

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

fra.europa.eu

March 2021, Vienna

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

Contents

Data Explorers and Tools	3
Annual Reports	4
Fundamental Rights Report 2020 (June 2020).....	4
2. <i>Equality and non-discrimination</i>	4
3. <i>Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance</i>	4
7. <i>Rights of the Child</i>	5
8. <i>Access to Justice</i>	6
9. <i>Developments in the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</i>	6
Fundamental Rights Report 2019 (June 2019).....	6
3. <i>Equality and non-discrimination</i>	6
4. <i>Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance</i>	7
5. <i>Roma integration</i>	7
7. <i>Information society, privacy and data protection</i>	7
8. <i>Rights of the child</i>	7
9. <i>Access to justice</i>	8
10. <i>Developments in the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</i>	8
Thematic Reports	9
Crime, safety and victims' rights – Fundamental Rights Survey (February 2021).....	9
Business and human rights – access to remedy (October 2020).....	11
Antisemitism: Overview of anti-Semitic incidents recorded in the European union 2009-2019 (September 2020).....	11

Strong and effective National Human Rights Institutions – challenges, promising practices and opportunities (September 2020).....	11
Roma and Travellers in six countries (September 2020).....	12
A long way to go for LGBTI equality (May 2020).....	15
Relocating unaccompanied children: applying good practices to future schemes (May 2020).....	15
Criminal detention conditions in the European Union: rules and reality (December 2019).....	16
Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey - Migrant women - selected findings (September 2019).....	17
From institutions to community living for persons with disabilities: perspectives from the ground (December 2018).....	18
Protecting migrant workers from exploitation in the EU: workers’ perspectives (June 2019).....	20
Hate crime recording and data collection practice across the EU (June 2018).....	20
Under watchful eyes: biometrics, EU IT systems and fundamental rights (March 2018).....	21
Challenges facing civil society organisations working on human rights in the EU (January 2018)...	21
Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey - Main results (December 2017)...	22

Data Explorers and Tools

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

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

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

Finally, the FRA website also includes the following **databases**:

- The [Criminal Detention Database 2015-2019](#), which combines in one place information on detention conditions in all EU Member States;
- [Anti-Muslim hatred Database 2012-2019](#), which provides information on significant international, European and national case law and rulings, UN human rights body decisions, reports, findings by human rights and equality bodies and organisations relating to hate crime, hate speech and discrimination against Muslims, as well as relevant research, reports, studies, data and statistics on these issues.

Annual Reports

Fundamental Rights Report 2020 (June 2020)

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

2. Equality and non-discrimination

“Several Member States’ activities prepared the ground for the practical implementation of the [EU High Level Group on Non-Discrimination, Equality and Diversity]’s 2018 Guidelines on improving the collection and use of equality data. [...] In October, the **Irish** Human Rights and Equality Commission (IHREC) convened a national roundtable on implementing the guidelines. It comprised senior decision makers from government departments, public bodies, academia and civil society organisations. In addition, the Equality Budgeting Expert Advisory Group chaired by the **Irish** Department of Public Expenditure and Reform (DPER) set up a data subgroup. It aims to increase the availability of disaggregated equality data and is led by the DPER and the Central Statistics Office. (p. 41)

“As outlined in this section, the rights of LGBTI persons did advance in several Member States in 2019, namely Belgium, Finland, Greece, **Ireland**, Malta, the Netherlands, Spain, and Sweden.” (p. 46)

3. Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance

“In 2019, ECRI identified gaps in several Member States’ legislation against the public expression of and incitement to hatred, which is also subject to EU legislation. Its reports on **Ireland**, Latvia, Slovenia and Romania raised concerns that no legislative provisions penalise the public expression of insults, or defamation on grounds of race, colour, language, religion, nationality or national or ethnic origin.[...] ECRI called on the authorities in **Ireland** and Slovenia to amend their legislation to provide that racist and other hate motivation constitutes an aggravating circumstance for all criminal offences and is taken into account in sentencing.” (p. 63)

“In **Ireland**, the Minister of State for Equality, Immigration and Integration established an Anti-Racism Committee. It brings together stakeholders from public sector organisations and experts, to discuss how to address racism systematically. Importantly, in October 2019, the police force, *An Garda Síochána*, introduced a working hate crime definition as part of its diversity and integration strategy. The strategy defines a hate crime as any criminal offence which is perceived by the victim or any other person to, in whole or in part, be motivated by hostility or prejudice, based on actual or perceived age, disability, race, colour, nationality, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or gender.” (p. 66)

“In **Ireland**, the progress report on the national migrant integration strategy notes persistent low rates of reporting hate crime. It highlights that only 18 % of governmental offices display information on how to report racism.” (p. 68)

“Reflecting increasing societal diversity in **Ireland**, the police force, *An Garda Síochána*, has altered its uniform policy to permit members of religious minorities to join it and maintain dress code requirements.” (p. 68)

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

- [...]

- Facing All The Facts, with partners in Greece, Hungary, **Ireland**, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom
 - o European report – Connecting on hate crime: Recording and data collection – Emerging themes
 - o national reports
 - o bias indicator courses” (p. 69)

“Likewise, ECRI’s reports on **Ireland** and Romania stressed that the law should clearly define and prohibit racial and ethnic profiling by the police.” (p. 72)

7. Rights of the Child

“Approximately half of the EU Member States have provisions to extend some [transitional support measures for after majority] such as having an advisor or social services support – beyond majority. The extension may be limited to children enrolled in an education programme, as for example in Bulgaria, Estonia, **Ireland** or Slovakia. These measures are often limited to asylum applicants and/or international protection beneficiaries.” (p. 131)

“While a majority of data protection supervisory authorities (SAs) saw their budget and human resources increased, some noted that resources are still insufficient to cope with their updated mandate. In **Ireland**, for instance, staff increased from 80 in 2018 to 170 by the end of 2019, but the SA estimated it needed 200 more to fulfil its new mandate. Furthermore, the **Irish** SA highlighted that its budget increase in 2019 was less than a third of what it requested so it could carry out its tasks effectively.” (p. 144)

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

“Early childhood education and childcare services can have an important impact on child poverty or social exclusion. [Country-specific recommendations (CSRs)] identified the quality and adequacy of these services as an issue to consider in many EU Member States, but the aim was to foster women’s participation in the labour market more than to address child poverty. The EU Council addressed CSRs on these services to Austria, Cyprus, Czechia, **Ireland**, Italy, Poland and Slovakia. (p. 169)

“Member States continued to incorporate the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMS) Directive into national law during 2019. [...] Other Member States have started consultations on the directive or drafted legislative amendments, such as Denmark, Finland, **Ireland**, Latvia, the Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom.” (p. 173)

“In **Ireland**, the public consultation highlighted the need for a clear definition of ‘harmful content’. It should include child sex abuse, serious cyberbullying and material that promotes self-harm or encourages nutritional deprivation. Respondents also stated that, in addition to the right to be protected from harm, children have the same range of fundamental rights as adults, including freedom of expression and access to information.” (p. 174)

“The Council of Europe’s Lanzarote Convention, which has been adopted by all EU Member States except **Ireland**, contains comprehensive obligations to prevent, protect, prosecute and promote cooperation in relation to child sexual exploitation and sexual abuse, including where facilitated by

information and communication technologies (ICTs).” (p. 174)

“The only Member States bound by [Directive 2011/93] that have implemented it are Cyprus, the Netherlands, **Ireland** and the United Kingdom. The directive requires reforms of criminal and criminal procedure laws; the development of administrative measures; and the involvement of multiple bodies, such as national and regional authorities, civil society organisations and internet service providers.” (p. 174)

8. Access to Justice

“**Ireland** ratified the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (the Istanbul Convention) in 2019, bringing to 21 the total number of EU Member States that had ratified the convention by the end of 2019.” (p. 201)

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

“**Ireland’s** Supreme Court referenced Article 27 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in the case of a special needs assistant. She was dismissed after she acquired a disability that her employers considered made her unfit for work. The Supreme Court established that reasonable accommodation can include the redistribution of any task or duty provided it is not a disproportionate burden on the employer. It also set out an expectation that the relevant employee and other employees related to the role should participate in decisions about reasonable accommodation.” (p. 219)

“By the end of 2019, however, six Member States (Bulgaria, Czechia, **Ireland**, the Netherlands, Poland and Romania) and the EU itself had still not ratified or acceded to the Optional Protocol [to the CRPD].” (p. 219)

“Other Member States have created advisory bodies to existing independent monitoring bodies. After ratifying the CRPD, **Ireland** established the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission (IHREC) and the National Disability Authority as the monitoring framework under Article 33. To aid its work, in 2019, IHREC set up a Disability Advisory Committee of 11 members representing a broad range of lived experiences of disability. The committee will provide advice and grassroots-level information to IHREC and will be directly involved in monitoring laws, policies and practices relevant to the implementation of the CRPD.” (p. 221)

Fundamental Rights Report 2019 (June 2019)

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

3. Equality and non-discrimination

“**Ireland** enacted legislation enabling same-sex couples to register both of their names on their child’s identification documents, including birth certificate and passport. The amending legislation recognises the legal parenthood of both parents.” (p. 68)

“Promising practice: Taking action to counter discrimination in the labour market. The **Irish** Equality and Human Rights Commission has issued retirement and fixed-term contract guidelines to ensure that older workers who wish to continue in employment are not discriminated against. They provide

guidance to legal and human resources professionals, trade unions, employers and others on interpreting and applying sections of employment law relating to older workers.” (p. 74)

4. Racism, xenophobia and related intolerance

“In December 2018, FRA published the findings of EU-MIDIS II, which, among others, surveyed 5,803 people with African descent in 12 EU Member States. Across these 12 EU Member States (Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, **Ireland**, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom), nearly one in three people of African descent (30 %) said they had experienced racist harassment in the five years before the survey, the findings show.” (p. 89)

“In **Ireland**, Black Irish people are twice as likely as White Irish people to experience discrimination when seeking work and three times as likely to experience discrimination in the workplace, the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission and the Economic and Social Research Institute found.” (p. 90)

“Equality bodies are crucial in helping ethnic minorities to access justice and seek redress. [...]The highest levels of awareness of such bodies are in **Ireland** (67 %), the United Kingdom (65 %) and Denmark (62 %), and the lowest in Malta (9 %), Luxembourg (12 %), Italy (19 %) and Austria (20 %).” (p. 96)

5. Roma integration

“**Ireland** has started consultations on the possibility of including Traveller culture and history in schools’ curricular.” (p. 115)

7. Information society, privacy and data protection

“On 23 April 2018, the European Commission presented a proposal for a Directive on the protection of persons reporting on breaches of Union law. At that stage, only 10 EU countries (France, Hungary, **Ireland**, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Sweden and the United Kingdom) had comprehensive laws protecting whistleblowers.” (p. 155)

“In **Ireland**, the High Court also ruled that national legislation on data retention violates EU law and the ECHR, as it established a general and indiscriminate data retention regime.” (p. 163)

“The US and the vast majority of the EU Member States – the only exceptions being **Ireland** and Sweden – are parties to the Budapest Convention on cybercrime, which is the only binding international instrument on this issue.” (p. 164)

8. Rights of the child

“In **Ireland**, the national implementation plan for SDGs adopted in 2018 embraces the target to reduce at least by half the proportion of children living in poverty by 2030.” (p. 181)

“**Ireland** opted in to the Reception Conditions Directive in 2018. This decision was partly a response to the judgment of the Irish Supreme Court in *NHV v. Minister for Justice and Equality & Others* in 2017. In this case, the court put an end to the absolute prohibition on asylum seekers’ access to the Irish labour market, which would include children from the age of 16. On 9 February 2018, the Supreme Court formally deemed unconstitutional the absolute ban that had been in place on asylum seekers entering employment.” (p. 186)

“Promising practice: The Minister for Children and Youth Affairs in **Ireland** has introduced a Bail Support Scheme (BSS) for children suspected of committing a criminal offence. This scheme is to help child suspects remain on bail in the community, rather than being imprisoned in child detention centres on remand awaiting the hearing of their trial. This pilot scheme was subcontracted to Extern, a social justice charity, and aims to offer an alternative to detention for young persons. It focuses on supporting young offenders to remain within their home and in education, training or employment, keeping them out of trouble with the law. Extern intervenes as needed using Multisystemic Therapy (MST). This type of therapy is in operation worldwide and is proven to help reduce reoffending rates, keep young people in education, and decrease adolescent drug and alcohol use.” (p. 188)

9. Access to justice

“At the national level, during 2018, legislative measures were adopted or entered into force in almost two thirds of the Member States. They were largely to better implement and reflect the Victims’ Rights Directive (2012/29/EU). These Member States are Belgium, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, **Ireland**, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden. Advances and developments include, among others, improving the rights of crime victims to participate in proceedings (e.g. the victim’s right to be heard); enhancing victims’ rights to financial compensation (e.g. by enlarging the scope of crimes for which financial compensation is available); and facilitating victims’ rights to information (e.g. through awareness-raising initiatives and training).” (p. 206)

“In **Ireland**, as part of an EU-funded training programme for lawyers, the Irish Council on Civil Liberties published a Guide for lawyers on the Victims’ Directive and the Irish Criminal Justice (Victims of Crime) Act 2017. In addition, several non-governmental organisations made submissions to the Commission on the Future of Policing, including multiple recommendations on victims’ rights and the directive. All the NGOs stressed the need for officers to receive proper training in the complexities of victims’ needs, and the manner in which victims respond to – and cope with – violent crime. Rape Crisis Network Ireland and Women’s Aid pointed to the need for specialist training in developing and implementing risk-assessment matrices.” (p. 207)

“In 2018, several Member States took measures to align their legislation with the [Istanbul] convention requirements. The following Member States have adopted wider definitions with a view to bringing their legislation in line with the convention: Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, **Ireland**, Malta, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Relevant legislative initiatives are currently pending in Denmark and Finland.” (p. 210)

“In **Ireland**, the enactment of the Domestic Violence Act 2018 realised a major part of the government’s implementation strategy. The Minister for Justice and Equality has indicated that only one issue remains before **Ireland** can formally ratify the Istanbul Convention: extra-territorial prosecution of offences. To that end, the government has approved the introduction of new legislation to deal with this issue, and in May the Department of Justice and Equality published a bill to that effect.” (p. 211)

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

“Ten years after the entry into force of the CRPD, 2018 saw the convention reach full ratification in the EU when, on 20 March, **Ireland** became the last Member State to ratify it. **Ireland**, a further five Member States (Bulgaria, Czechia, the Netherlands, Poland and Romania), and the EU itself have

not, however, ratified the Optional Protocol to the CRPD, which allows the CRPD Committee to handle complaints and set up inquiries relating to CRPD implementation.” (p. 229)

“Activities in **Ireland** focused on a broader range of services as part of actions under the Service Reform Fund. Using funding allocated in late 2017 to reform disability services, 2018 provided the opportunity for consortia including people with disabilities, family members, services providers and community groups, to apply for grants. In addition, consultations with service users and providers aimed to develop reasonable and sustainable plans to reconfigure services.” (p. 234)

Thematic Reports

Crime, safety and victims' rights – Fundamental Rights Survey (February 2021)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2021/fundamental-rights-survey-crime>

“The Irish Crime and Victimization Survey found that, in the 12 months before the survey, 2.7 % of households had experienced a burglary; 3 % of respondents in **Ireland** had, according to the Fundamental Rights Survey.” (p. 66)

“Overall, 8 % of people in the EU-27 experienced online banking or payment card (credit or debit card) fraud in the five years before the survey, and 3 % experienced it in the 12 months before the survey. Results range from 19 % in France, 15 % in Denmark and 14 % in **Ireland** experiencing online banking or payment card fraud in the five years before the survey, to 1 % in Greece, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal and Romania.” (p. 67)

“Examining these results by country, bear in mind that the rates of internet penetration and use vary between countries and that in 10 countries the survey was conducted online. Of only internet users in the EU-27, 51 % who have experienced consumer fraud indicate that this involved buying something online, while 30 % experienced it when going to a shop to buy something. The share of online consumer fraud ranges from over two in three in the United Kingdom (73 %), Germany (69 %), **Ireland** and Denmark (both 67 %) to under three in 10 in Slovakia (27 %), Bulgaria (22 %) and Greece (19 %).” (p. 73)

“Reporting rates of [experiences of violence] vary from 40 % in France and 37 % in Germany to 9 % in Finland, 12 % in Greece and 13 % in Estonia, **Ireland** and Romania.” (p. 77)

“In Cyprus, 31 % of harassment incidents in the five years before the survey were reported to the police or other authorities, followed by 23 % reported in each for Belgium, **Ireland** and Malta.” (p. 84)

“It is possible to identify differences in how ready people in various countries would be to intervene personally when witnessing an offence, as opposed to calling the police – that is, engaging the criminal justice system (Figure 31). In countries such as **Ireland**, Luxembourg, Malta and the United Kingdom, people prefer having the police address the situation to direct personal intervention.” (p.96)

“Overall, 52 % of people in Spain, 26 % in France and 23 % in Latvia are very worried about experiencing a terrorist attack in the next 12 months, compared with 3 % in **Ireland**, 5 % in Poland and 6 % in the Netherlands.” (p.102)

“One in four people or more in Czechia, France, **Ireland** and the United Kingdom avoid certain situations or places often or all the time for fear of assault or harassment (one or more of the three

listed situations)." (p.107)

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

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

“Since 2013, 15 of the 27 EU Member States have adopted [National Action Plans] on business and human rights, namely Belgium, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, **Ireland**, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden (p. 88)

Antisemitism: Overview of anti-Semitic incidents recorded in the European union 2009-2019 (September 2020)

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

“In 2019, ECRI published country reports for six EU Member States: Finland, **Ireland**, Latvia, the Netherlands, Romania and Slovenia. These reports include a broad overview of the situation regarding antisemitism in the particular country under examination.” (p. 17)

“At the time of writing, the latest available data in ODIHR’s online hate crime reporting database covered the year 2018. Fourteen EU Member States (Austria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, **Ireland**, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain and Sweden) provided ODIHR with data on antisemitic crimes for the purposes of the database, as can be seen in Table 2.” (p. 19)

“The Central Statistics Office (CSO) in **Ireland** published the number of antisemitic incidents reported to the police between 2007 and 2015. No data were available for 2017 or 2016 at the time this report was compiled. However, the data collected by ODIHR shows one police recorded hate crime involving antisemitic motivation in 2018.⁵⁸ No data are available concerning the number of recorded incidents in 2019 at the time when this report was being compiled. The report of the country visit (24–25 June 2019) to **Ireland** by the Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on Combating Anti-Semitism notes that “[t]he small number of recorded anti-Semitic incidents thus precludes specific data being made public” while also noting the perception of authorities that hate crimes are being underreported.⁵⁹ As a part of the implementation of the Diversity and Integration Strategy 2019–2021, Garda Síochána (police authorities) will record both hate crimes and non-crime hate incidents.” (p. 53)

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

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

“All countries covered by this report are parties to OPCAT, except four (Belgium, **Ireland** and Slovakia have only signed and Latvia has not even signed).” (p. 31)

“All countries covered by this report are parties to the Council of Europe’s Lanzarote Convention (formally the Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse) save **Ireland** which has only signed the convention.” (p. 32)

“The development of mandates under OPCAT is under discussion for the NHRI in **Ireland**.” (p. 32)

“**Ireland**’s current NHRI was founded in 2014 through a merger between the equality body and the human rights commission.” (p. 34)

“In 15 countries covered by this report, institutional leaderships enjoy such [functional] immunity (Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Greece, Hungary, **Ireland**, Latvia, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania (ombuds institution), Serbia, Slovenia and Spain). Such immunity also extends to the management board in four cases (Greece, **Ireland**, Romania (ombuds institution) and Spain).[...] With regard to staff, protection against such liability is provided in only two cases (Cyprus and **Ireland**).” (p. 48)

“The **Irish** NHRI, the Human Rights and Equality Commission, appointed in 2019 a formal advisory committee, made up of a significant majority of people with disabilities, to deliver on its mandate to monitor **Ireland**’s implementation of the Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities.” (p. 60)

“Sixteen of the NHRIs surveyed have a mandate that allows them to intervene [in proceedings before constitutional or equivalent-level courts at national level] but does not oblige them to do so (Austria, Czechia, Estonia, Hungary, **Ireland**, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Portugal, Romania’s ombuds institution, Slovakia, Slovenia and all three United Kingdom organisations).” (p. 87)

“Twenty-one NHRIs have offered advice to policy makers [on fundamental rights implications of the measures taken to respond to Covid-19], including open letters addressed to governments or ministers, as in the case of **Ireland**’s NHRI, the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission, and the United Kingdom’s Equality and Human Rights Commission, or Luxembourg’s NHRI.” (p.94)

Roma and Travellers in six countries (September 2020)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/roma-travellers-survey>

“**Ireland** recognised Travellers as an ethnic group in 2017, although Irish Travellers have been documented as being part of Irish society for centuries. Travellers have a long-shared history, traditions, language, culture and customs. An estimated 40,000 Travellers live in **Ireland**. While their heritage involves a nomadic lifestyle, most now live in permanent locations (82 % of the respondents in permanent housing and 18 % in trailers) and the majority have never experienced nomadic life. However, many may still travel during the summer months.” (p. 11)

“The proportion of Roma and Travellers in work is very low across all survey countries, the results show, and well below the employment rate of the general population, ranging from 15 % in **Ireland** to 50 % in Belgium. The employment gap between women and men is high, except in **Ireland**, ranging from 10 percentage points in Sweden to 52 percentage points in the United Kingdom. (p. 20)

“Rates [of adults and children going to bed hungry at least once in the last month] are also high in Belgium (15 % of Roma and 13 % of Caravan dwellers surveyed), France and **Ireland** (10 % of the Travellers surveyed in both countries).”(p. 22)

“Almost half of the respondents have felt discriminated against when looking for housing in the past five years because of being Roma or Travellers. More than 90 % of Travellers in **Ireland**, Belgium and the Netherlands feel that there are not enough places – especially appropriate halting sites – for them to live.” (p. 23)

“Roma in the Netherlands (76 %) and Travellers in **Ireland** (65 %) have the highest proportions of respondents who felt discriminated against because of their Roma and Traveller background in the 12 months preceding the survey.” (p. 27)

“Moreover, on average, the proportion of Roma and Travellers who felt discriminated against is higher for younger respondents (52 % for those aged 16–24 years) than for older respondents (47 % for those aged 25–44 and 37 % for those aged 45 and older), according to the findings. There are no great differences in the average level of discrimination between women (46 %) and men (44 %). Exceptions to this finding are in the United Kingdom, where the prevalence of discrimination among Gypsy and Traveller women is 13 percentage points higher (47 %) than among men (34 %), and among Travellers in **Ireland**, where a slight reverse trend is observed (68 % of men versus 62 % of women). (p. 28)

“Looking specifically at the countries included in the Roma and Travellers Survey (RTS), France has the biggest share of the general population that feels uncomfortable with Roma and Travellers as neighbours (52 %) [according to FRA’s Fundamental Rights Survey]. In other countries, this proportion is lower: 46 % in **Ireland**, 41 % in Belgium, 38 % in the United Kingdom, 33 % in the Netherlands and 30 % in Sweden. These results are also reflected in the findings of the 2019 special Eurobarometer on discrimination in the European Union: 61 % of Europeans say that discrimination against Roma is widespread in their country. [...] In **Ireland** (65 %), Belgium (62), the United Kingdom (55 %) and the Netherlands (47 %) the proportion is similar to or lower than the EU-28 average.” (p. 28)

“The highest awareness levels of such bodies [with a legal mandate to receive discrimination complaints] are observed among Travellers and Sinti in the Netherlands (59 %), Roma and Travellers in Sweden (57 %) and Travellers in **Ireland** (49 %), where every second respondent has heard of at least one equality body in their country.” (p. 29)

“The highest levels of reporting [of incidents of discrimination] were among Travellers in **Ireland** (28 %) and Gypsies and Travellers in the United Kingdom.” (p. 31)

“With the exception of Sweden (90 %), the participation of children from targeted groups of population was far below that of the general population and the ET 2020 target. It ranged between 75 % of Travellers’ children in **Ireland** to 32 % of Travellers’ children in France.” (p. 44)

“Whereas only 13 % of all respondents assesses their skill [in using the national language(s)] as not good when it comes to speaking (ranging between 24 % of Roma in Belgium and 5 % of Travellers in **Ireland**), it jumps to 36 % when it comes to reading [...] and to 43 % when it comes to writing [...]. (p. 50)

“However, the share of Roma and Travellers in work is considerably lower across all countries in this survey and well below the employment rate of the general population. The proportion of those who worked in the last four weeks, including in part-time work and as self-employed, ranges from 15 % for Travellers in **Ireland** to 50 % for Roma in Belgium.” (p. 54)

“Women from minority groups are often underrepresented in the labour market and often face multiple discrimination. The new EU gender equality strategy and the European Institute for Gender Equality review of the Beijing Platform for Action focus on them. The survey shows notable differences in the paid work rate between women and men in all countries surveyed except **Ireland** (Figure 15). [...] Only in **Ireland** do the survey results not show an employment gap between men and women; both have very low participation in the labour market, 17 % for women and 13 % for men.” (p. 54)

“Only Travellers in the Netherlands and in **Ireland** show higher proportions in other occupations such as in the building, personal service and clerical support sectors (44 % and 38 % respectively).

Almost none of the Roma or Travellers work as professionals. The majority of Roma and Travellers work full-time, except in France and **Ireland**, where only 41 % and 38 % of Travellers in employment work full-time. In France, a higher share work in occasional (26 %) and ad hoc jobs; in **Ireland** they are mostly in part-time jobs (58 %). The work situation in these two countries is particularly precarious for Travellers. In France only 18 % and in **Ireland** only 26 % of respondents in employment hold a permanent contract.” (p. 55)

“**Ireland** has the lowest employment rate among the surveyed groups; 38 % there say they felt discriminated against when looking for work in the last 12 months and 70 % in the last five years.” (p. 56)

“The survey results show that many Roma and Travellers do not have a bank account and for some groups the numbers are far higher than those of the general population. In **Ireland** 63 % do not have a bank account. [...] In 2012, in Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom less than 5 % of the general population did not have a bank account; in **Ireland** 6 % of the general population did not.” (p. 61)

“The survey results show considerable gender differences in the proportion of those who consider their health to be (very) good. Women assess their health less often as good or very good than men among Caravan dwellers (22 percentage points less) and Roma (21 percentage points less) in Belgium, and among Roma and Travellers in Sweden (11 percentage points less). The opposite is found among Travellers in **Ireland**, with women considering their health better than men (7 percentage points more).” (p. 64)

“[...] women are 10 percentage points more often affected by health-caused limitations than men. In **Ireland**, this share is again reversed, with men reporting problems in this area more often than women (13 percentage points). Chronic health issues can result from unhealthy housing conditions and environmental hazards. As many as 13 % of Roma and Travellers live in accommodation with leaking roofs, damp walls or rot in window frames or floor, the survey results show. The percentage is highest for Travellers in **Ireland**, a quarter of whom live in such conditions (25 %). In **Ireland** and Sweden, the proportions of Roma and Travellers living in such conditions are much higher than among the general population (25 % versus 12 % and 12 % versus 8 %). (p. 65)

“In **Ireland**, Sweden and the United Kingdom, every fifth respondent reports pollution, grime and other environmental problems in the local area.” (p. 66)

“The disadvantages of Roma and Travellers [in life expectancy] compared with the corresponding general populations vary from 8.4 years for male Travellers in **Ireland** and 7.1 years for female Gypsies and Travellers in the United Kingdom to 14.2 and 13.6 years for male and female Roma and Caravan dwellers in Belgium.” (p. 67)

“In France, **Ireland**, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, close to or more than 90 % of the respondents are covered by the national basic health insurance scheme or additional (private) health insurance.” (p. 68)

“Roma and Travellers in Sweden, Travellers in **Ireland** and Roma in the Netherlands experience discrimination substantially more often when accessing health services.” (p.69)

“As many as 28 % of Traveller children in **Ireland** and Sweden and 25 % of Roma children in Belgium grow up in severe material deprivation.” (p. 75)

“In France and **Ireland**, 10 % of the Travellers surveyed faced hunger at least once in the last month; in Belgium 15 % of the Roma and 13 % of the Caravan Travellers did so.” (p. 77)

“Discrimination can be a major barrier to improving and overcoming adverse housing conditions. Travellers in **Ireland** and the Netherlands indicate the highest prevalence of discrimination; 73 % and 78 % respectively experienced discrimination when trying to rent or buy houses in the last five years. For Travellers this includes experiences of discrimination when trying to buy land and property for their caravans or to get a permanent pitch in a halting site.” (p. 81)

“The survey asked respondents who lived in a caravan or mobile home if they think there are enough places for Roma and Travellers to live in their country. Overall, a large majority (79 %) of respondents living in mobile homes or caravans consider that the number of places for Travellers in their country is not sufficient (Figure 30). More than 90 % of Travellers in **Ireland**, Belgium and the Netherlands feel the same.” (p. 83)

“In **Ireland**, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom, the majority (60 % or more) of the Roma and Traveller households have been living in the same neighbourhood for more than five years or have always lived there.” (p. 85)

[A long way to go for LGBTI equality \(May 2020\)](https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/eu-lgbti-survey-results)

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

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

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

(also annexed to this submission)

“There are important differences among the countries surveyed. For instance, in **Ireland**, Malta and Finland, over 70 % of respondents perceive a decrease in intolerance. [...] 70 % of respondents in Malta and 59 % in **Ireland** believe violence [against LGBTI people] has overall decreased in the past five years.” (p. 12)

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

“A number of Member States have not signed and/or ratified [Oviedo] convention. These include Austria, Belgium, Germany, **Ireland**, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland and Sweden.” (p.54)

[Relocating unaccompanied children: applying good practices to future schemes \(May 2020\)](https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/relocation-unaccompanied-children)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2020/relocation-unaccompanied-children>

“**Ireland** voluntary supported the relocations of more than 40 unaccompanied children from France, located in the unofficial camps around Calais, and relocated eight unaccompanied children from Greece in 2019–2020.” (p. 6)

“Promising practice: In bilateral relocations to **Ireland**, Tusla, the Irish Child and Family Agency, cooperated closely with the Irish National Police and Security Service to avoid duplicating each other’s work when interviewing children selected for relocation. Tusla carries out a well-being assessment of the child, while the Garda undertakes screening and security checks. Before starting the interview, Tusla’s social workers inform the child about the purposes of the interviews and the role of each authority present. Both authorities remain during the whole interview with the child. Besides increasing efficiency, this practice has helped build a relationship of trust with the child.” (p. 31)

“After arrival in the state of relocation, the child will generally receive the same accommodation as any child arriving there spontaneously and benefit from similar reception conditions. The child go through the normal asylum procedure, except in some relocations, for which national authorities established a different process for examining the asylum claim, as shown in Table 10. For example, the **Irish** Department of Justice and Equality decided to grant programme refugee status, as in resettlement programmes, to those children who were voluntarily relocated from France under the Calais special project. Children relocated to **Ireland** from Greece or Malta had to apply for international protection and follow the regular procedure.” (p. 34)

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

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

“To date, 24 EU Member States have established National Preventive Mechanisms (NPMs) whose findings – just like the findings of the CPT – are crucial evidence of the situation concerning detention conditions on the ground. Belgium, **Ireland** and Slovakia have signed but not yet ratified the Optional Protocol, while Latvia has still to sign it.” (p. 12)

“In **Ireland**, despite the fact that minimum cell space is not defined in law, the Irish Prison Service has accepted the recommendation by the Inspector of Prisons that single-occupancy cells should be at least 7 m² (and at least another 4 m² per prisoner if the cell contains more than one prisoner). Bed capacity is now in line with the Inspector of Prison’s recommendations in nine prisons. Nevertheless, overcrowding still occurs. The UN Committee against Torture (CAT) recommended in 2017 that **Ireland** take measures to reduce overcrowding, especially among female prisoners.” (p. 17)

“However, even in Member States that have established the right of access to regular showers in their national legislation, the standards often do not meet the required frequency specified by Rule 19.4 of the European Prison Rules. These Member States include Austria [...]; Estonia; **Ireland**; Lithuania; Luxembourg; Latvia; Malta; Poland [...]; and Slovenia. (p. 24)

“In **Ireland**, in response to high numbers of cells lacking sanitary facilities in the past, forcing prisoners to ‘slop out’ each morning (e.g. by emptying a chamber pot, bucket or chemical toilet), the Irish Prison Service took action. In 2016, it stated that 98 % of all prisoners now have in-cell sanitation facilities. The service itself has accepted that the “single most pressing objective of estate modernisation in recent times has been the need to ensure appropriate in-cell sanitation throughout the estate, and to cease the practice of ‘slopping out’ in prisons without in-cell toilets”. The service is developing plans for new blocks in Limerick and Portlaoise prisons, which will eliminate the practice of slopping out (i.e. emptying human waste in prison when flushable toilets are not available in a

cell).The UN CAT recommends that these plans are implemented as a priority.” (p. 25)

“All Member States have requirements in place that stipulate a person arriving at a facility must be examined. However, the rules and practice may vary in terms of how promptly the initial examination takes place. For example, prison standards in **Ireland** explicitly state that all prisoners are to be medically assessed upon reception into prison, which will involve a clinical assessment within the first 24 hours.” (p. 34)

“In **Ireland**, pregnant prisoners must be allowed to give birth outside the prison.” (p.35)

“In addition, in eight EU Member States (Czechia, France, Finland, **Ireland**, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Latvia and Luxembourg) an in-cell system, usually an emergency button or phone or other intercommunication system, that can be used to call for help 24 hours per day is provided.” (p.40)

“Some Member States (e.g. Belgium, Greece and **Ireland**) are currently in the process of legislating or drafting official guidelines on specific measures for the protection and treatment of LGBTI prisoners.” (p. 41)

Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey - Migrant women - selected findings (September 2019)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2019/second-european-union-minorities-and-discrimination-survey-migrant-women-selected>

“Overall, 60 % of women and 54 % of men respondents have acquired citizenship of their country of residence. Among first-generation immigrants, slightly more women (45 %) have citizenship than men (40 %), with stronger gender differences among immigrants of Sub-Saharan origin in Finland, **Ireland** and Sweden – with women indicating they are nationals at higher rates than men.” (p. 10)

“While official statistics provide overall figures for all third-country nationals, the data provided by EU-MIDIS II, which are disaggregated by gender and by country of origin, can also be used by policy makers to develop gender sensitive measures that target the specific challenges faced by different immigrant groups. For instance, while gender differences in the educational attainment of respondents with Turkish origin in all countries surveyed are very small, they are more pronounced – with more men than women having higher qualifications among respondents of African descent – for example in **Ireland**, Germany, and Denmark, as well as in Italy, Austria, and Finland, and among recent immigrants in Slovenia.” (p. 14)

“First-generation respondents not attending a language course gave different reasons, but overall, the majority said that this was because they do not need one. For the English-speaking EU countries, this was the case for 76 % of women and 85 % of men in the United Kingdom, and 89 % of women and 100 % of men in **Ireland**.” (p. 19)

“The EU-MIDIS II survey finds that overall the proportion of women respondents not looking for work because of caring obligations (small children, elderly or sick relatives) is pronounced in some EU countries, but largely disappears in others. Figure 7 shows that the highest rates for women are found in Italy (47 %), the United Kingdom (37 %), Spain (36 %), **Ireland** and Slovenia (both 33 %), and France (29 %). It is interesting to note that in the United Kingdom and in **Ireland**, the proportion of women not looking for work because of caring obligations is also quite high among the general population (28.1 % and 22.6 %, respectively)” (p. 28)

“Early childhood education and care, beyond its critical function in improving educational performance later in school, facilitates the participation of young mothers in the labour market. The survey results show that in 12 of the 19 Member States surveyed, the majority of children in the respondents’ households benefit from such services. Children’s regular attendance in public or private childcare is lower in Belgium (49 %), **Ireland** (46 %), Italy and Poland (both 40 %), and the Netherlands (34 %)” (p. 29)

“It should be noted that while the EU’s anti-discrimination directives apply to third-country nationals, they do not cover unequal treatment based on nationality per se, although as the Commission has pointed out, “there is sometimes an overlap between racial or ethnic origin and other grounds, in particular nationality, religion and language”. Moreover, as previously mentioned, both the Single Permit and the Long-term Residence directives introduce equal treatment of third-country nationals with the nationals of the host Member State in several areas of social life. Nevertheless, as FRA reported, nationality-based discrimination against third-country nationals is prohibited in Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, France, Hungary, **Ireland**, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania and the United Kingdom.” (p. 31)

“The share of women respondents of Sub-Saharan African descent experiencing discrimination is higher than that of men in Denmark (women 42 % – men 30 %), **Ireland** (women 38 % – men 24 %), and Portugal (women 23 % – men 20 %).” (p. 32)

From institutions to community living for persons with disabilities: perspectives from the ground (December 2018)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/independent-living-reality>

“In Finland, **Ireland** and Italy, deinstitutionalisation has made greater progress, with official statistics indicating that many people with disabilities in these countries have made the transition from institutional to community-based settings.” (p. 20)

“Policy has made significant strides towards independent living for persons with disabilities in **Ireland** and Finland, with both committing to completely close institutions. Ireland initially envisaged a complete closure of institutions by the end of 2018. However, available figures show that 2,579 people remained in institutions at the end of 2016.” (p. 20)

“Participants underlined the critical importance of setting specific targets with clear deadlines. [...] However, participants noted that targets are not always met. In **Ireland**, the aim of completing deinstitutionalisation by the end of 2018 was revised in 2016 to the longer-term objective of “reduc[ing] this figure by at least one-third by 2021 and to ultimately eliminate all congregated settings”.” (p. 24)

“Each of the five Member States has devolved responsibility for legislation and policy on deinstitutionalisation in different ways. **Ireland** has the most centralised approach, and Italy and Slovakia the most decentralised.” (p. 24)

“In contrast, **Ireland**, which has a more centralised system, subcontracts many of its services for people with disabilities to voluntary service providers. Participants felt that this led to disparities in service provision as well as in the commitment and approach to deinstitutionalisation.” (p. 25)

“Deinstitutionalisation is funded through national, regional or local funds, or a mix of all three in Finland, **Ireland** and Italy. This funding is often tied to particular pieces of legislation or policy.” (p. 27)

“The financial crisis played a part in the lack of additional resources allocated for implementation of the Time to move on strategy in **Ireland** when it was adopted in 2011. Earmarked funds for deinstitutionalisation were put in place in 2016, including capital investment to provide new housing for people leaving institutions and a Service Reform Fund to support the implementation of reforms.” (p. 28)

“In **Ireland**, the national strategy, Time to Move On, defines an institution as any building which houses more than 10 people, while an acceptable community-based living arrangement should house no more than four.” (p. 31)

“Regional and local pilot projects in **Ireland** and Italy play an important role in informing, encouraging and developing national policy.” (p. 39)

“Pressure to complete deinstitutionalisation in **Ireland** came from national sources, but ones external to the deinstitutionalisation process. Findings of very poor conditions in some institutions by the inspector of disability services in 2013 prompted urgent action. This often involved steps towards a transition to community-based services. The findings also triggered an undercover investigation in one institution by the national broadcaster, provoking widespread public outcry and calls for action.” (p. 40)

“More generally, parents and staff highlighted the particular role of younger people with disabilities in demanding community-based services. Young people in Finland, **Ireland** and Italy do not tend to enter institutions, so are not themselves part of deinstitutionalisation processes [...]. However, by demanding adequate community-based services to enable them to live independently of their parents, they support the development of such services. These can then be used by others leaving institutions.” (p. 40)

“The situation of legal capacity varies across the Member States covered in the research. [...] In Finland and **Ireland**, new legislation looks to promote supported decision-making: attitudinal barriers predominate here.” (p. 43)

“In **Ireland**, the National Disability Authority has conducted a nationwide survey on attitudes to disability every five years since 2001. The 2017 results showed an overall improvement in attitudes towards people with disabilities when compared to 2011 data, and have either returned to, or exceeded, 2006 levels. For instance, there was an increase in the level of agreement that people with all types of impairments can participate fully in life. Moreover, the 2017 survey revealed that 87 % respondents agreed or strongly agreed that people with disabilities should have the same access to housing as everyone else, as well as an increase in the respondents’ levels of comfort with having people with different types of impairments as neighbours.” (p. 46)

“In **Ireland**, several services assign extra staff hours to those just leaving an institution, to help them acquire independent living skills.” (p. 49)

“In **Ireland**, person-centred plans have been used in disability services since the mid-2000s and are now a statutory requirement.” (p. 60)

“A similar picture emerges in **Ireland**. Official policy states that housing for people with disabilities should be provided by local authorities, as for anyone else with a housing need. However, many participants felt that local authorities do not fully take into account the needs of people with disabilities in terms of accessibility and suitable locations. This left them feeling that houses owned either by service providers or the Health Service Executive (HSE) are in fact a better option, despite them being tied to particular support.” (p. 65)

“Disability benefits are typically tied to income, meaning that the amount of financial assistance received begins to drop once people with disabilities start earning a salary. Many participants highlighted that this process begins very quickly, undermining the financial incentive to work and creating a so-called ‘welfare to work’ trap. In **Ireland**, this presents a particular challenge for those moving from institutions to their own apartments or houses, as the rental supplements they receive do not usually cover actual rental costs.” (p. 67)

“Like the convention as a whole, Article 19 of the CRPD applies to all persons with disabilities, irrespective of the type or severity of their impairment. Previous FRA research has, however, shown that disability services struggle to respond to the needs of persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities, as well as those with more severe impairments. This is reflected in the data on people with disabilities living in institutions: these groups of persons with disabilities are disproportionately likely to be institutionalised. Indeed, in Finland, Italy and **Ireland**, the deinstitutionalisation process largely concerns people with intellectual disabilities, as people with other types of impairment typically live in the community” (p. 69)

Protecting migrant workers from exploitation in the EU: workers’ perspectives (June 2019)

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2019/protecting-migrant-workers-exploitation-eu-workers-perspectives>

“The International Labour Organization’s Convention concerning decent work for domestic workers (No. 189, 2011) which entered into force on 5 September 2013, states that every domestic worker has the right to a safe and healthy working environment and that this principle shall be implemented with due regard for the specific characteristics of domestic work (Article 13). To date, only six EU Member States have ratified the convention: Belgium, Germany, Finland, **Ireland**, Italy and Portugal.” (p.18)

“Promising practice: In 2014 the **Irish** government introduced the Reactivation Employment Permit (REP) Scheme. The REP scheme is designed so that a third-country national who entered **Ireland** on a valid employment permit but has fallen out of the employment permit and immigration system through no fault of his/her own (e.g. has been made redundant) or has been badly treated or exploited in the workplace can work legally again. The REP is available for most occupations, including certain carers but excluding all jobs in a domestic setting, for example housekeepers. This measure can be seen as a system to safeguard victims of labour exploitation.” (p.69)

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

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

This report provides detailed information on hate crime recording and data collection systems across the EU, including any systemic cooperation with civil society. Data for **Ireland** can be found on pp. 60-61.

“The comparative analysis of the legal framework shows that 13 Member States [...], treat bias motivation as a general aggravating circumstance; 7 provide for specific aggravating circumstances regarding certain substantive offences [...]; 3 have a combination of both general and specific [...]; and 5 have no such provision (Estonia, Hungary, **Ireland**, the Netherlands, Poland). (p. 103)

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

[Under watchful eyes: biometrics, EU IT systems and fundamental rights \(March 2018\)](https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/under-watchful-eyes-biometrics-eu-it-systems-and-fundamental-rights)
<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/under-watchful-eyes-biometrics-eu-it-systems-and-fundamental-rights>

“Persons in need of international protection may resort to self-harm to avoid fingerprinting with the aim of trying to reach their preferred country of destination. [...] Although EU Member States do not collect statistics on incidents of self-harm, one out of three EU Member States (Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, **Ireland**, Malta and Sweden) reported to FRA in late 2015 that they are aware of such incidents.” (p. 50)

“Such ‘function creep’ may also happen if fingerprints – taken for whatever purpose – are included in searches done for criminal investigation purposes. This was the case in **Ireland**, when an audit by the Data Protection Commissioner revealed that fingerprints taken in the context of asylum or visa applications were included in all fingerprint searches carried out during police investigations, irrespective of whether there was any reason to believe that the immigrant or asylum seeker was involved in a crime.” (p. 61)

“Croatia, Greece, Italy, **Ireland**, Portugal and the United Kingdom had not implemented the [Prüm] mechanism [for fingerprint exchange].” (p. 67)

“The majority of EU Member States erase records of previous convictions when a child reaches the age of maturity, but some EU Member States retain such data. The age of criminal responsibility varies across Member States. In most EU Member States, it is set at 14 or 15 years, but is set at 12 years in **Ireland**, the Netherlands and most parts of the United Kingdom (though it is as low as 10 years in Northern Ireland).” (p.68)

“Promising practice: The **Irish** child protection authorities deal with unaccompanied and separated children before immigration agencies conduct their checks and verifications. This gives them an important role in the protection of children within the immigration processes.” (p.108)

[Challenges facing civil society organisations working on human rights in the EU \(January 2018\)](https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/challenges-facing-civil-society-organisations-working-human-rights-eu)
<https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/challenges-facing-civil-society-organisations-working-human-rights-eu>

“In **Ireland**, concerns were expressed over the vague wording and overly broad application of the Electoral Act 1997 as amended in 2001, which imposes restrictions and reporting obligations on ‘third parties’ who accept donations over € 100 for ‘political purposes’. This provision was introduced to regulate political campaign funding. However, ‘political purposes’ are defined as “to promote or oppose, directly or indirectly, the interests of a third party in connection with the conduct or management of any campaign conducted with a view to promoting or procuring a particular outcome in relation to a policy or policies or functions of the Government or any public authority”. This broad definition can potentially cover the activities of a wide range of CSOs, including human rights NGOs, and in the past year, it appears that the regulatory body has applied the law in a more expansive way. In addition, investigations are often triggered by complaints to the regulatory body, so enforcement can inadvertently be selectively targeted. The effect of applying this law to CSOs is that they are thereby prohibited from receiving any donations from foreign sources and from any individual exceeding € 2,500 in any year. The blanket ban on foreign funding can have a particularly serious impact in **Ireland**, where most independent funding of human rights work comes from trusts and foundations based outside of Ireland.” (p.22)

“Although overall comparisons are not possible, available figures do show reductions in funding in some EU Member States. In Greece, **Ireland** and the United Kingdom, public funding has dropped significantly. There were reductions in at least two other Member States (Denmark and Finland). In **Ireland**, public funding of NGOs fell by 41 % in the period 2008– 2014, with the total employment in CSOs falling by 31 % by the end of 2015.” (pp 29-30)

“In **Ireland**, there is some evidence that state agencies are increasingly using binding service level agreements, which specifically prevent state funds from being used for advocacy purposes. This trend will need to be monitored to ensure CSOs’ continuing ability to advocate for human rights.” (p.32)

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

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

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

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