sufficient reasons, relating to protecting the interests of justice, not to undermine the effectiveness of their enquiries. However, the ECtHR found that the absence of a lawyer during the applicant's initial interrogation by the police, as well as the applicant's inability to communicate with his lawyer prior to his first appearance before the investigating judge, did violate Article 6 ECHR." (pp. 163-164)

## Thematic Reports

European legal and policy framework on immigration detention of children (June 2017)

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2017/child-migrant-detention>

“In 18 EU Member States the authorities reported that a child was detained on one of the specific dates, and 14 of them provided some data about the children who had spent the most time in detention on those dates. The number of detention days varied across Member States, from a few hours to several months. Only four EU Member States (Belgium, **Luxembourg**, Slovenia and Sweden) had held those children for 15 days or less.” (p. 13)

#### **Promising Practice: Finding practical ways to avoid child detention**

“Some EU Member States may allow deprivation of liberty in theory in exceptional cases, but viable alternatives exist so it does not occur in practice. In **Luxembourg**, no unaccompanied child has been detained at the centre in Findel since it opened in August 2011 as this has not been deemed necessary.” (p. 37)

“Facilities in only four EU Member States reported regular training or awareness raising on issues related to child protection. In **Luxembourg**, the security guards working in the Findel facility receive regular training in sensitivity for working with detained foreigners.” (p. 79)

#### **Together in the EU - Promoting the participation of migrants and their descendants (March 2017)**

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2017/migrant-participation>

“FRA’s research found that, of the 19 EU Member States with an active national integration strategy or action plan, 15 conducted some type of periodic assessment or review by 2015 (Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, **Luxembourg**, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia).” (p. 35)

“In several Member States, trade unions have well-established policies to reach out and support migrant workers – for example, in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Italy, **Luxembourg**, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Slovenia and the United Kingdom.” (p. 47)

#### **Violence, threats and pressures against journalists and other media actors in the European Union (November 2016)**

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/violence-threats-and-pressures-against-journalists-and-other-media-actors-european>

“In January 2016, the press in **Luxembourg** reacted strongly to a memorandum sent by the prime minister’s office to all ministerial departments, administrations and services of the State on the “rights and obligations of State officials in their relations with the press”. Journalists felt that this put serious limitations on interactions between State officials and journalists and other media actors and that it would affect how they research stories and the protection of their sources. The memorandum obliges State officials to refer any request for information from the press to the designated person in the relevant department and to transfer to that person any information and documentation she or he wishes to share with the press.” (p. 13)

“The LuxLeaks case concerns two whistleblowers and a French journalist. The whistleblowers were former employees of PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) who leaked classified documents revealing a large amount of tax avoidance arrangements that the authorities in **Luxembourg** struck with hundreds of companies. In 2014, the leaked documents were published by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists. Following these revelations, the whistleblowers and the journalist were charged by the public prosecutor in **Luxembourg**; the journalist was charged with violating trade secrets and confidentiality. In June 2016, the court acquitted the journalist while convicting the whistle-blowers and imposing suspended jail sentences and fines.” (p. 15)

## Criminal detention and alternatives: fundamental rights aspects in EU cross-border transfers (November 2016)

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/criminal-detention-and-alternatives-fundamental-rights-aspects-eu-cross-border>

“FRA’s research shows that, in a majority of the EU Member States, the only information made publicly available about the Framework Decisions is the legislation implementing its content. Seventeen states make available only the text of the law implementing the Framework Decision (Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, **Luxembourg**, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Spain).” (pp. 85 - 86)

### **Promising Practice: Informing accused or sentenced persons about the possibility of transfer**

“Promising practices are emerging in how states provide information to accused/sentenced persons. While published national laws serve as the only source of information in many states, others summarise relevant information and package it in an accessible and understandable manner for accused/sentenced persons. [...] Romania, **Luxembourg**, Ireland, Hungary, the Netherlands and Finland also make relevant information sheets publicly available online. For example, **Luxembourg** provides general information online that makes it clear that under domestic law consent is necessary for transfers under all three Framework Decisions.” (p. 86)

## Rights of suspected and accused persons across the EU: translation, interpretation and information (November 2016)

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/rights-suspected-and-accused-persons-across-eu-translation-interpretation-and>

“In terms of who has the responsibility for determining the need for interpretation during the pre-trial stage, in the vast majority of the 27 Member States bound by the directive, legislation specifies who is responsible for that determination. In most Member States (21), this is prescribed in the criminal codes, while in **Luxembourg**, this is addressed in a circular note of the Prosecutor General as a formal recommendation to prosecutors.” (p. 32)

“Although Directive 2010/64/EU does not require Member States to establish a register, Figure 4 shows that 17 Member States bound by the directive have provided for one in their laws: Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, **Luxembourg**, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, 21 and Sweden.” (p. 45)

“Some Member States in the first group have laws that refer in a general manner to the obligation to provide information about rights to every person subject to questioning with regard to whom there are strong or plausible reasons to suspect that they have committed or attempted to commit an offence. These include Croatia, France, **Luxembourg**, the Netherlands, Slovenia, and the United Kingdom (England & Wales and Northern Ireland).” (p. 64)

“Rules of criminal procedure in individual EU Member States reflect different approaches to organising access. In some Member States, strict limitations are placed on where and for how long case material can be consulted. [...] In **Luxembourg**, access is possible after the first interrogation by the investigating judge, but only in the office of the judge. Pending legislation is expected to grant the accused the right to receive a copy of the file for a reasonable period of time before the hearing.” (p. 77)

“The initial stage of the pre-trial phase is generally conducted by the police, and the rules on providing information emphasise safeguarding the rights of persons facing detention. Access to case materials for those questioned by the police but not deprived of their liberty is not always regulated in national law, and depends on the organisation of the criminal proceedings. In Slovenia, unless a judge orders an investigative act – such as interrogating a witness – to be performed prior to the opening of a judicial investigation, suspects who are not detained generally cannot access case materials during the initial police phase, i.e. until the public prosecutor files the request to open a judicial investigation. In **Luxembourg**, the law foresees access to elements of the file only after a person has been questioned by the police.” (p. 78)

“Countries in which an obligation to keep a record exists can be further divided into two groups: countries that do not require the suspected/accused person’s signature to confirm the provision of information, and those that do. In **Luxembourg**, for instance, during the police questioning and investigative stage, the law provides for recordkeeping about information on procedural rights, noting that the written records shall include the date and time at which the person was informed of the rights, but not mentioning their signature.” (p. 87)

### [Ensuring justice for hate crime victims: professional perspectives \(April 2016\)](http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/ensuring-justice-hate-crime-victims-professional-perspectives)

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/ensuring-justice-hate-crime-victims-professional-perspectives>

“A striking general finding with regard to interviewees’ responses is a lack of awareness or agreement between experts on the actual availability of such services (e.g. in Ireland, **Luxembourg** and Portugal).” (p. 38)

“Two clusters of countries were formed on the basis of patterns that surfaced in the research, and compared. The first cluster consists of five Member States – Denmark, France, **Luxembourg**, Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The second group comprises eight other Member States – Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Latvia, Malta, Poland, Portugal and Romania. Of the 51 professionals interviewed from the first cluster, 13 (25 %) viewed the risk that police officers share discriminatory attitudes as either very high or fairly high. However, of the 71 interviewees from the second cluster, 41 (58 %) rated this risk as very or fairly high. Hence, according to the professionals interviewed in this research, the risk that police officers to whom hate crime victims report share the discriminatory attitudes of offenders is more than twice as high in the second cluster of Member States compared to the first.” (p. 55)

“Community-based approaches to policing hate crime involve partnerships and cooperation at various levels. For example, the police in **Luxembourg** consistently work with groups perceived to be vulnerable to hate crime and have established a stable working relationship with the Support Association for Migrant Workers (Association de Soutien aux Travailleurs Immigrés, ASTI).” (pp. 57-58)

### [Protection against discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity and sex characteristics in the EU – Comparative legal analysis – Update 2015 \(December 2015\)](http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2015/lgbti-comparative-legal-update-2015)

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2015/lgbti-comparative-legal-update-2015>

“According to the NGO Transgender Europe, as of 2014, at least 24 EU Member States required diagnosis of a gender identity disorder in order to access SRS and/ or legal recognition of a person’s gender. These were Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, **Luxembourg**, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom.” (p. 16)



“According to the same scheme, as of 2014, the prohibition of discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation covers all areas mentioned in the Racial Equality Directive in 13 Member States [...], up from 10 in 2010. In eight other Member States (Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, **Luxembourg**, Malta, the Netherlands and Portugal), equal treatment legislation on the ground of sexual orientation extends to at least some of those areas.” (p. 26)

“In nine other Member States (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, **Luxembourg**, Romania and Slovenia), the lack of legislation or case law addressing discrimination based on gender identity results in legal uncertainty about the precise protection against discrimination available to trans persons.” (p. 29)

“As of mid-2015, 20 Member States (Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, **Luxembourg**, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom) make it a criminal offence to incite hatred, violence or discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation.” (p. 59)

“As of 2014, 15 EU Member States [...] consider homophobic intent an aggravating circumstance or an element to be taken into account when determining penalties, either for all common crimes or for a closed set of criminal offences. In 11 other Member States (Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Italy, **Luxembourg**, Latvia, Poland and Slovenia), committing criminal offences with such intent is not an aggravating circumstance.” (p. 63)

“At the time of writing, eleven EU Member States allow same-sex couples to marry. In 2010, five did so. [...] Between then and October 2015, six others joined the group: Denmark (2012), France (2013), the United Kingdom (2014), **Luxembourg** (2015), Finland (2014, will enter into force on 1 March 2017), and Ireland (2015).” (p. 82)

“As of 2014, 12 Member States (eight in 2010) clearly do not distinguish between same-sex spouses and different-sex spouses of foreign EU citizens for purposes of entry and residence rights (Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, **Luxembourg**, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom).” (p. 82)

“In **Luxembourg**, the immigration law does not recognise unregistered partnerships.<sup>564</sup> However, the Ministry of Immigration can authorise unregistered partners of EU citizens to remain in Luxembourg if in their countries of origin they are dependent on or are members of the EU citizen’s household, or if the EU citizen must take care of their partner because of serious health reasons. Thus, the immigration law does not incorporate the directive’s wording aimed at partners with whom sponsors are in a “duly attested stable long-term relationship” (Article 12).” (p. 85)

“Seventeen Member States currently grant family reunification rights to same-sex partners of third country nationals. Ten extend the right to family reunification to same-sex partners in de facto relationships (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom), while seven (the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, **Luxembourg**, Malta and Slovenia) restrict this possibility to registered partnerships.” (p. 89)

“In **Luxembourg**, a 2012 judgment by the Administrative Tribunal of the Grand Duchy of **Luxembourg** rejected a claim filed by a homosexual man from Serbia, who declared that he suffered physical aggression from family members because of his sexual orientation. The tribunal found that he was unable to prove persecution.” (p. 105)

## Surveillance by intelligence services: fundamental rights safeguards and remedies in the EU (November 2015)

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2015/surveillance-intelligence-services>

“In **Luxembourg**, on the other hand, the Parliamentary Control Commission has the power to conduct checks on specific issues. At the end of each review, the commission then files a confidential report that includes findings, conclusions and recommendations to its members, the prime minister, and the Director of the Intelligence. This may also be requested by the prime minister. The committee is also informed every six months of surveillance measures of communications ordered by the prime minister.” (p. 35)

“**Luxembourg’s** Parliamentary Control Committee is also authorised to access any information and documents it considers relevant to the performance of its duties, with the exception of information or documents that could reveal the identity of a source or that would impair the rights of third parties. It can also request assistance from external experts when it requires special knowledge. This ensures that technical information is not overlooked by, in this case, parliamentarians who may not have the proper training or expertise. This is in line with the CoE Commissioner for Human Rights’ recommendation that “oversight bodies should have recourse to specialists in information and communications technology who can enable overseers to better comprehend and evaluate surveillance systems and thus to better understand the human rights implications of these activities”.” (pp. 40 -41)

“In **Luxembourg**, the Data Protection Authority (DPA) itself is not competent to supervise the intelligence service, but the supervisory authority competent to supervise data processing related to state security, defence and public safety comprises the Chief State Prosecutor and two members of the DPA. This interesting solution ensures that the oversight body is knowledgeable on data protection requirements.” (p. 47)

“In France and in **Luxembourg**, the prime minister authorises the surveillance of communications. In **Luxembourg**, the prime minister needs the assent of a commission composed of the President of the Superior Court of Justice, the President of the Administrative Court, and the President of the District Court.” (pp. 52-53)

## Guardianship systems for children deprived of parental care in the European Union (October 2015)

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2015/guardianship-children-deprived-parental-care>

“Although only four Member States have developed a separate system for unaccompanied children, in practice differentiated arrangements exist in more Member States. In **Luxembourg**, for example, in practice guardianship of unaccompanied children is assigned to the Red Cross and Caritas, who run the reception facilities for these children.” (p. 32)

## Freedom to conduct a business: exploring the dimensions of a fundamental right (August 2015)

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2015/freedom-conduct-business-exploring-dimensions-fundamental-right>

“The main barriers that the identified population groups face concerning the freedom to conduct a business include: discrimination; having limited business networks because of lack of experience or being new to a particular country or field; facing other difficulties linked to level of education, status, being a foreigner or social exclusion; and certain legal requirements being applied that may not take into account the needs or specificities of certain segments of

the population. This lack of financial, human and social capital can create significant obstacles to entrepreneurs. In **Luxembourg** for instance, a lack of information on the documentation and steps required for registering a business was identified as a difficulty faced by youth, women and migrant entrepreneurs.” (p. 38)

### **Promising Practice: Young Enterprise & Create Young Entrepreneur Luxembourg**

“Young Enterprise is an initiative to promote the creativity and entrepreneurial spirit of young entrepreneurs through student competitions and educational programmes. Students are asked to create a business plan and present it before a jury composed of private sector and academic representatives. The winning team is invited to present its business plan at a European competition. The Young Entrepreneurs **Luxembourg** is a branch of Junior Achievement Worldwide (JA). [...] The Jeune Chambre Economique **Luxembourg** organises a ‘Create Young Entrepreneur Luxembourg’ competition and award for young entrepreneurs. The prize is €1,500 and provides recognition to young entrepreneurs for dynamic, new approaches. The award also generates publicity with national ministries and large private sector companies, and attracts international attention.” (p. 41)

“Women also tend to be more involved in part-time work than men. In Austria, Belgium, Germany and **Luxembourg**, women represent more than 80 % of part-time workers. On average, in the EU-28 in 2012, although women represented 46 % of those in employment, they accounted for 76 % of those working on a part-time basis and for only 38 % of those working full-time. This is in part due to women trying to balance work and family life – women often work part-time to gain flexibility.” (p. 44)

“To overcome some of the difficulties that entrepreneurs with disabilities face and to pre-empt the potential incompatibility of legal requirements for businesses with the special needs/concerns of entrepreneurs with disabilities, several Member States including Bulgaria, France, **Luxembourg**, and Romania, have adapted their legal frameworks to include specific laws on persons with disabilities. ...

In Luxembourg, persons with disabilities may receive additional support and benefits, and may be allowed partial or total exemption from social security charges supported by the state budget.” (p. 47)

### **Severe labour exploitation: workers moving within or into the European Union (June 2015)**

<http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2015/severe-labour-exploitation-workers-moving-within-or-european-union>

“Desk and field research carried out by FRA indicates that less than half of EU Member States have implemented Article 13 (4) of the Employer Sanctions Directive at the level of legislation; those that have done so include Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, **Luxembourg**, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden.” (p. 79)

“Desk research conducted in all 28 Member States revealed that in at least half of the Member States – Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, **Luxembourg**, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain and Sweden – trade unions are entitled to lodge complaints on behalf of victims.” (p. 85)