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Editorial

The first edition of the survey on victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations was a major step forward in advancing knowledge on this subject. Published in June 2017, the findings clarified the overarching trends characterising trafficking in human beings in France and shed fresh light on the profiles of its victims. The media coverage regarding the survey helped to raise the profile of a reality that is still too far below the radar. This first edition demonstrated the relevance of the survey and the need to continue it in the future.

For the second edition, our ambition – which is shared by the associations involved with the victims, especially the members of the “Together against human trafficking” collective – was, on the one hand, to improve the quality and representativeness of the data collected and, on the other, to report more clearly on the different facets of the phenomenon. Thanks to the hard work and dedication of the Interdepartmental Unit for Protecting Women against Violence and for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings (MIPROF) and the National Observatory of Crime and Criminal Justice (ONDRP) in identifying and rallying to the cause those structures likely to come into contact with and support victims of trafficking in human beings, the number of associations that have responded has almost doubled and it has thus been possible to diversify their profile. Additional insight was provided in the survey through a specific questionnaire on victims of trafficking assisted in places where they are deprived of liberty, the answers to which were rounded off by qualitative interviews with association leaders. We are delighted with the notable extension in the survey’s scope that this represents.

We are immensely grateful to the associations, without which this survey would not have been possible. Its findings will prove an invaluable source of information for the work in progress on the next national action plan against trafficking in human beings.

Élisabeth MOIRON-BRAUD
Magistrate, Secretary-General of the Interdepartmental Unit for Protecting Women against Violence and for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings (MIPROF)

and Stéfan LOLLIPLIER
Inspector General of the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (Insee)
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Aware of the work that this has represented, we would like to thank all the associations that responded to the questionnaire: ABEJ – Solidarité (Association Baptiste pour l’Entraide et la Jeunesse), ACPE (Agir contre la Prostitution des Enfants), AFJ (Association Foyer Jorbalan), Amicale du Nid, Anafé (Association nationale d’assistance aux frontières pour les étrangers), ARAP-Rubis (Association Réflexion Action Prévention Communautaire), Armée du Salut (CHR le Nouvel Horizon et les Hutins), ARS (Association pour la réadaptation sociale), Association ALC (Accompagnement, Lieux d’accueil, Carrefour éducatif et social) – Dispositif National Ac.Sé, Autres Regards, Aux captifs la libération, CCEM (Comité Contre l’Esclavage Moderne), Croix Rouge Française, Dom’Asile, Hors la rue, I.P.P.O (Information Prévention Proximité Orientation), La Cimade – Ile-de-France, L’Embellie, Les Amis du Bus des Femmes, OICEM (Organisation internationale contre l’esclavage moderne), Ordre de Malte France, et SOS Esclaves. We also thank the associations that have expressed their interest in this work, although they cannot provide us any data at this time.

We particularly thank Charlène Cuartero-Saez (Policy Officer, Anafé), Audrey Guitton (Policy Officer for Combating trafficking in human beings, Hors la rue), and Mathias Venet (Supervisor of activities in immigration detention centre, Ordre de Malte France) for participating in telephone interviews, as well as Nasrine Tamine (Foreign Isolated Minors Policy Officer, Croix-Rouge française) for the details provided on the victims supported in waiting areas.
Abstract

Dimensions and contours of trafficking in human beings in France remain difficult to grasp. This annual survey conducted among associations supporting victims provides highlight on this phenomenon. Based on the victims supported in 2016, this second edition confirms the trends observed in the first survey. Depending on activities and specificities of associations, the results are not representative of the whole phenomenon in France.

1,857 victims of human trafficking were supported by 24 associations in 2016. Of these, almost three quarters (74%) were victims of sexual exploitation, 15% of forced labour, mainly in a domestic context, 7% of forced criminality, and 2% of forced begging. The exploitation form was not identified by the association for 2% of victims.

Victims of nearly 70 different nationalities were supported in 2016 by the associations. Behind this diversity, nearly 8 out of 10 victims come from only five countries: Nigeria, Romania, Morocco, Algeria, and Bulgaria. The forms of exploitation varied according to the origin of the victims. Nigerian victims, who represent half of the victims on their own, are almost entirely sexually exploited. The survey confirms the extent of the activity of Nigerian prostitution trafficking networks in France. Organised networks from Eastern European countries are active in several forms of exploitation, mainly sexual exploitation, forced criminality, and forced begging. North African victims are victims of sexual exploitation and forced labour, including domestic services. Forced labour affects 3 out of 4 victims from West Africa (excluding Nigeria) and 6 out of 10 victims from Asia.

Analysis by forms of exploitation also reveals specific profiles, including sex, gender, origin, and circumstances of exploitation. One of the specific features of this crime is the low recourse to the security forces, with only one third of the victims attending a police service, whether or not they have reported the crime.
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**Key findings**

1,857 victims of trafficking in human beings, all forms of exploitation taken together, supported by 24 associations in 2016

**1,366 victims of sexual exploitation**
- supported by 20 associations
- 95% female
- 78% adults
- Original country: 72% Nigeria, 11% Eastern and Southern Europe
- Exploited in another country: 63%
- (Data supplied for 114 victims supported by 5 associations for which 114 traffickers have been identified)

**134 victims of exploitation in forced criminal activities**
- supported by 3 associations
- 66% male
- Victims implicated for trafficking-related offences: 81% Romania, 13% Algeria
- When their age is known, almost all victims are children: 53%
- (Data supplied for 133 victims supported by 2 associations for which 133 traffickers have been identified)

**287 victims of forced labour**
- supported by 10 associations
- 94% female
- 11% Eastern and Southern Europe
- Exploited in another country: 49%
- Accommodation of the victim by the trafficker: 9%
- Brought to France by the trafficker: 53%
- (Data supplied for 116 victims supported by 3 associations for which 126 traffickers have been identified)

**38 victims of forced begging**
- supported by 5 associations
- 26 out of 38 victims are children: 25 males, 12 females
- Disabled victims: 15
- (Data supplied for 28 victims supported by 3 associations for which 28 traffickers have been identified)

At least one known trafficker

Victims implicated for trafficking-related offences

FORCED LABOUR FOR DOMESTIC SERVICES
- 197 victims
- Almost all of the victims of these forms of exploitation are adults
- (Data supplied for 116 victims supported by 2 associations for which 126 traffickers have been identified)

FORCED LABOUR (excluding domestic services)
- 90 victims
- (Data supplied for 47 victims supported by 2 associations for which 48 traffickers have been identified)
Introduction

Trafficking in human beings is a complex subject to get to grips with in statistical terms owing to the precarious and clandestine circumstances in which the victims are placed. Although the hold exerted by networks limits victims’ possibilities of reaching out to law enforcement and associations, the data collected by the latter remain the main sources available for understanding this phenomenon and illustrating its main trends.

Since 2015, efforts have been ongoing to improve knowledge of trafficking in human beings in France. These have particularly allowed for collation and processing of the data collected by associations, which yield insight into victims’ profiles, pathways and needs. Since associations operate independently from the activity of administrative departments, they provide information about victims who remain invisible to institutions.

In partnership with the member associations of the “Together against human trafficking” collective, the ONDRP and MIPROF have thus drawn up a questionnaire aimed at bringing together the data collected by the associations every year. The findings of the first survey on victims supported in 2015 were published in June 2017 (Simon & Sourd, 2017). In its most recent report, the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA) underscored the importance of statistics where this theme is concerned, and highlighted the work initiated to create a tool for collecting data from associations (GRETA, 2017).

This publication analyses the findings of the survey’s second edition. It bears on victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016. Special attention has been paid to victims in places where they are deprived of liberty.

Clarifications on the findings, presented on page 10 of this document, explain the care that should be taken to ensure they are interpreted properly.
Background information

Definition of trafficking in human beings

An international definition...


Article 3.a of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

“‘Trafficking in persons’ shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation.

Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs.”

This definition has particularly been adopted in two international texts binding France in the matter of combating trafficking in human beings:

- Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (known as the Warsaw Convention, 2005);

...transposed into French law

The offence of trafficking in human beings is defined in French law by Article 225-4-1 of the Criminal Code. It has particularly been amended by the 5 August 2013 Act (Act no. 2013-711) so as to comply with the Warsaw Convention and Directive 2011/36/EU.

Article 225-4-1 of the Criminal Code addresses the following forms of exploitation: the offences of procuring, sexual offences or assault, enslavement, forced labour or services, servitude, exploitation for the purposes of organ removal, forced begging, undignified working or living conditions, forced to commit criminal activities.

The offence is committed where three elements are present: an action, a means and a purpose (Diagram 1).

The phenomenon of trafficking in human beings can also concern French perpetrators or victims without any borders being crossed.

Diagram 1. Illustration of the offence of trafficking in human beings

When the victim is a minor, the offence is established even without any form of coercion (the means)

Source: MIPROF, ONDRP
Assessment of the scale of the phenomenon by international organisations

Various sources can be drawn on to measure the scale of trafficking in human beings at international and European level. These measurements rely on the aggregation of data collected at national level but also have methodological limitations.

By the estimates of the International Labour Organization (ILO), in 2016 there were nearly 21 million victims of forced labour worldwide (ILO, 2017). The definition that the ILO has adopted of forced labour includes sexual exploitation.

Regarding the victims identified by the competent authorities, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has registered 63,251 victims of trafficking in human beings across 136 countries and territories between 2012 and 2014. Majority are women and girls (71%) and victims of sexual exploitation (54%). Although women remain in the majority, the shares of men and boys are rising in comparison with previous years. This increase goes hand-in-hand with a rise in the number of labour exploitation victims¹ (4 in 10), a clear majority of them are male (63%). UNODC notes that these trends reflect a better understanding of the many forms that trafficking in human beings can take (UNODC, 2016).

According to a report published by Eurostat in 2015, between 2010 and 2012, 30,146 victims were registered by the 28 EU Member States, 8 out of 10 were female and 7 out of 10 victims of sexual exploitation. 95% of the latter were female and 7 out of 10 victims of labour exploitation were male.

Good practices in Europe for measuring trafficking in human beings

Several European countries have initiated projects or set up monitoring centres to better understand this phenomenon, the UK and Portugal among them.

In 2009, the UK set up a system for collecting data on victims of trafficking in human beings and modern slavery (slavery, domestic servitude, forced or compulsory labour). Data is collected by a specialist department (Modern Slavery Human Trafficking Unit), the aim being to locate and identify potential victims. With the victims’ consent, the competent authorities – which may form part of government departments or civil society – can share the data. In 2016, 3,805 potential victims were recorded. 108 different countries of origin were identified, the top three being Albania, the UK and Vietnam (Modern Slavery Human Trafficking Unit, 2017). Forced labour (including forced criminality) is the most common type of exploitation (41% of potential victims in 2016). Sexual exploitation victims account for 35% of total numbers, 11% are victims of forced labour for domestic services and, for 13%, the form of exploitation is unknown. 51% of potential victims are female and 49% male (less than 1% is transgender). Children represent 34% of victims.

Portugal has set up an observatory on trafficking in human beings² and a tool for collecting data from authorised associations and competent authorities. Portugal counts both presumed victims and “confirmed”, i.e. identified, victims. In its report on 2016, 264 presumed victims of human trafficking were registered, including 118 “confirmed” (Observatório do Tráfico de Seres Humanos/OTSH 2017). These victims came from 23 countries of origin, primarily Portugal, Romania and Nepal. The most common type of exploitation identified was forced labour (including domestic services). The majority of victims were adult males, for which Portugal was the country of destination (181 victims).

Methodology

Unit of account: the victim supported

Determined in conjunction with our partner associations, the unit of account in our study bears on the victims of trafficking in human beings supported by an association. These “supported” victims correspond to victims of human trafficking counted as such in the current register of the association. Supporting may have begun in 2016 or before. Where this information was available, associations specified the number of victims for whom it began in 2016, so the number of new victims.

The questionnaire also sought to estimate the number of “detected” victims, i.e. those who had been in touch with the association and for whom a trafficking situation had been presumed. Analysis of the answers provided by the associations threw up a difference in interpretation of this field, which means that this question cannot be processed.

Victims are counted on the basis of the form of exploitation endured. The form of exploitation selected, not least when the victim had suffered several types, corresponds to the one for which the victim came into contact with the association.

Four forms of exploitation defined pursuant to Article 225-4-1 of the Criminal Code and to the experience of the partner associations have been selected:

- Sexual exploitation;
- Forced labour, which includes domestic services⁴ and the other forms of labour exploitation⁵;
- Forced begging;
- Forced criminal activities.

Organ trafficking was removed from the questionnaire because no victims had been counted in 2015⁶.

References

[1] Unlike the ILO, UNODC does not include sexual exploitation in its definition of labour exploitation.
[3] The association’s current register corresponds to victims given assistance over a given year, so the victims supported.
[4] Referred to as “domestic servitude” in the previous questionnaire.
[5] Referred to as “forced labour” in the previous questionnaire.
[6] Although the “organ trafficking” form of exploitation no longer appears as such in the questionnaire, associations still had the possibility of specifying the other forms of exploitation. In 2016, none reported having supported victims of organ trafficking.
Another option, “other form of exploitation”, was introduced, which enabled associations to count the victims for whom the form of exploitation was unknown.

The main questionnaire

Data is gathered by distributing an online questionnaire among all associations likely to work with victims of trafficking in human beings. This was drawn up by the MIPROF and ONDRP, in partnership with the member associations of the “Together against human trafficking” collective. For each form of exploitation, the questions bear on a set of victims supported over a given year. No respondent-level data features in the questionnaire, and as such it is not possible to cross-link answers. That said all of the questions have been cross-linked beforehand according to the form of exploitation endured.

The feedback from associations following the first collection campaign enabled the questionnaire to be edited to make it easier to use, all the while retaining the outline of the first survey. To enable more associations to send in their answers, the questionnaire was split into two sections (Diagram 2):

✓ A basic questionnaire on the number, gender, age and country of origin of victims was compulsory for all associations taking part.

✓ An advanced questionnaire, which was optional, enabled those associations with additional information about the profiles, conditions of exploitation, referral and guidance given to victims and the steps they took, to provide more data.

Diagram 2. Main questionnaire for associations

The questionnaire bears on trafficking in human beings as a whole, and does not go into the specific features of each form of exploitation. Owing to the limited length of the questionnaire, the complex question of the multiple types of violence that trafficking victims may have endured during their exploitation could not be broached.

Questionnaire on victims supported in places where they are deprived of their liberty

At the request of associations working in places of deprivation of liberty, a specific questionnaire was drawn up to be able to report on the specific aspects associated with assisting victims in these places.

Three types of places of deprivation of liberty have been identified:

✓ Immigration detention centres are closed places where foreign nationals are detained, pending an expulsion decision. Placement in detention is an administrative decision which may be extended by a judge where departure has proved impossible. Holding in a detention centre cannot last longer than 45 days. At the end of this period, the foreign national is either released or expelled from French territory.

✓ Waiting areas are located in airports, ports or stations open to international traffic. These concern non-European foreign nationals who have been denied entry into France, people passing through facing a refusal from the country of destination, or when asylum is requested at the border. The procedure for holding people in a waiting area is governed by law and limited to 26 days maximum. Their holding ends either in the case of departure (voluntary or forced) from France or temporary entry into France.

✓ Penal institutions concern people who have been handed down an unconditional prison sentence or placed in temporary detention. Several types of institutions exist: long-stay prisons, detention centres, prisons for minors, juvenile detention centres, open prisons and centres for adjusted sentences, and remand centre.

Adult and child victims of trafficking alike can be placed somewhere they are deprived of their liberty when they commit an offence in the eyes of criminal or residence law. Such an offence (committed in the context of forced criminal activities, illegal stay and so on) often turns out to be associated with their status as victim of trafficking.

The questions have been written so as to take account of the specific features defining each type of place where people are deprived of liberty (Diagram 3).

Diagram 2. Main questionnaire for associations

Source: MIPROF, ONDRP

Notes:

(7) Where associations did not have all the information, they were able to complete the questionnaire by ticking the option “Missing Information” for each question.
(9) In 2018, an “Asylum and Immigration” bill is being examined, aimed, among other things, at increasing the maximum period for administrative detention to 90 days.
(10) Visit https://www.service-public.fr/particuliers/vosdroits/F111444.
Four associations completed the questionnaire. In order to shed constructive light on the situations of victims of trafficking in human beings in such places, interviews were held with the leaders of the associations concerned.

The findings of this questionnaire are set out in three text boxes on victims present in waiting areas (p.20), penal institutions (p.36) and immigration detention centres (p.39).

**Diagram 3. Questionnaire for associations supporting victims in places where they are deprived of their liberty**

![Diagram showing places of deprivation of liberty](image)

*Source: MIPROF, ONDRP*

**Data collection**

The questionnaire was sent out to 73 associations, whose branches belonged to the same association. This required work to be carried out beforehand on defining the scope of associations likely to assist victims of trafficking in human beings. As such, alongside associations specialising in this theme, those working with prostituted persons, immigrants and vulnerable groups were also contacted.

Since victims of human trafficking have to cope with several different issues (health and social, legal, to do with housing and so on), they may be in touch with various associations and stakeholders. Moreover, few are aware of their trafficking situation, and do not see themselves as a “victim” (Guinamard, 2015). This means that associations may establish initial contact with victims without this having to do with their exploitation.

The data collection stage ran from 18 October 2017 to 2 March 2018, and 24 associations supplied data on victims supported through 2016. During the first edition, 13 associations had supplied data for 2015 (Diagram 4).

Several associations indicated that they were unable to provide data for 2016 but that they would take this need on board for future years. Three associations forwarded the questionnaire to their local branches as they were unable to report global data. Of all the associations contacted, 13 said that the subject was not relevant to their sphere of action or that they systematically redirected victims to specialist associations and 20 did not respond to our requests.

The non-response rate may be explained by the burden this work can represent for associations in terms of time and human resources, and sometimes by the unavailability of the data being requested.

Of the 20 associations that did not respond, half are located in French overseas territories, including 6 in French Guiana, 3 in Mayotte and 1 in Martinique. Most Overseas associations assist vulnerable groups, particularly women, and two specialise in supporting immigrants. Apart from overseas territories, 9 associations for people living in precarious circumstances were approached with no response (including 6 branches of the same association). Likewise, we did not hear back from two other associations supporting immigrants.

13 of the associations approached claimed that the subject was not relevant to their sphere of action, either because they did not provide for this type of victim, or because they referred them directly to specialist associations.

**Diagram 4. Overview of data collection for 2016**

![Diagram showing data collection overview](image)

*Source: MIPROF, ONDRP*

**Interpreting the findings**

**Clariﬁcations about the findings**

To accurately interpret the findings of this survey, they must be analysed in light of the context of trafficking in human beings in France and of the speciﬁc features of the questionnaire.

In France, identiﬁcation of human trafﬁcking victims is the responsibility of the police and gendarmerie as well as, since 2016, the Labour inspection authority. The identiﬁcation process begins as soon as the authorities consider there to be reasonable grounds for believing an individual is a victim of human trafﬁcking. Not all of the people supported by associations, on which this study bears, have decided to ap-
proach these authorities, and there is therefore a difference between the notion of identification of victims of trafficking in human beings by the authorities and that of the detection of victims by associations. Care should also be taken not to analyse them from a linear perspective of the victims’ pathway.

In addition, some cases with a link to human trafficking in principle are processed on different grounds (procuring, illicit employment, undignified living or working conditions and so on). Comparisons cannot be made between data sourced from the work carried out by State departments and associations.

The people counted as victims of human trafficking in this study are those with respect to whom the associations consider, in light of the criteria having specifically to do with them, that they are or were in a trafficking situation. The survey focuses primarily on victims for whom the responding association has significant information, i.e. those who have been supported. It is therefore important to bear in mind that only a certain proportion of victims of trafficking in human beings is assisted by associations and, as such, the victims recorded in the survey cannot be considered a representative sample of all victims present on French territory. It is possible that the rates of detection and provision by associations are higher for some categories of victims than others, particularly according to the type of exploitation they endure. It is also possible that individuals receiving support from associations do not immediately recognise that they are victims, but only report this fact much later – sometimes several years later.

In view of the response rate and non-exhaustive questioning of associations, the findings do not allow for all victims of trafficking supported by associations in France to be counted. The activities of associations having responded therefore have a major impact on the findings and may incur an over-representation of victims of certain forms of exploitation.

Out of the 24 associations that responded to the questionnaire, 20 had given support to victims of sexual exploitation. Eight of these specialise in assisting prostituted persons. By comparison, ten associations supported victims of labour exploitation, including domestic, five victims of forced begging, three of forced criminality and four of other purpose of exploitation. Each association had occasion to support victims enduring different forms of exploitation. Out of the 24 responding associations, six specialise in supporting victims of trafficking in human beings and nine others have taken initiatives aimed specifically at victims of trafficking (training employees and volunteers, designing information brochures, setting up dedicated protocols or open-access drop-in times, advisors for trafficking in human beings and so on).

It should be noted that the questionnaire only allows for the form of exploitation regarding which the victim came into contact with the association to be indicated. Accordingly, it is not possible to detect the different forms of exploitation that may be endured at the same time or subsequently. That said, where they have such information available, the associations have been able to specify how many victims have endured several forms of exploitation (without specifying which forms).

Comparisons between the findings from this year’s survey and the previous one should be carried out carefully. Indeed, the responding associations are not the same, and the findings depend on the activity of these associations, which may vary from one year to the next. Furthermore, the small size of certain samples depending on the forms of exploitation makes comparisons difficult.

**Calculation method**

All 24 associations supplied data for the basic questionnaire, so on the number, gender, age and country of origin of victims. As for the optional questionnaire, the respondents indicated the questions for which they had information available. Not all of the structures were able to provide data for all of the questions (Table 1). For each question, the findings were calculated on the basis of the number of victims supported by the structures indicating that they had information.

For example, out of the 24 responding associations, seven selected the question about the number of victims with a disability. These associations supported 576 victims of human trafficking in 2016. The percentages for this question are therefore calculated on the basis of this number of victims supported. Where data is presented according to the exploitation form, calculations are based on the number of victims supported for this form of exploitation by the structures that selected the question. For example, with respect to domestic exploitation, four associations supported 191 disabled victims, so the percentage will be calculated on the basis of these 191 victims.

---

12. Criteria notably defined according to Warsaw Convention.
Table 1. Summary table of associations’ responses to questions and of the proportion of missing information entered as unavailable by the associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
<th>Number of associations having responded</th>
<th>Number of supported victims concerned</th>
<th>Proportion of missing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims detected</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported since 2016</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of victims supported</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group of female victims supported</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group of male victims supported</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group of transgender victims supported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin of victims supported</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
<th>Number of associations having responded</th>
<th>Number of supported victims concerned</th>
<th>Proportion of missing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details on the profile of victims</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported having endured several forms of exploitation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adult victims supported presumed to be minors at the time they were supported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adult victims supported who were children at the beginning of their exploitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported with children living with them at the time of the exploitation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported with a disability detected by the association</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the victims supported with a disability detected by the association, number of victims for whom the disability has been confirmed by a doctor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported in an addiction situation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DETAILS ON VICTIMS’ PROFILES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITIONS OF EXPLOITATION</th>
<th>Number of associations having responded</th>
<th>Number of supported victims concerned</th>
<th>Proportion of missing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported still in a situation of exploitation at the time the association supported them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported according to the links with the trafficker(s)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported for whom the transfer was arranged by the trafficker or another person</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported whose accommodation was arranged by the trafficker or one of his/her intermediaries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the victims supported who are housed by the trafficker or one of his/her intermediaries, number of victims housed at the place of exploitation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported according to the length of time of exploitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported who were exploited in another country</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported having been implicated for acts concerning their exploitation situation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the victims supported who were housed, number of victims who benefited from accommodation geographically distant from the place of exploitation (Ac.Sé network or similar)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported according to residence status</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DETAILS ON THE CONDITIONS OF EXPLOITATION</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance and support of victims</th>
<th>Number of associations having responded</th>
<th>Number of supported victims concerned</th>
<th>Proportion of missing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported according to the type of contact with the association</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported according to the type of support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported who were offered an appropriate housing solution by an association or other organisation (including the Ac.Sé network)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the victims supported who were housed, number of victims who benefited from accommodation geographically distant from the place of exploitation (Ac.Sé network or similar)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported according to residence status</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DETAILS ON GUIDANCE OR SUPPORT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official steps taken by victims</th>
<th>Number of associations having responded</th>
<th>Number of supported victims concerned</th>
<th>Proportion of missing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported who went to the police and/or gendarmerie and pressed charges</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported who benefited from a cooling-off period after going to the national police and/or gendarmerie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported who filed a direct complaint with the Public Prosecutor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of victims supported according to the outcome of their official complaint filing (proceedings) to the police/gendarmerie or public prosecutor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DETAILS ON OFFICIAL STEPS TAKEN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scope: Data provided by 24 associations having supported 1,857 victims.
The victims of trafficking in human beings mentioned in the rest of this document correspond to those detected as such by the associations who responded to the questionnaire. The victims have not all been officially identified by the competent authorities.

Findings

The data gathered by the associations and collated in this survey provide a source of invaluable insight into the profiles of victims of trafficking in human beings situated in French territory. Although only partially reflecting the phenomenon, the information collected enable several sweeping trends characterising trafficking in France to be outlined: the presence of numerous Nigerian victims of sexual exploitation; the activity of networks involving procuring, forced criminality and begging in Eastern and Southern Europe; the high proportion of victims of labour exploitation, especially in the domestic setting, coming from African or Asian countries. Although they represent a minority of victims supported by associations, the survey also lays bare the vulnerability of girls and boys, often of a very young age, to the risks of sexual exploitation, forced criminal activity and forced begging. This finding is consistent with the feedback from the ground, which points to a significant rise in the number of child victims in recent years. These datasets also reflect the need for victims to be given comprehensive support, and the barriers sometimes encountered to take official action with the authorities.

1,857 victims of trafficking in human beings supported by 24 associations in 2016

24 associations completed the questionnaire on victims of trafficking in human beings supported through 2016. 1,857 victims have been recorded in total, for all forms of exploitation, whether or not their supporting began in 2016. 17 associations having supported 1,132 victims were able to specify the year in which supporting began. It transpires that supporting began for 616 victims in 2016.

Last year, during the first edition of the survey, 13 associations having supported 1,826 victims had supplied data. With the exception of one association, specialising in support for victims of human trafficking, those who responded to the first survey also took part in the second. The small increase in number of victims supported, despite the near twofold increase in the number of responding associations, can be explained by the fact that most of the associations having responded for the first time this year do not specialise in the issue of trafficking. This primarily concerns associations that support vulnerable people or immigrants, which on occasion detect and support victims of trafficking in human beings without this being their main focus.

The associations having replied to the survey on victims of trafficking supported in 2016 can be divided into four categories:

✓ Associations specialising in support for victims of trafficking in human beings, with respect to one or more forms of exploitation: Association Foyer Jorbalan (AFJ), Comité Contre l’Esclavage Moderne (CCEM), National Ac.Sé Network, L’Embellie, Organisation internationale contre l’esclavage moderne (OI-CEM), SOS Esclaves. These associations supported 432 victims of trafficking in human beings in 2016, 23% of victims recorded in the survey.

✓ Associations helping migrants: Anafé, Croix-Rouge française Espace Solidarité (mission in waiting areas), Réadaptation sociale, Dom’Asile, Hors la Rue, La Cimade Ile-de-France – Action femmes étrangères victimées de violences, Ordre de Malte France (mission in immigration detention centres). These associations supported 237 victims of trafficking in human beings in 2016, 13% of victims recorded in the survey.

✓ Associations working with precarious circumstances: ABEJ Solidarité – Accommodation unit, Association pour la réadaptation sociale (ARS), Croix-Rouge française Espace Solidarité (Martinique), Foundation de l’Armée du Salut – Comité Contre l’Esclavage Moderne (CCEM), National Ac.Sé Network, L’Embellie, Organisation internationale contre l’esclavage moderne (OI-CEM), SOS Esclaves. These associations supported 1,154 victims of trafficking in human beings in 2016, 62% of victims recorded in the survey.

✓ Associations working with people living in precarious circumstances: ABEJ Solidarité – Accommodation unit, Association pour la réadaptation sociale (ARS), Croix-Rouge française Espace Solidarité (Martinique), Foundation de l’Armée du Salut – ‘Le nouveau Horizon’. These associations supported 34 victims of trafficking in human beings in 2016, 2% of victims recorded in the survey.

Most of these associations support adult victims for the most part. Two associations nevertheless specialise in supporting children: the ACPE, which works to combat child prostitution, and Hors la rue, which works alongside wandering and at-risk foreign minors.

... (14) This association specialising in trafficking in human beings supports victims of sexual exploitation only.
In addition to the six associations specialising in supporting trafficking victims, nine had implemented initiatives that were specifically aimed at victims of trafficking in human beings.

Figure 1. Victims recorded in the survey according to the type of association supporting them

The associations that took part in the survey work across a variety of geographic sectors. Half of them operate in several regions, and in some cases throughout mainland France. The other 12 work in a specific territory: half in the Parisian region, three in Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur, one in Occitanie, one in Nouvelle-Aquitaine, one in the Haute-Savoie and one in Martinique. The participation of an association active in overseas territories is a new factor compared with the previous edition of the survey.

Profile of human trafficking victims supported by the associations in 2016

Most associations support victims of sexual exploitation

Of the 1,857 victims of trafficking in human beings supported in 2016, 1,366, so nearly 3 in 4, were victims of sexual exploitation (74%). This predominance of sexual exploitation over the other forms of trafficking needs to be interpreted in light of the fact that 20 associations supported victims of this exploitation form in 2016. Moreover, 8 out of 24 associations specialise in this issue. Of the different forms, sexual exploitation is perhaps the best known and the one for which the victims are the most visible and the most accessible. The other types of exploitation are almost invisible, especially as far as labour exploitation is concerned, which includes domestic exploitation, as this happens behind closed doors.

Forced labour is the second most common form of exploitation encountered. It concerns 287 individuals, 15% of the victims supported by associations in 2016 (Figure 2). Nearly 7 in 10 of these are victims of forced labour for domestic services. Victims of forced criminality account for 7% of all victims recorded in the survey (134 victims), and victims of forced begging 2% (38 victims). Lastly, 32 victims (2%) have endured a different form of exploitation to those cited. These are mainly child victims encountered in airport waiting areas, regarding whom there is a strong suspicion of exploitation, although this hasn’t been officially confirmed by the association (see text box p.20).

Figure 2. Form of exploitation endured by the victims of human trafficking supported by associations in 2016

The number of victims and distribution between the different forms of exploitation are much the same between 2015 and 2016 (Table 2). As explained above, the increase in number of responding associations has not led to a significant rise in the number of victims recorded. The slight variations observed can be put down to the activity of the responding associations.

Table 2. Form of exploitation endured by victims supported by associations in 2015 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of exploitation</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of responding</td>
<td>Number of responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associations: 13</td>
<td>associations: 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of victims</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recorded in the survey</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual exploitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Labour including domestic</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including other form of forced</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced criminal activities</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced begging</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other purposes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of adult women among the victims

Out of the 1,857 victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016, 1,587, 85%, were women (Figure 3). Men account for 14% of victims, 258 victims. The associations also supported 10 transgender people (1%). In two situations, the information about the victim’s gender could not be entered.

1,360 of the trafficking victims supported by the associations were adults (73%) and 248 children (13%). For 249 victims, the age-related information could not be entered. Most of the child victims are girls (61%), sometimes of a very young age, since 61 victims were under 15 years (Table 3). It is important to note here that because child victims are dealt with by child welfare services, they are less likely than adults to be supported by an association.

Figure 3. Gender of victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016

![Gender of victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016](image)

Note: Information is missing on the gender of victims supported in 0.1% of cases.
Scope: Data provided by 24 associations having supported 1,857 victims.

Table 3. Gender and age of victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016 (number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and Age</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>Information missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-14 y/o</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17 y/o</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child with no further information</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 y/o</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 y/o</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 y/o</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 y/o</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 +</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult with no further information</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total adults</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing information</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scope: Data provided by 24 associations having supported 1,857 victims.

Except on rare occasions, child victims are concerned by three forms of exploitation: sexual exploitation (113 victims, i.e. 45% of all child victims), forced criminal activities (77 victims, i.e. 31%), and forced begging (26 victims, i.e. 10%). 29 child victims having endured a form of exploitation not specified in the survey have also been identified (see text box p.20).

Figure 4. Main countries of origin of victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016 (number)

![Main countries of origin of victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016 (number)](image)

Scope: Data provided by 24 associations having supported 1,857 victims.
Over half of the victims recorded are of Nigerian origin

The victims of trafficking supported by the associations that responded to the survey come from 68 different countries (Map 1). That said the distribution of victims depending on their country of origin is very unequal. Nearly 8 in 10 victims (78%) come from only five countries: Nigeria, Romania, Morocco, Algeria and Bulgaria.

Of the human trafficking victims recorded in the 2016 survey, 990 (53%) come from Nigeria, and almost all of them endured sexual exploitation. Much like the distribution according to the different forms of exploitation, this predominance of Nigerian victims needs to be interpreted in light of the fact that most of the responding associations work with victims of sexual exploitation.

The data gathered also reveals a high presence on French soil of victims from Romania (222 victims), Morocco (117), Algeria (70) and Bulgaria (43). To a lesser extent, the survey records several dozen victims from other nations in Sub-Saharan Africa (Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cameroon, Ivory Coast and Senegal for example), Asia (Vietnam, the Philippines) or Latin America and the Caribbean (Peru, Dominican Republic) (Figure 4). Victims of trafficking in human beings are not necessarily of foreign origin, since 24 French victims were supported by an association in 2016.

Three-quarters (75%) of victims of human trafficking supported by associations in France in 2016 come from an African country, 18% Europe, 5% Asia and 2% from Latin America and the Caribbean (Figure 5). These proportions are similar to those observed during the previous edition of the survey (Table 4).

Figure 5. Geographic regions of origin of the victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016


Table 4. Geographic regions of origin of the victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2015 and 2016 (number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICA</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa (excluding Nigeria)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified African countries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern and Southern Europe</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including France</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality not entered</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scope: Data provided by 24 associations having supported 1,857 victims. Source: “Victims of trafficking in human beings” questionnaire, MIPROF – ONDRP, 2016. Countries and regions grouped according to the UN Statistics Division.

Varied forms of exploitation according to the victims’ region of origin

Studying the different forms of exploitation endured throws into focus certain features specific to the different geographic regions or countries of origin of the victims (Table 5). From this analysis, it is possible to get an idea of the main outlines of the phenomenon of trafficking in human beings in France, as revealed through the activity of associations who work with such victims.

Whereas victims coming from Nigeria, Central Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean have mainly endured forms of sexual exploitation, labour exploitation – including domestic – is predominant among victims from Western Africa (excluding Nigeria), Eastern Africa, Asia and France. Two geographic regions stand out owing to a wider diversity of forms of exploitation encountered: victims from Eastern and Southern Europe are mainly affected by sexual exploitation, forced criminal activities and forced begging, and victims from Northern Africa by sexual exploitation and forced labour – including domestic services.

Overall, the key trends remain similar to those that had been identified during the previous survey. Occasionally, for some nationalities and some forms of exploitation, significant differences in the number of victims are observed. These can be due to the specific activity of the new associations responding to the survey, to the shift in focus of the associations having responded for 2015, or to the emergence of new phenomena.
Map 1. Countries of origin of victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016

Scope: Data provided by 24 associations having supported 1,857 victims.

Africa (1,382 victims)

Nigeria: 990 victims

Out of the 1,857 victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016 in France, 990, 53%, came from a single country: Nigeria. Nearly all Nigerian victims were exploited for the purposes of prostitution. Two victims were exploited for the purposes of labour. The survey conducted among associations supporting trafficking victims in France confirms the observation often made by stakeholders on the ground that the sexual exploitation of Nigerian victims in France is a widespread phenomenon (see text box 1 p.18).

Northern Africa: 195 victims

Morocco (117), Algeria (70), Tunisia (5), Egypt (3)

North Africa is the third most common region of origin for victims of human trafficking exploited in France, after Nigeria and Southern and Eastern Europe. Three forms of trafficking concern North-African victims in relatively significant proportions: sexual exploitation, which concerns 49% of victims, forced labour (42% of victims) and forced criminality (9% of victims). Two-thirds of victims of labour exploitation are victims of domestic servitude. The presence of victims forced into crime, originating from North Africa, in the associations’ current registers is a new phenomenon compared with the previous survey. All of these victims, 18 in total, come from Algeria.

Central Africa: 91 victims

Democratic Republic of the Congo (39), Cameroon (26), Central African Republic (10), Equatorial Guinea (8), Angola (5), Congo (2), Chad (1)

The most concerned countries in this zone, where sexual exploitation is predominant (76%), are Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Central African Republic. Alongside sexual exploitation victims, the survey also counts 21 victims of labour exploitation (23%), 14 of these have been victims of domestic servitude and 7 of other form of forced labour.

Box 1. Nigerian networks of trafficking in human beings for sexual exploitation

Many reports highlight the prominence of Nigerian networks trafficking in human beings for sexual exploitation in France (Bouchoux & al., 2016; GRETA 2016; Guignard, 2015; Lavaud- Legendre & Peyroux, 2014; Sebtaoui & Harisson, 2017; Vernier, 2010). The Department for Information, Intelligence and Strategic Analysis on Organised Crime (SIRASCO) of the Criminal Police Central Directorate (DCPJ) also points out the scale of Nigerian networks in France and the worrying form these take, since they are well organised. In the same way as for the data bearing on 2015, this characteristic and the presence of these networks in France stands out in the data from the questionnaire, through the high number of Nigerian victims supported by associations in 2016. Beyond the number of victims, the activity of Nigerian networks is all the more visible because it concerns exploitation in the street.

Through the survey it has also been possible to record 16 victims of domestic servitude from an African country, without the association having been able to specify which one.

Western Africa (excluding Nigeria): 68 victims

For analytical purposes and owing to their large number, Nigerian victims have been counted separately from Western Africa.

Ivory Coast (17), Senegal (17), Guinea (11), Mali (6), Togo (5), Burkina-Faso (4), Ghana (3), Benin (2), Cape Verde (1), Mauritania (1), Niger (1)

In this region, the victims mainly come from Ivory Coast and Senegal, and to a lesser extent Guinea, Mali, Togo, and Burkina-Faso. Of the victims coming from this region, 3 in 4 (75%) are victims of forced labour – primarily in the domestic setting. Along with Eastern Africa, this is the geographic region where labour exploitation is proportionally the most widespread. Sexual exploitation (17 victims, 25%) is proportionally less common here than in the other geographic regions. Six victims of other form of forced labour from Western Africa have also been recorded by associations in 2016.

Eastern Africa: 22 victims

Ethiopia (6), Eritrea (6), Comoros (2), Madagascar (2), Mauritius (2), Kenya (2), Rwanda (2)

In this region, the victims mainly come from Ethiopia and Eritrea. All of the individuals supported have been victims of forced labour, whether in the domestic setting (15 victims – 68% of victims) or in another context (7 victims – 32%).

continued page 19...
Box 1

Although they have typically been women and teenage girls between 15 and 30 years of age, the associations are currently drawing attention to the ever-younger ages of victims now encountered.

A distinctive characteristic of Nigerian network is that it is partly controlled by women – at least for the most visible part. During their exploitation, victims often come across a number of different intermediaries, which makes it difficult to identify the network’s leaders. The “madams”, often former prostitutes who were exploited themselves, recruit the victims in Nigeria and manage their stay and exploitation in France. They “sponsor” the victims by paying for their transfer to the country where they will be exploited. In this way, the victims rack up a debt that they will pay back through prostitution. Each “madam” exploits between 10 and 15 women. The networks are highly mobile and often move the victims between different cities – even countries – thus preventing them from forging ties in the places they end up, not least with associations. Nigerian networks are well-versed in the legislation of the countries to which they traffic their victims. They often travel under a false passport, while their real papers are confiscated. This strengthens the hold traffickers have over them and makes any attempts to leave the network very difficult. Whereas in the past they were flown to Europe by plane, victims now follow the land and sea migratory routes to Europe that immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa take. These routes change depending on the tightening of border checks. The dangers along this migratory route increase the risks of victims being exploited during their journey.

“Madams” also have a psychological and economic hold over their victims. A psychological and spiritual hold which binds the victim to the “madam” through the “juju”, a frightening voodoo ritual for victims in which samples of their hair, skin or blood can be taken, scars etched into their flesh, or animal sacrifices made. The ritual is a contract sealed between the victim and her traffickers, binding both parties: the “madams”, who must get the victims to Europe and find them a means of repaying their debt, and the victims, who pledge to remain silent and obey. The hold stems from the belief that breaking this pact would bring a curse on the victim or her family. The economic hold arises out of the situation of debt bondage, where the victims must work to repay the price of organising the transfer, which is set by the “madam”. This can range between €40,000 and €85,000. It can be increased during the exploitation for many reasons (fines or punishment for example). Should the victim refuse to pay off her debt, reprisals can come in the form of extreme violence – in some instances the victim’s or her relatives’ death.

This text box has been written drawing on a special-focus article in the magazine “Prostitution et société”, published by the association Mouvement du Nid (Legardinier, 2017).

Europe (338 victims)

Eastern and Southern Europe: 314 victims

Romania (222), Bulgaria (43), Albania (18), Serbia (10), Hungary (9), Bosnia-Herzegovina (2), Moldova (2), Macedonia (2), Ukraine (2), Belarus (2), Russia (1), Portugal (1)

After Nigeria, Eastern and Southern Europe is the second most common geographic region of origin for victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in France in 2016. Of these victims, 7 in 10 are of Romanian nationality. The number of Romanian victims supported rose sharply between 2015 and 2016, from 116 to 222. This upsurge can mainly be explained by the increase in the number of victims forced into crime from this country. Forced criminal activities concerns nearly half of Romanian victims, with the rest mainly suffering from sexual exploitation and, to a lesser extent, forced begging.

Western Europe: 24 victims

France (24)

Victims do not have to be foreign for an offence in trafficking in human beings to be committed. There are instances of “internal” trafficking, with French nationals being exploited.

Accordingly, in 2016, 24 French victims were supported by associations. These are victims of different forms of exploitation, primarily forced labour, including domestic services (14 victims) and sexual exploitation (8 victims).

Asia (93 victims)

Vietnam (34), the Philippines (26), Pakistan (8), China (5), India (4), Turkey (4), Sri Lanka (3), Bangladesh (3), Georgia (2), Burma (1), Cambodia (1), Indonesia (1), Uzbekistan (1)

Asian victims supported by associations in 2016 mainly come from Vietnam and the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Pakistan, China, India and Turkey. Across the region, 59% of victims have endured forced labour, including domestic services, 30% an unidentified form of exploitation and 10% a situation of sexual exploitation. Within this geographic zone, the distribution between the different forms of exploitation suffered by the victims reveals striking specific features depending on the country. Filipino victims have almost all endured a situation of domestic exploitation. Chinese victims mainly suffer from sexual exploitation. Proportionally, the number of victims of forced labour (excluding domestic services) is higher than in the other geographic regions: this form of exploitation concerns 3 Bangladeshi victims, and 5 in 8 Pakistani victims for example. The Vietnamese victims represent a special case since, for 28 of them, the form of exploitation endured could not be identified by the association. These are unaccompanied minors; girls and boys, whom the associations encountered in airport waiting areas (see text box p. 19).
Specificities regarding victims of trafficking in human beings in waiting areas

Two associations completed the additional questionnaire on support of victims of trafficking in human beings in waiting areas. In 2016 they met 30 victims – 18 females and 12 males – in these areas, most of them children. Support provided by associations in waiting areas is very restricted – with time being in very short supply. This explains why the associations were unable to provide more detailed information on these victims.

28 were detected by the French Red Cross as part of its mission in the waiting area of Paris-Charles-de-Gaulle Airport. They were children from Vietnam – 12 boys and 16 girls. In recent years, the French Red Cross has seen unaccompanied girls and boys arrive in France from Vietnam. There are a number of factors suggesting that they could be victims of human trafficking – not least the well organised nature of this form of migration, and the stereotypical narratives and behaviour of the victims. Support provided in waiting areas does not enable the form of exploitation to which they are exposed to be identified, nor whether this exploitation is intended to take place in France or another country. For example, many Vietnamese victims have been recorded in the UK, some of whom have probably travelled through France.

Interview with Charlène Cuartero-Saez, Policy Officer, Anafé

Two trafficking victims have been supported by Anafé: two women, one victim of sexual exploitation and the other a different form of exploitation. Both of these victims have requested asylum.

Because of the small number of victims supported by Anafé, it is not possible to draw conclusions on the victims of trafficking in human beings present in waiting areas in France. Anafé only encounters a small proportion of individuals held in waiting areas. It is likely that many more victims of human trafficking transit through these French waiting areas, whether or not they subsequently end up entering the territory.

It is also possible that Anafé has met with victims of trafficking in human beings whom it has not identified. Support provided in waiting areas is very time-limited, and does not always allow for a precise assessment to be made of the person’s circumstances. Where Anafé suspects human trafficking, it gives the person contact details for specialist associations. However, this person will not be recorded in the statistics as a victim of trafficking in human beings.

In order to improve the detection and support of victims of violence, including of trafficking in human beings, training on the subject has been organised for Anafé volunteers working in the waiting area. In the same way as the French Red Cross has, Anafé has noticed a high number of Vietnamese children passing through, who are strongly suspected of being victims of exploitation. The association does not meet personally with these children however, as an ad hoc administrator is appointed to their case in principle.”

Latin America and the Caribbean (44 victims)

Peru (13), Dominican Republic (13), Brazil (6), Mexico (2), Venezuela (2), Haiti (2), Argentina (1), Columbia (1), Ecuador (1), Paraguay (1), Saint Lucia (1), Dominica (1)

33 of all victims from Latin America and the Caribbean have suffered sexual exploitation (75%). The other victims (11, 25%) have endured forced labour. There are noticeable differences with the findings of the previous survey. First of all, the appearance of victims from the Caribbean – primarily from the Dominican Republic – is a new feature. These are sexual exploitation victims supported by one of the new associations that responded, based in Martinique. A higher number of sexual exploitation victims from Peru has also been noted. The number of Brazilian victims supported by the associations, which accounted for two-thirds of Latin-America and the Caribbean victims last year, has fallen significantly.

Types of support set up by the associations

Key methodological considerations

The questions on the types of support set up by the association and the official steps taken by the victims were set out in the “additional” questionnaire. The associations were not obliged to fill in this part of the questionnaire, and some were unable to do so.

For each question, the findings presented below have been calculated solely on the basis of the victims supported by the associations that completed it.

11 associations having supported 663 victims answered the question on the type of contact with the victims. In 43% of cases, this happens during the association’s outreach rooms or open-access drop-in hours, and in 21% of cases following
a referral by another structure (associations, social services, professionals, institutions and so on). In 8% of situations, the association came into contact with the victim in a place where s/he was deprived of liberty, where the association was working (penal institutions, waiting areas, immigration detention centres). Reports by a third party and contact on a friend or relative’s advice account for 9% and 3% of type of contact with the association respectively (Figure 6).

In a section devoted to associations’ difficulties with identifying victims, the former emphasised just how challenging it is to meet them – on the one hand because they do not see themselves as victims and on the other because they are very mobile (in France and Europe). The inadequacy of professionals’ training in identifying victims of all forms of trafficking was also mentioned.

The associations that responded to the survey do not all have the same areas of work. Some are able to provide the victim with comprehensive support, while others specialise in a certain type of support. Each association thus practises the types of support for which it is competent, depending on the needs expressed by the victim. The complexity of situations and wide-ranging needs of trafficking victims often require several associations and professionals to work together.

The needs expressed by the victim can change during the support process and in some cases, on account of their exploitation, supporting of victims can cease. For all these reasons, a negative response does not mean that the victim does not need the type of support in question. The data presented below only reveals the support needs expressed.

Table 4. Geographic regions of origin according to the form of exploitation of the victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Sexual exploitation</th>
<th>Forced labour (including domestic services)</th>
<th>Forced criminal activities</th>
<th>Forced begging</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>99.9 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49.6 81 (52)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76.5 21 (14)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa (excluding Nigeria)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8 51 (45)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern and Southern Europe</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>46.4 14 (6)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.6 14 (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1 55 (37)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75.2 11 (9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>73.6 287 (197)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NO. is equivalent to the number of victims supported by associations. Percentage is calculated on the total supported. Source: «Victims of trafficking in human beings» questionnaire, MIPROF – ONDRP, 2016.

Figure 6. Type of contact between the victim and association

Note: The «open-access drop-in hours/Outreach roams» option groups together the victims who contacted the association of their own, those met during open-access drop-in hours or outreach roams. Source: «Victims of trafficking in human beings» questionnaire, MIPROF – ONDRP, 2016.
by the victim at the time of the survey, and coming under the remit of the responding association.

Nine associations having supported 466 victims completed the question about the type of support set up. More than 8 in 10 victims (82%) received health and social support, which also encompassed assistance with administrative procedures (except right of residence). Procedures associated with the right of residence concern 73% of victims. Legal support is also very common, with 71% of victims having received this type of support. 46% of victims received assistance with finding accommodation. Less than a third of victims (29%) received counselling (Figure 7).

The associations pointed out that the time required to support and build the confidence of victims is fairly long. The victim also needs some stability and support in terms of accessing his/her rights or housing.

Legal proceedings initiated by victims

Official identification of victims of trafficking in human beings comes particularly under the remit of the police and gendarmerie. Recognition of victim status entitles the person to the possibility of exercising specific rights, not least in terms of residence. The questions bearing on official steps taken with the police and gendarmerie were filled in by ten associations having supported 946 victims. Nearly a third of victims (31%) went to a police station or gendarmerie post: 16% filed a complaint for an offence related to trafficking in human beings, 8% for another type of offence, in 6% of these cases the association does not know whether an offence was reported, and 1% did not file a complaint (Figure 8). The proportion of victims who did not go to a police station or gendarmerie post is 65%. For 4% of the victims supported by the associations that completed this question, the information was not entered.

Victims’ situation regarding the right of residence

Alongside safe accommodation that enables victims to break free from the trafficker, permission to stay in the country is often one of the decisive conditions for enabling them to truly leave a situation of exploitation behind them.

The circumstances regarding right of residence for foreign trafficking victims supported by associations in France vary. Eight associations having supported 638 victims answered the question on this subject. What it tells us is that 26% of the victims they support were legally resident at the time of the survey: 8% had a temporary residence permit pursuant to Article L. 316-1 of the Code for Entry and Residence of Foreigners and Right of Asylum (CESEDA) (see text box 2), 8% a residence document on other grounds than trafficking and 10% benefited from international protection (refugee status or subsidiary protection). More than a quarter (26%) of victims were not legally resident (Figure 9). Finally, 32% of them were waiting to hear back from the authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of support</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and social support</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of residence</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information missing</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A victim may have received several types of support, since multiple answers are possible.
Scope: Data provided by 9 associations having supported 466 victims.
Victims’ situation regarding the right of residence

Alongside safe accommodation that enables victims to break free from the trafficker, permission to stay in the country is often one of the decisive conditions for enabling them to truly leave a situation of exploitation behind them.

The circumstances regarding right of residence for foreign trafficking victims supported by associations in France vary. Eight associations having supported 638 victims answered the question on this subject. What it tells us is that 26% of the victims they support were legally resident at the time of the survey: 8% had a temporary residence permit pursuant to Article L. 316-1 of the Code for Entry and Residence of Foreigners and Right of Asylum (CESEDA) (see text box 2), 8% a residence document on other grounds than trafficking and 10% benefited from international protection (refugee status or subsidiary protection). More than a quarter (26%) of victims were not legally resident (Figure 9).

Finally, 32% of them were waiting to hear back from the authorities.

Box 2. Trafficking in human beings and the right of residence

Where the competent authorities recognise “victim of trafficking in human beings” status, this has implications in terms of right of residence. Article L. 316-1 of the Code for Entry and Residence of Foreigners and Right of Asylum (CESEDA) provides for the issuance of a temporary residence permit bearing the indication “family and private life” to the foreign victim of human trafficking who files a complaint or testifies in criminal proceedings against their trafficker. Said provisions apply under the same conditions to victims of procuring.

Victims who could find themselves in danger if they returned to their country of origin can also apply for international protection (refugee status or subsidiary protection).

Figure 8. Proportion of victims who did or did not go to the police or gendarmerie and did or did not file a complaint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not go to the police or gendarmerie</th>
<th>65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filed a complaint – THB grounds</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed a complaint – other grounds</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to the police or gendarmerie</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without filing a complaint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to the police or gendarmerie</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– no available information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing information</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scope: Data provided by 10 associations having supported 946 victims.

Figure 9. Circumstances regarding the right of residence for victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016

| Illegally resident                     | 26% |
| Missing information                    | 15% |
| Pending                                 | 12% |
| Resident permit L. 316-1               | 8%  |
| International protection               | 10% |
| Resident permit for grounds other than THB | 8% |
| Victims not concerned                  | 1%  |

Scope: Data provided by eight associations having supported 638 victims.
Findings by form of exploitation

By analysing the data according to the different forms of exploitation, we can identify specific characteristics in these victims’ profiles, as well as their conditions of exploitation. These characteristics are not apparent in the overall findings because of the significant proportion of sexual exploitation victims in the sample.

For some forms of exploitation, with a small sample, the data is presented in numbers directly. The data presented in this study can reflect a specific situation at a specific point in time.

The optional part of the questionnaire on victims’ profiles, conditions of exploitation support and official steps was only completed by the associations that selected the questions. For each question, the number of associations that answered it and the corresponding number of victims are specified. No answers were able to be provided to the question on female victims who got pregnant during their exploitation.

A majority of women and Nigerian victims

Out of the 1,366 victims of sexual exploitation, more than 9 in 10 were female (1,295 victims), and 4% male (61 victims) (Figure 10). As in 2015, transgender people are only concerned for this type of exploitation, and they represent 1% of victims (10 victims).

7 in 10 victims of sexual exploitation were of Nigerian origin (Figure 11). Nigeria aside, 13% of victims come from an African country, including 7% from North Africa – primarily Morocco (61 victims) and Algeria (33 victims); and 5% from Central Africa – mainly Democratic Republic of the Congo (31 victims) and Cameroon (17 victims). Nigeria aside, 1% of sexual exploitation victims came from a Western African country (17 victims).

Victims from Europe account for 11% of victims of sexual exploitation. More than 10% of victims came from Eastern and Southern Europe. The main countries of origin are Romania, Bulgaria and Albania (83, 29 and 18 victims respectively). As revealed in the previous survey, victims of trafficking in human beings are not exclusively foreign nationals. French victims of sexual exploitation have also been supported by associations (8 victims, i.e. 1% of European victims).

Moreover, 2% of victims came from Latin America and the Caribbean (33 victims), for the most part the Dominican Republic (39%) and Peru (36%). All of the victims from the Caribbean endured exploitation in Martinique. Less than 1% of victims came from Asia (9 victims, including 4 from China and 2 from Vietnam).

Most of the victims were adults (78%) during their support process (Figure 12), and nearly all of them women. Children account for 8% of victims – teenage girls in 9 out of 10 cases. Information concerning age is unknown for 14% of victims in 2016 (191 victims).

Sexual exploitation

In France, trafficking for sexual exploitation as defined in Article 225-4-1 of the Criminal Code is particularly related to acts of procuring. It corresponds to the act of exploiting a person for the purposes of prostitution.

As with the data for 2015, the associations supporting sexual exploitation victims form a majority among the responding associations. 20 out of the 24 associations supported victims of sexual exploitation. Of these 20 associations, eight specialise in prostitution and sexual exploitation and only provide support for this target group. The other associations provide for a broader target group, either vulnerable individuals or immigrants, or victims of all forms of exploitation, including victims of sexual exploitation.

In 2016, 1,366 victims of sexual exploitation were supported by these 20 associations in France. 13 of these associations were able to provide data about the year in which supporting began. Out of the 617 victims of sexual exploitation supported by these 13 structures, for a little over two-thirds of victims, supporting began in 2016 (419 victims).
The age group has not been specified for 75% of adult female victims. Most of the victims for whom information is available are under 30 years old. For child victims, the age group is not known for 83% of them (for 94 child victims). According to the associations that supported them, when the age group has been completed, the child victims were between 15 and 17 years old.

**Figure 12. Child and adult victims of sexual exploitation supported by the associations in 2016**

Additional information on victims’ profiles

Additional information can be obtained on the profile of sexual exploitation victims by processing the optional questionnaire. Not all of the associations having supported victims of trafficking for procuring were able to answer these questions. These profiling details particularly concern the different forms of exploitation, suspicions that the victim is a child, the presence of children or a situation of disability or addiction.

Regarding the different forms of exploitation, in 2016, few of the victims supported had endured another form of exploitation apart from sexual exploitation. Two associations provided us with data on whether more than one form of exploitation had been experienced. Only one sexual exploitation victim of the 111 victims they supported had also endured another form of exploitation.

The associations sometimes harboured doubts over a victim’s declared age. This is because legal infancy has implications for networks, which therefore often force victims to claim to be of adult age. The trafficker(s) can make threats to ensure that victims’ infancy is not revealed and thus prevent them from being taken under the wing of child welfare services (Lavaud-Legendre & Peyroux, 2014). The associations draw attention to the fact that victims are getting younger, even though some claim to be of adult age, especially those from Nigeria. In 2016, 13% of adult victims were presumed to be children while they were receiving support (data supplied by three associations having supported 156 adult victims).

Furthermore, the presence of children living with the victim can bring about a situation of vulnerability regarding the victim and the child in relation to the trafficker. 14% of the 173 victims supported by five associations had children living with them during their exploitation (Figure 13).

**Figure 13. Children living with the victims of sexual exploitation at the time of their exploitation**

The questionnaire enables us to gain a picture of the situation of disability or addiction of victims detected by the associations. A situation of disability was detected by the association and confirmed by a doctor for 2 of the 133 victims supported by five associations. A situation of addiction was detected for 7 of the 114 victims supported by five associations.
The trafficker’s strong control over the victims

Victims still being exploited when they first start to receive support

One of the defining features of trafficking victims is their dependence on the network and the difficulty they have in finding a way out. Indeed, most victims of sexual exploitation were still in a situation of exploitation at the time the association began to support them. This was the case for 89% of the 210 victims supported by nine responding associations (Figure 14).

The victim’s transfer to France was organised by the trafficker or one of his/her intermediaries for more than 9 in 10 victims (95% – data provided by 8 associations having supported 194 victims). Accommodation is another key factor defining trafficking in human beings, along the same lines as organisation of transfer. The network’s control of accommodation enables it to strengthen its hold over the victims (by keeping tabs on or confiscating earnings under the pretext of rent). 63 of the 100 victims supported by five associations were or had been housed by the trafficker(s). All of them lived at the place of exploitation. This hold exercised by the trafficker can explain the difficulty associations have in contacting victims.

Nearly two-thirds of traffickers are mere acquaintances or unknown to the victim

In 2015, the way the questionnaire was designed did not make it possible to single out which associations had information on the links between traffickers and victims of sexual exploitation. The new questionnaire design makes this possible. Five out of the 20 associations having supported victims of sexual exploitation supplied data on the links between the traffickers and victims. These associations supported 114 sexual exploitation victims in 2016 and provided data on 114 traffickers.

Links with traffickers tend not to advance beyond the acquaintance stage, and are seldom close: 32% of traffickers are an acquaintance of the victim, and 32% a stranger (Figure 15). Yet 22% of traffickers are the victim’s spouse. Several studies lift the lid on the phenomenon of “lover boys”. Young men groom young women, playing on their vulnerability with promises of a better life.

Figure 14. Victims still in a situation of sexual exploitation at the time the association began to support them

Once their confidence has been gained, the young women are exploited (Guinamard, 2015). Moreover, in one study on Romanian child immigrants, Olivier Peyroux (2012) makes the point, about sexual exploitation victims, that “recruitment is mainly carried out through trickery and/or grooming. The most common scenario was that of a young man luring a girl into a relationship with him, so as to be able to take her abroad for the purposes of prostitution.”

Concerning the duration of exploitation, three associations having supported 95 victims entered this duration. The exploitation of a little over half of these victims (57%) lasted from one to under three years (Figure 16). If the victims who were exploited for less than a year are added to this proportion, in total a little over 8 in 10 victims were exploited for less than three years. For a fifth of victims, their exploitation lasted for more than three years.

Figure 15. Link between the trafficker(s) and the victims of sexual exploitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple (spouse, boyfriend)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim’s family</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing information</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Since the links with the trafficker(s) may be of several types, several answers were accepted.
Note to readers: 32% of traffickers are acquaintances of the victim.
Scope: Data provided by five associations having supported 114 victims of sexual exploitation for which 114 traffickers have been identified.

...
A third of victims exploited in another country

Trafficking in human beings is an overwhelmingly transnational phenomenon, and it is therefore common for victims to be exploited in another country. Sexual exploitation is a criminal phenomenon, a key tenet of which economic profitability is, and which is driven by the law of supply and demand. Traffickers therefore adapt to the local context and the risks (local legislation, law enforcement and so on) (Scarpa, 2010).

In addition, commonly moving victims from place to place within a country or abroad enables the trafficker to isolate them by making it impossible to form emotional ties or gain geographic bearings (Guinamard, 2015). A third of the 138 victims of sexual exploitation supported by six associations were exploited in a different country, and a little under half in France only (Figure 17).

In this way, traffickers maintain their hold over victims by forcing them into illegal circumstances in the eyes of the law of the country in which they find themselves. The victims sometimes have legal proceedings brought against them. 2 of the 114 victims supported by three associations were implicated for acts connected with their exploitation, i.e. 2% of these victims. Both of these victims were convicted.

Most victims do not go to the police or gendarmerie

To have their status recognised, victims must make a statement to the police or gendarmerie. But few victims do so. A quarter of the 540 victims of sexual exploitation supported by nine associations went to the national police or gendarmerie (Figure 18). 16% of the victims supported filed a complaint, whether or not this was for trafficking in human beings.

Half of the victims who went to the authorities (135 victims) filed a complaint for trafficking in human beings and 13% on other grounds. Information on whether or not an official complaint was filed was not available for a third of the victims who went to the authorities.

Yet, nearly three-quarters of victims supported by the associations did not go to the police or gendarmerie (74%). This could be explained by the difficulty victims have in betraying their trafficker (particularly out of fear of reprisals), the precarious circumstances in which the victims find themselves, their unfamiliarity with the legal system of the country in which they are exploited, or on account of being illegally resident.

Three-quarters of victims are illegally resident or awaiting determination of their status

The victims’ right of residence is partly dependent on reporting their situation of human trafficking to the authorities. 6% of the 466 victims of sexual exploitation supported by seven associations received a residence permit pursuant to Article 316-1 of the CESEDA (see text box 2 p.22). What is more, the associations clarified that 13% of victims had benefited from international protection, namely subsidiary protection or refugee status. However, 35% of these victims were illegally resident, and 39% were waiting for a residence permit (Figure 19).
In this way, traffickers maintain their hold over victims by forcing them into illegal circumstances in the eyes of the law of the country in which they find themselves. The victims sometimes have legal proceedings brought against them. 2 of the 114 victims supported by three associations were implicated for acts connected with their exploitation, i.e. 2% of these victims. Both of these victims were convicted.

Most victims do not go to the police or gendarmerie

To have their status recognised, victims must make a statement to the police or gendarmerie. But few victims do so. A quarter of the 540 victims of sexual exploitation supported by nine associations went to the national police or gendarmerie (Figure 18).

16% of the victims supported filed a complaint, whether or not this was for trafficking in human beings.

Half of the victims who went to the authorities (135 victims) filed a complaint for trafficking in human beings and 13% on other grounds. Information on whether or not an official complaint was filed was not available for a third of the victims who went to the authorities.

Yet, nearly three-quarters of victims supported by the associations did not go to the police or gendarmerie (74%). This could be explained by the difficulty victims have in betraying their trafficker (particularly out of fear of reprisals), the precarious circumstances in which the victims find themselves, their unfamiliarity with the legal system of the country in which they are exploited, or on account of being illegally resident.

Three-quarters of victims are illegally resident or awaiting determination of their status.

The victims’ right of residence is partly dependent on reporting their situation of human trafficking to the authorities. 6% of the 466 victims of sexual exploitation supported by the associations received a residence permit pursuant to Article 316-1 of the CESEDA (see text box 2 p. 44). What is more, the associations clarified that 13% of victims had benefited from international protection, namely subsidiary protection or refugee status. However, 35% of these victims were illegally resident, and 39% were waiting for a residence permit (Figure 19).
Forced labour

Enslavement or servitude, as well as forced labour or services, form part of the offences under the Criminal Code which constitute exploitation of victims of trafficking in human beings. Owing to the characteristics they have in common, these offences are grouped under a single category headed “forced labour”. Victims of forced labour are either not paid or are given remuneration which is grossly inadequate given their workload, and the number of hours worked often exceeds twelve, even fifteen hours a day\(^\text{(17)}\). Forced Labour often associates hand-in-hand with substandard housing conditions, violence\(^\text{(18)}\) and restricted freedom – particularly of movement.

10 of the 24 associations who responded to the survey supported victims of forced labour in 2016. Of these 10 associations, five specialise in provision of support to exploitation victims only. The other associations provide for a broader target group, either vulnerable individuals or immigrants.

287 victims of forced labour have been recorded in all (15% of all victims). For 71 victims, the association’s supporting began in 2016 (i.e. 30%, out of 237 victims supported by six associations).

An analysis of the data collected from associations distinguishes two profiles of forced labour victims: victims of domestic servitude, and victims of other form of forced labour (excluding domestic services). Domestic servitude is understood to mean forcing a person to carry out household chores or home care services on a daily basis. Outside of the domestic setting, labour exploitation can be found across a range of activity sectors including agriculture, construction, catering, trading or beauty and hairdressing salons. There are frequent examples of victims being exploited across different sectors at the same time or in succession.

197 of the forced labour victims supported by the associations in 2016 were victims of domestic servitude, and 90 another form of forced labour.

In order to paint as accurate a picture as possible of the situations encountered, the data bearing on victims’ profiles and conditions of exploitation is presented separately for domestic servitude and labour exploitation (excluding domestic services). The data on legal proceedings undertaken is presented in an overall manner for all victims of forced labour – including in the domestic setting.

Profile and conditions of exploitation of victims of forced labour for domestic services

8 of the 24 associations that completed the survey supported victims of domestic servitude. 4 of these specialise solely in provision of support to victims of trafficking in human beings. In all, 197 victims of domestic servitude were counted by the associations responding to the survey.

A majority of women and victims from 5 countries

Nearly all of the victims of trafficking in human beings for the purposes of domestic exploitation supported in 2016 by the associations in France were women. They accounted for 185 of a total 197 victims, 94% (Figure 20).

Figure 20. Distribution of victims of forced labour for domestic services by gender

Scope: Data provided by eight associations having supported 197 victims of forced labour for domestic services.

At the time of the survey, only one victim of trafficking in human beings for the purposes of domestic servitude was a child, between 15 and 17 years of age. For 78 victims, 40%, the association indicated that they were adults, without being able to specify their age. Where their age group is specified, most victims are between 30 and 39 years old.

Concerning origin of victims, a quarter (26%) were from Northern Africa: 37 were from Morocco, 14 Algeria and 1 Tunisia. 23% came from Western Africa (excluding Nigeria), chiefly Senegal (14 victims), Ivory Coast (11), Mali (6) and Togo (5). Victims from an Asian country, primarily the Philippines (24 victims), account for 19% of victims of domestic servitude. A high proportion of victims from Ethiopia can also be noted (6). Meanwhile, 16 victims come from an African country that has not been specified by the association (Figure 21).
Moroccan, Filipino, Algerian, Senegalese and Ivorian victims alone account for half of the domestic servitude victims supported by the associations in France in 2016.

Regarding the information from the “additional” questionnaire on victims’ profiles, 5 victims had children with them when they were being exploited (data provided by three associations having supported 117 victims) and five victims had a disability which had been confirmed by a doctor (data provided by four associations having supported 191 victims).

More than half of the victims know the trafficker

When the association began to provide support, 18 victims, 16% of those for whom the information was entered, were still being exploited (data provided by two associations having supported 116 victims) (Table 6). What is more, 20 victims endured several forms of exploitation (data provided by two associations having supported 155 victims).

Victims of domestic servitude were exploited for varied lengths of time: 34% for less than a year, 37% from one year to fewer than three years, 9% from three to fewer than five years, 11% from five to fewer than ten years and 6% for ten years or more. For 3% of victims, this information was not entered (data provided by two associations having supported 116 victims).

The question on the link between the victim and the trafficker was completed by two associations having supported 116 victims. The questionnaire’s design enables us to know for how many traffickers the association has information, bearing in mind the fact that a victim may have been exploited by several people. In all, as regards domestic exploitation, 126 traffickers have been identified. Nearly half knew the victim (49%), who may have been a family member (22 traffickers, 17%), an acquaintance (21 traffickers, 17%), spouse (9 traffickers, 7%) or member of his/her family-in-law (10 traffickers, 8%). 31 traffickers recorded by the associations, 25%, do not know the victim (Figure 22). Finally, 33 traffickers (26%) had a link with the victim that was not included as an option in the questionnaire: pastor, employer, false adoptive parents and so on.

For 132 victims, 84% of those for whom the information was entered, the transfer to France was organised by the trafficker or one of his/her intermediaries (data provided by four associations having supported 158 victims) (Table 6). The victim’s accommodation is almost always organised by the trafficker at the place of exploitation. 117 of the 118 victims for whom this information was entered were housed by the trafficker or an intermediary, and 116 of these at the place of exploitation (data provided by three associations having supported 118 victims).

![Figure 21. Geographic origin of victims of forced labour for domestic services](image)

**Figure 21. Geographic origin of victims of forced labour for domestic services**

![Table 6. Conditions of exploitation of victims of forced labour for domestic services](table)

**Table 6. Conditions of exploitation of victims of forced labour for domestic services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16% still being exploited when the association began supporting them</td>
<td>84% brought to France by the trafficker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49% do know who the trafficker(s) is(are)</td>
<td>99% housed by the trafficker on exploitation site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% data provided by two associations having supported 116 victims</td>
<td>84% data provided by four associations having supported 158 victims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 22: Link between the trafficker and victims of forced labour for domestic services

Note: Since the links with the trafficker(s) may be of several types, several answers were accepted.
Scope: Data provided by two associations having supported 116 victims of domestic servitude for which 126 traffickers have been identified.

Profile and conditions of exploitation of victims of forced labour exploitation (excluding domestic services)

Eight of the 24 associations who responded to the survey supported victims of labour exploitation (excluding domestic services) in 2016. These include four that specialise in provision of support to exploitation victims only. 90 victims of forced labour were supported in all. Five associations having supported 80 victims indicated the number of victims for whom supporting began in 2016. This is the case for 38 of them.

A majority of male victims

Outside the domestic setting, forced labour mostly concerns male victims. They represent 68% of victims (Figure 23). Two victims supported were children at the time of the survey – one girl and one boy. Regarding adult victims, when the association was able to specify the age group, it can be observed that the majority of victims are between 30 and 49 years old.

Victims of forced labour (excluding domestic services) come from a number of different countries. About a third (32%) comes from Northern Africa and 20% from an Asian country (Figure 24). The most commonly cited country of origin is Morocco, with 19 victims, and to a lesser extent, of France (12 victims), Pakistan (5 victims), Eritrea (4 victims) and Democratic Republic of the Congo (4 victims).

Figure 23. Distribution of victims of forced labour (excluding domestic services) by gender

Scope: Data provided by eight associations having supported 90 victims of forced labour (excluding domestic services).

Situations of disability detected by the associations

Four associations having supported 79 victims answered the questions about disability. In 2016, 10 of the victims of forced labour, excluding domestic services, supported by these associations, were in a situation of disability. For 5 of them, this disability had been confirmed by a doctor. One victim, meanwhile, was in a situation of addiction (data provided by two associations having supported 47 victims).

No children lived with these victims during their exploitation (data provided by three associations having supported 48 victims).

More than half of the victims are exploited by a stranger

With respect to the conditions of exploitation, when the association began to provide support, 10 victims were still in a situation of exploitation (data provided by three associations having supported 52 victims). It can also be observed that 8 victims, 11% of those for whom the information has been entered, have endured several forms of exploitation (data provided by two associations having supported 73 victims).

For 44 victims, over a half, transfer to France was organised by the trafficker or an intermediary (data provided by five associations having supported 83 victims). Eight victims were exploited in another country before arriving in France (data provided by four associations having supported 56 victims). During their exploitation, 86% of victims were housed by the trafficker or an intermediary. Of these, 82% were housed at the place of exploitation (data provided by three associations having supported 51 victims).

The question on the link between the victim and the trafficker(s) was completed by two associations having supported 47 victims. The questionnaire’s design enables us to know for how many traffickers the association has information, bearing in mind the fact that a victim may have been exploited by several people. In all, with regard to forced labour (excluding domestic services), 48 traffickers have been identified. More than half (27, 56%) of them are not acquainted with the person exploited (Figure 25). Cases where the trafficker knows the victim account for 18% of situations indicated, whether as an acquaintance (4 traffickers, 8%), family member (4 traffickers, 8%) or member of his/her family-in-law (1 trafficker, 2%).
Figure 24: Distribution of forced labour (excluding domestic services) victims according to main geographic regions

Scope: Data provided by eight associations having supported 90 victims of forced labour (excluding domestic services).

Figure 25. Link between the trafficker and victim of forced labour (excluding domestic services)

Note: Since the links with the trafficker(s) may be of several types, several answers were accepted.
Scope: Data provided by two associations having supported 47 victims of forced labour (excluding domestic services).

Table 7. Conditions of exploitation of victims of forced labour (excluding domestic services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19%</th>
<th>56%</th>
<th>53%</th>
<th>86%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>were still being exploited when the association began supporting them</td>
<td>do not know who the exploiter(s) is(are)</td>
<td>were brought to France by the exploiter</td>
<td>were housed by the exploiter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scope: Data provided by three associations having supported 52 victims.


Figure 26. Proportion of forced labour victims who did or did not go to the police or gendarmerie and did or did not file a complaint

Scope: Data provided by six associations having supported 234 victims of forced labour, including domestic services.
Victims were exploited for varied lengths of time: 36% for less than a year, and the same proportion from one to fewer than three years. 28% of victims experienced exploitation for more than three years, 10% from three to fewer than five years, 5% from five to fewer than ten years, and 13% for ten years or more (data provided by two associations having supported 47 victims). The associations explained that the short period of exploitation could partly be put down to the fact that the victims were provided support following the dismantling of networks or places of exploitation.

**Legal action taken by the victims of forced labour, including domestic services**

Given the similarities in the types of support for these victims, the decision was made to analyse the legal action taken by all forced labour victims together – including those of domestic servitude.

61% of forced labour victims supported in 2016 by the associations that completed the survey went to a police station or gendarmerie post (data provided by six associations having supported 234 victims). This rate is much higher than the rate observed for all victims taken as a whole, across all forms of exploitation (31%). Such a difference can particularly be explained by the fact that the three most active associations where forced labour victims are concerned specialise in legal assistance.

Because it is not possible from the survey to determine when the victims took these official steps, they may have been referred to the association after filing a complaint.

**Box 3 – The cooling-off period for victims of trafficking in human beings likely to file a complaint or testify in criminal proceedings.**

Pursuant to Articles R 316-1 and R 316-2 of the Code for Entry and Residence of Foreigners and Right of Asylum (CESEDA), victims of trafficking in human beings and procuring benefit from a 30-day cooling-off period for determining whether they wish to file a complaint or testify in criminal proceedings against their traffickers. During this period, the victim is issued a receipt permitting them to remain on French territory. This means that, during this time, no expulsion order may be issued or enforced against them. Out of the 141 victims of forced labour who went to the police or gendarmerie, 36% (51 victims) benefited from a cooling-off period (data provided by three associations having supported 230 victims of labour exploitation). This data must be used with caution: almost all of the victims who benefited from a cooling-off period were supported by the same association. It may therefore reflect more the particular situation of a good practice established at the local level than a reality throughout the territory.

33% of forced labour victims filed a complaint for an offence related to trafficking in human beings, 25% for another type of offence, 1% went to a police station or gendarmerie post but did not file a complaint, and in 3% of cases where victims went to the authorities, the association does not know whether an official complaint was filed (Figure 26). 24% of victims did not go to the police or gendarmerie. Lastly, information is missing for 14% of victims.

The victims also have the possibility of filing a direct complaint with the Public Prosecutor. In this context, 60 complaints were sent to the Public Prosecutor’s offices. 50 for an offence related to trafficking in human beings and 10 for another type of offence (data provided by three associations having supported 230 victims of labour exploitation).

Two of the responding associations having supported victims of forced labour were able to provide data on the outcome of the criminal proceedings. Together they supported 139 victims who filed a complaint (including 103 for an offence related to trafficking in human beings, either with the police and gendarmerie, or the Public Prosecutor. At the time of the survey, these associations were able to clarify that, for 20 victims, proceedings were in progress on the grounds of “trafficking in human beings”, for 15 victims, cases were in progress on other grounds, and for 23 victims the case had been dismissed. Lastly, investigations were still ongoing for 23 victims, and 19 victims had not heard back about the proceedings. The information could not be entered for 39 victims.

**Diagram 5. Stage reached in the judicial proceedings when data are collected for victims of forced labour, including domestic services, having filed a complaint**

Scope: Data provided by two associations having supported 139 victims of forced labour, including domestic services, who have filed a complaint.

Exploitation in forced criminal activities

This form of exploitation corresponds to the fact of forcing someone to commit a crime or offence with a view to reaping the profits. The main crimes in this regard are theft-related (pickpocketing, ATM theft, burglaries and so on), although this form of exploitation can also be practised in the context of drugs (UNICEF France, Trajectoire, 2016). Most of the time, the victims forced to commit crime are children.

Three of the 24 associations that took part in this questionnaire claimed to have supported victims of this form of exploitation. The majority of these victims were supported by an association specialising in provision of support for foreign minors in danger. In all, these three associations claimed to have supported 134 victims of forced criminality in 2016 in France. These victims account for 7% of all victims of trafficking in human beings supported by the corresponding associations.

2 out of 3 associations having supported these victims supplied information about the victims for whom supporting began in 2016. This was the case for more than half of the victims (56%, 74 out of 133 victims).

Child victims from Eastern and Southern Europe

In the same way as for forced labour (excluding domestic services), nearly two-thirds of victims forced to commit crime are male (Figure 27). When the victims’ age has been entered, it is possible to observe that, unlike victims enduring forced labour, in this case nearly all victims are children. They are between 10 and 17 years old: 24% between 10 and 14 years old, and 33% between 15 and 17 years old (Figure 28).

More than 8 in 10 victims were from Eastern and Southern Europe (108 from Romania, 4 Serbia and 2 Bosnia-Herzegovina) (Figure 29). Nearly half of the victims from Romania were forced into crime.

Victims from Algeria also endured this form of exploitation (13%, 18 victims). The associations reported that these victims from Northern Africa reflected a fairly recent phenomenon.

[19] Unlike victims of sexual exploitation, those forced to commit crime are prompted by traffickers to report being under 13 years old to escape criminal proceedings (Lavaud-Legendre & Peyroux, 2014). Networks adapt to local legislations (Peyroux, 2012).
Victims in an addiction situation

For 31% of 134 victims (41 victims) forced into crime, the association had detected a situation of addiction (drugs, alcohol, medicinal products) (Figure 30). Out of 133 victims supported by two associations, none presented any disability.

Exploitation organised by relatives and forcing victims into illegal circumstances

In terms of the conditions of exploitation, nearly all of the 133 victims of forced criminality, supported by two associations, were still in a situation of exploitation when first provided with support. Where exploitation in forced criminal activities is concerned, information about the link between the victim and the trafficker is important. According to the responding associations, more than half of the traffickers were in the victim’s family or family-in-law (Figure 31). To be more exact, 32% of traffickers correspond to one or more family members, and 21% to the family-in-law (this may be one of the parents-in-law or the spouse’s family).

Victims forced to commit crimes in other countries

48% of the 133 victims forced into crime, supported by two associations, had already been exploited in another country (Figure 32). Information is missing for the other victims, which means that there is no way of knowing whether or not they have been exploited in another country.

Nearly half the victims are implicated for offences in connection with their exploitation.

What is specific about forced criminality is that the victims are forced into illegal circumstances. Because they are exploited, they are victims, and yet often they are considered first and foremost as offenders. This is why 44% of the 133 victims supported by two associations were implicated for acts in connection with their situation of exploitation (59 victims of forced criminality) (Figure 33). If it is complex for a victim of trafficking in human beings to be recognised as such, this is even truer when the victim is considered to be a criminal.

Figure 30. Victims of exploitation in forced criminal activities in a situation of addiction detected by the association

Scope: Data provided by three associations having supported 134 victims of exploitation in forced criminal activities.


Figure 31. Link between the trafficker(s) and the victim of exploitation in forced criminal activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim’s family</th>
<th>32%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim’s family-in-law</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information missing</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Since there may be several traffickers, several answers could be given to this question.
Note to readers: 32% of traffickers are in the victim’s family.


Figure 32. Victims of exploitation in forced criminal activities exploited in other countries

Scope: Data provided by two associations having supported 133 victims of exploitation in forced criminal activities for which 133 traffickers have been identified.

Of the 59 victims of forced criminality who have been implicated for offences in connection with their exploitation, 47 were sentenced, and for 12 others alternatives to prosecution were pronounced.

None of the 133 victims supported by two associations went to the police or gendarmerie. Neither did any of them file a complaint directly with the Public Prosecutor.

The findings on the profile and conditions of exploitation of children forced into crime brought to light in this survey are shared by a number of other studies.

Several studies led by Olivier Peyroux on child victims from Eastern Europe (Peyroux, 2010; 2012; 2014) highlight the prominence of trafficking networks involving forced criminality that more particularly concern children. These are well organised and the victims can sometimes come from the same locality. Moreover, ties with the family or family-in-law are often very strong, entailing conflicts of loyalty for victims towards their relatives if they betray the network. The family-in-law’s involvement is secured through payment by the victim’s family to obtain “ownership” over the victim, and subsequently to be able to subject him or her to exploitation. The stronghold these networks occupy in close circles dissuades victims from testifying or filing a complaint against their traffickers (Lavaud-Legendre & Peyroux, 2014).

Networks also set up bases across several European countries, which lead to high mobility on the part of victims. Furthermore, a report by France terre d’asile on the identification and protection of trafficking victims’ states that “drug use can also reinforce this dependency link [with the traffickers] for some exploited children”²⁰ (Sebtaoui & Harrison, 2017).

**Interview with Audrey GUITTON, Policy officer on trafficking in human beings, Hors la Rue**

Hors la Rue association supports foreign children exposed to danger and in a situation of wandering. It is the only association that has provided us data on victims in detention centres. In 2016, 41 underage victims of forced criminal activities were supported by Hors la Rue in a detention centre. 19 were girls and 22 were boys.

All victims have been convicted for a theft offence and for 34 under an aggravating circumstance (with violence, in group, breaking and entering and so on) and 7 others for a theft (shoplifting, pickpocketing and so on).

For most of them, it was their first detention (36 victims). 24 had a committal order²¹ up to 4 months. Most of the committal orders were between 2 and 4 months (19 victims). The sentences for victims convicted are between more than a month to 6 months (18 victims).

**Detection of victims**

« Hors la Rue association has a committee room in detention centres where they develop a partnership with case-
workers of the Juvenile Protection Service (PJJ) working in detention. Hors la rue also works with other professional as child welfare services, other associations or other professional of PJJ.

Individual situations are very diverse. However, it has been possible to identify some “profiles” for which a risk of human trafficking for forced criminal activities exists. Some elements of detection are objective as the country of origin especially from particular areas well known to be the heart of criminal networks for trafficking, the multiplicity of crimes, the difficulty to contact family (on phone, muddled speech, not coming at the detention place and so on) or also deschoolisation. Other more subjective signs can help the detection of victims: a stereotypical speech, the vision of their activities, the connection with crime or the question of ascendancy and loyalty conflict with networks. All these signs have been shared with caseworkers of PJJ who redirected people to association who can support their profile.

Victims’ profile

The majority of young people that we support in detention are the victims of trafficking in human beings for forced criminality with a high rate of reiteration. The first crime is committed very young (11-12 years old) and the victims are already known by police before their detention. Our association support children between 13 and 17 years old in detention places. Doubts may still remain about their actual age, since this is the age they declare and it sometimes happens that some young people are incarcerated under false identities.

Supporting minors were equally young women and young men. They mostly come from Romania and countries of former Yugoslavia (as Bosnia-Herzegovina). Recently we also support young people from Morocco (mostly men22). They are frequently out-of-school, whether or not they have been in school in the past.

These victims have often been exploited in other European countries, especially bordering countries such as Germany, Italy or Spain. Networks adapt to legislatives framework of different countries23, thus the situation of young people regarding exploitation can be really different within each country.

The Pathway in a penal institution

“The minor is supported during all his detention with bi-monthly or weekly meetings regarding his situation and needs. These “victims-offenders” are only considered as perpetrators of crimes during their detention, even if there is sign of a potential situation of exploitation. These minors become “alleged victims” when they go out of detention. “Non-implication” principle of the Warsaw Convention is not applied in France 24. Victims are generally not identified as “victims of trafficking in human beings” at the time of their incrimination, whether or not they are prosecuted.

It is only at the end of the detention that the “alleged victim” status can be taken into consideration and that a protection system by geographically remoteness can be established. The purpose of this system is to protect children from the network and to prevent them from failing back into exploitation. To benefit from this system, they don’t need to be officially identified by the authorities. Thereafter, these minors may be included in the framework of child welfare services.

We report to the public prosecutor for juvenile offences all cases that we have identified in detention centres.

The procedure to be discharged from prison depends on the monitoring in place, which is, whether protective measures are effective or not. Indeed, after release, there are often recoveries by the network or runaways of minors. Usually, family is linked to the network in the situation that we encounter (whether it is itself an author and/or a victim) and it is difficult for these children to break ties with their traffickers. It often happens that the minor is lost sight of for few weeks or months when he is released without protection. He is “going green” by the network in his origin country or remain discreet in France. When the protection is effective, the transfer between the detention centre and the shelter place or host family is realized with child welfare services and sometimes our association. The purpose is to organize the transition with other caseworkers who will support the minor. It is absolutely crucial to avoid “letting go” of the support overnight.

The intervention in detention is complementary to our other actions: children are known by our association before detention. About half of them were already known outside the detention centre. This facilitates contacts with them. In comparison with street works, the work in detention allows to realize an individual supporting while it is a collective support outside. Even if the first meeting with the minor takes place in detention, our association often knows some of his acquaintances, or the group he belongs to. When there is no link with them, our language skill (Romanian or Arabic speaking) can facilitate exchanges.”

(22) This is a recent observation; it is possible that the profile changes with time.
(23) These strategies allow criminal groups to « minimize risks of pursuit and to disturb investigation” (translate from French by authors: « minimiser les risques de poursuite et gêner les enquêtes ») (Peyroux, 2014).
(24) The Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Warsaw, 16.V.2005, ratified by France in 2008, stipulate in Chapter IV, Article 26 that “Each Party shall, in accordance with the basic principles of its legal system, provide for the possibility of not imposing penalties on victims for their involvement in unlawful activities, to the extent that they have been compelled to do so.” In an opinion on deprivation of liberty of minors, the National Consultative Commission for Human Rights (CNCHD) mention a failure to consider the status of victims of trafficking in human beings in places of deprivation of liberty (Commission nationale consultative des droits de l’Homme 2018).
Exploitation in forced begging

Exploitation in forced begging is the act of forcing a person to beg with a view to recovering any earnings. This form of exploitation is difficult to grasp precisely as it must be distinguished from begging for survival purposes. Moreover, even in situations where it would seem the children are being exploited by their parents, it is possible that the parents themselves are being forced to beg by a criminal network.

Out of the 24 associations that responded to the questionnaire, five had given support to victims of forced begging. 38 such victims have been recorded in the questionnaire for 2016 in France, accounting for 2% of all victims of trafficking in human beings detected by the responding associations.

The small sample size may impact the results, particularly when 2016 figures are compared with those from 2015. For this reason, the findings will not be presented as percentages, but as numbers of victims.

Four associations provided data on the victims whose supporting began in 2016. 23 out of 37 victims of forced begging are newly recorded victims.

A majority of child victims

The majority of victims of forced begging (25 out of 38) are male (Figure 35). Victims of exploitation in forced begging are younger than for other forms of exploitation. Our figures show 26 child victims and 12 adults (Figure 36). Seven of these child victims were under 10 years old, eleven between 10 and 14 years old and eight between 15 and 17 years old. Where the age of the adult victims has been specified, they are over 40 years old.

All of the victims of this form of exploitation came from Eastern and Southern Europe: 26 from Romania and 12 from Bulgaria. A report by the association ECPAT\(^2\) highlights the resurgence of child trafficking from this geographic region - particularly for forced begging and criminality (Anti-Slavery, 2004).

---

\(^{2}\) End child prostitution, child pornography and trafficking of children for sexual purposes [ECPAT].

---

**Figure 35. Number of victims of forced begging by gender**


**Figure 36. Number of victims of forced begging depending on whether they are an adult or a child**


**Table 8. Number of victims of forced begging by situation of disability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation of Disability</th>
<th>Number of Victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With a disability detected by the association which has been confirmed by a doctor</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not concerned</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Many victims have a disability

One of the distinguishing characteristics of this form of exploitation is the high proportion of victims with a disability detected by the association. For 15 of the 37 victims supported by four associations, a situation of disability was detected (Table 8). The disability of 8 of these victims had been confirmed by a doctor.

Indeed, people with a disability may be actively sought out by the networks for exploitation through begging (Yea, 2010). Moreover, out of 28 victims supported by three associations, a situation of addiction was detected for one of them.
The trafficker, a family member

Regarding the situation of exploitation at the time the association begins to provide support, 27 of the 28 victims supported by three associations were still in this situation.

Information about the transfer organisation was entered by three associations having supported 11 victims of forced begging. What becomes clear is that transfers to France were organised by the trafficker or one of his/her intermediaries in all cases.

In the same way as for victims of forced criminality, the trafficker is often a member of their family or family-in-law. This is the case for 14 out of 28 traffickers of victims of forced begging (data provided for 28 victims supported by three associations for which 28 traffickers were identified) (Figure 37). The close relationship the offenders have with their victims restricts associations’ possibilities of accessing or even reaching out to victims.

Victims’ profile of exploitation in forced begging is more or less the same as those of victims of forced criminality (Bouchoux, et al., 2016). This form of exploitation particularly concerns children when the traffickers are part of the family circle.

The victims of forced begging supported in 2016 by three associations (27 victims) had not been implicated for offences in connection with their exploitation.

Official steps taken by victims

10 out of 37 victims supported by four associations filed a complaint on the grounds of trafficking in human beings. The other victims did not go to the authorities (27 victims). None of the 10 victims who went to the police or gendarmerie benefited from a cooling-off period. None of the 36 victims supported by three associations filed a complaint with the Public Prosecutor (information was missing for 9 victims).

Figure 37. Link between the trafficker(s) and the victim of forced begging

| Victim’s family | 10 |
| Victim’s family-in-law | 4 |
| Acquaintance | 2 |
| Information missing | 12 |

Note: Since there may be several traffickers, several answers could be given to this question.
Scope: Data provided by tree associations having supported 28 victims of forced begging for which 28 traffickers have been identified.

Interview with Mathias Venet, Supervisor of immigration detention centre, Ordre de Malte France

The Ordre de Malte France intervenes in tree immigration detention centres (CRA) in Metropolitan France. Information mission and support of held persons have been realising by their association.

In 2016, 12 victims of trafficking in human beings have been supported by the Ordre de Malte France in immigration detention centres where they act. Almost all victims were women (11 victims) and adults (11 victims). Two kind of exploitation has been identified: sexual exploitation for 7 victims and forced labour for 5. Nigeria (5 victims) and Vietnam (3 victims) are the two main origin countries. Half of the victims were exploited in France and the other half were in transit.

On 12 victims, 5 victims of sexual exploitation and 2 of forced labour have filed an asylum application in the immigration detention centre. Most victims have been released for other reason than human trafficking. For 3 victims, administrative action was linked with trafficking in human beings: 2 victims of sexual exploitation had a decision of administrative or court linked to human trafficking and one victim of forced labour has been granting international protection. Despite, two victims of

(26) Details on age, origin and the pathway of victims supported in immigration detention centre, come from the main questionnaire on victims of trafficking in human beings supported by associations in 2016. The Ordre de Malte France only gives us information on these victims.
sexual exploitation were subjected to Dublin transfer\textsuperscript{28} or readmission in Schengen area. These two victims were deported to Italy.

**Detection of victims of human trafficking in immigration detention centre**

« In 2017, the Ordre de Malte France had supported around 4,000 persons in immigration detention centre. Among them, around ten victims of trafficking in human beings have been identified and accepted the support of our association. The criteria that allow workers to identify the risks of exploitation for a person remain subjective and non-exhaustive. This can be the gender and the nationality of a person: for example, a lonely young woman from Nigeria. When a worker notices some sign, he informs the person on what’s human trafficking and on the protection they can benefit. The purpose is that the victim can decide of the next step with full background knowledge.

Locally, we have implemented protocols to improve identification of victims and if they want to, give them the possibility of an earliest taking care of them. Thereby in Metz and Lille at the same time as the support of the Ordre de Malte France for victims we ask the Mouvement du Nid to meet victims for whom we have a suspicion on sexual exploitation risk to comfort our evaluation. In cases where the Mouvement du Nid evaluates that the exploitation is effective, they write a certificate that will be presented at the hearing to liberty and custody judges or administrative court. With the Comité contre l’esclavage moderne (CCEM), we train our workers on forced labour. These partnerships are essential between associations.

Victims and their traffickers or smugglers are sometimes detained in the same immigration detention centre. This can bring some strain and making impossible the support. This situation has been noticed for Vietnamese. Excepting these situations, when victims are momentarily separate from their network, especially when they are in transit in France, can facilitate their identification and supporting. Moreover, for some victims, the removal order can send them back in their origin country or another where they can endure reprisal. These risks can decide them to start some process.

In most cases, detected victims have been released, most of the time without any link with human trafficking. Once outside, victims’ have a risk to be “taking back” by the trafficker. That why, it is really important that the victim had been supported; especially for accommodation, and that s/he declares as soon as possible their will to start procedure. The control of traffickers on victims is often an obstacle regarding their decision, which have to remain quick. These victims need time. »

Victims’ profile in immigration detention centre

« A young lonely woman from Nigeria is the most common profile encounter by the Ordre de Malte France. Some of them are exploited in France while others have been arrested when they were in transit on French territory, especially in buses between Italia and Belgium. These victims are often very young women despite that they declare or have been judged adults. There are also Albanese or Georgian victims of sexual exploitation who have been detected. We also meet Vietnamese people in transit to the UK detected as victims of forced labour although that they didn’t recognise their situation of exploitation. »

Ordre de Malte France action with victims of trafficking in human beings supporting in immigration detention centre

« Sometimes it is difficult for persons that we encounter to distinguish the role of associations and authorities. It is really important to create a confident and secure atmosphere with potential victims that they can understand that we are here to inform them on their right and to help them, and that we will not take any decision for them.

In reality, the support of victims can meet lots of obstacles. For most of them, the network confiscates their identity document making it difficult for them to obtain temporary residence permit, which they have right as a victim of trafficking in human beings. There is also an issue around training of police and administration on human trafficking, and on the particularity of the support of these victims specially to facilitate the filing of a complaint. The support remains fragmented regarding the important and vary needs of these victims. »

\textsuperscript{27} Refugee status [https://www.ofpra.gouv.fr/fr/asile/les-differents-types-de-protection/le-statut-de-refugie](https://www.ofpra.gouv.fr/fr/asile/les-differents-types-de-protection/le-statut-de-refugie) or subsidiary protection [https://www.ofpra.gouv.fr/fr/asile/les-differents-types-de-protection/la-protection-subsidiaire](https://www.ofpra.gouv.fr/fr/asile/les-differents-types-de-protection/la-protection-subsidiaire).

\textsuperscript{28} For more information on Dublin procedure, visit: [https://www.gisti.org/spip.php?article5153](https://www.gisti.org/spip.php?article5153) et [https://www.service-public.fr/particuliers/vosdroits/F2717](https://www.service-public.fr/particuliers/vosdroits/F2717).
Conclusion

This second edition of the survey on victims of trafficking in human beings, supported by associations, confirms the profiling established in 2015 for sexual exploitation, forced labour (including domestic services) and exploitation in forced criminal activities. Even though there is a possibility that the predominance of responses coming from associations specialising in prostitution and sexual exploitation and associations supporting these victims has an influence on the findings, these nevertheless shed invaluable light on a theme that has not been sufficiently explored to date. They corroborate and build on the observations made by the institutional stakeholders on the ground.

Two key characteristics stand out from the sample compiled from the data provided by the associations that completed the survey for 2016: 85% of victims are female and 73% were victims of sexual exploitation. Whilst it is difficult to ascertain the representativeness of this sample, a detailed analysis of the findings enables a profiling of the victims according to the form of exploitation as well as the variety of situations encountered, depending on the geographic region of origin. These additional analyses bring to light certain phenomena that tend to go unnoticed in an overall assessment of the findings: the child victims of forced criminality, male victims of forced labour (excluding domestic services) and the victims of domestic servitude from Western and Eastern Africa and Asia. 38 victims of forced begging were supported by associations. The threefold increase in the number of victims of forced begging, supported by one association, compared with the previous survey, fleshes out their profile with new details. In 2016, most victims were boys, sometimes of a very young age (under 10 years old). Many parallels have been drawn with victims forced into crime in the study and the literature (Bouchoux, et al., 2016).

The survey also lays bare some characteristics in the way the exploitation is organised, which demonstrate the hold traffickers exercise over their victims. The transfer to France or the place of exploitation is organised by the trafficker or an intermediary in the majority of cases. Similarly, the latter also tend to arrange accommodation. What is more, most victims – across all forms of exploitation – are still in a situation of exploitation when they first receive support from the associations.

Building on the findings of the first two surveys, the MIPROF and ONDRP intend to push on with this work and collect data for the following years. A specific measure in the second National Action Plan for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings is set to be devoted to enhancing knowledge. This measure will particularly bear on the survey’s continuation and improving the data collection tool. The aim is to reach out to a larger number of associations, especially those working Overseas, so as to enhance the representativeness and quality of the data collected. Several partner associations have already incorporated certain questions from the questionnaire into their own data collection tool.

To end, in a bid to improve the response rate, it could also be worth contacting the associations individually to present the study and the findings obtained.

The forthcoming publication of the findings on the basis of administrative data should shed additional light on this phenomenon.

(29) 20 in 24 associations having completed the survey supported victims of sexual exploitation: results are impacted by this preponderance.
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