



Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Fifty-second session
Geneva, 4–15 May 2026

Summary of stakeholders' submissions on Denmark*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review and the outcome of the previous review.¹ It is a summary of 16 stakeholders' submissions² for the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. The Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) noted that a national action plan against racism was published in February 2025 and recommended that Denmark expand the action plan with specific, measurable goals and indicators.³

3. The DIHR was concerned that the conditions and rights of persons in pre-trial detention remained problematic, including that some detainees stayed in their cells close to 23 hours a day, often without access to meaningful activities and with restrictions on contact with the outside world. It recommended that Denmark introduce legislation to adequately regulate conditions and rights of prisoners in remand detention and limit the length of pre-trial detention.⁴

4. The DIHR was concerned that the handling of complaints against the police often resulted in cases being closed, raising concerns about the effective assessment of alleged human rights violations by the police. It recommended that Denmark expand the mandate of the Independent Police Complaints Authority to include assessing and deciding on whether individuals who file complaints against the police had been subjected to human rights violations.⁵

5. The DIHR was concerned that an agreement concluded in 2024 between the government and several political parties allowed the police to use facial recognition without

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



a clear and precise legal basis in the Police Act and the Administration of Justice Act. It recommended that Denmark adopt a clear and precise legal basis on the use of facial recognition by the police.⁶

6. The DIHR was concerned that some people might experience challenges in using digital solutions, which could hamper their ability to claim their rights and ultimately result in rights being lost. It recommended that Denmark introduce a legal requirement to conduct human rights impact assessment in digital solutions, including artificial intelligence.⁷

7. The DIHR reported that self-censorship was an issue in Denmark, with individuals avoiding expressing their opinion on social media or in public due to fear of violence or harassment by other individuals, and that illegal content such as hate speech was spread widely online. It recommended that Denmark ensure that the police conduct an effective investigation and, when appropriate, prosecution of hate speech.⁸

8. The DIHR noted a low number of convictions for trafficking of human beings, while the number of persons exposed to trafficking had increased. It recommended that Denmark establish a permanent, independent National Rapporteur for monitoring the Government's anti-trafficking activities with a clearly delineated mandate and a human-rights based approach.⁹

9. The DIHR was concerned that the national action plan against intimate partner violence and homicide would expire in 2026 and did not include initiatives addressing violence against women and femicide beyond the scope of intimate partner relationships. It was also concerned about the lack of a dedicated offence code for intimate partner homicide in the police case management system. It recommended that Denmark adopt a renewed national action plan to combat violence against women and introduce a dedicated offence code for intimate partner homicide in the police case management system.¹⁰

10. The DIHR was concerned about the significant increase in reported use of coercive measures in residential facilities for persons with disabilities. The DIHR recommended that Denmark ensure accurate and reliable data on the use of coercion in residential facilities for persons with disabilities and take effective measures based on this data.¹¹

11. The DIHR was concerned that legislation allowing the transfer of asylum seekers to a third country, to have their asylum case processed, lacked important legal safeguards. DIHR recommended that Denmark ensure that human rights are respected in any plans to transfer asylum seekers to a third country.¹²

12. With regard to Greenland, the DIHR noted that torture was not explicitly defined as a punishable act in Greenland's Penal Code and recommended that Greenland incorporate torture as a specific crime into its legislation.¹³

13. The DIHR expressed concern that persons from Greenland sentenced to psychiatric measures could be placed in Denmark due to the lack of specialist institutions and psychiatrists in Greenland, and might not receive care provided in a manner that take due account of their cultural origins. It recommended that Denmark, in cooperation with Greenland, ensure that persons from Greenland sentenced to psychiatric measures and placed in Denmark had access to culturally sensitive care.¹⁴

14. The DIHR recommended that Denmark ensure that the reconciliation fund established following investigations into involuntary intrauterine device (IUD) insertions affecting Inuit women in Greenland provide redress to all victims and cover other related systematic human rights violations based on unequal treatment of Greenlanders/Inuits.¹⁵

15. The DIHR stated that suicide rates remained high in Greenland and increased from 2022 to 2024, including among adolescents and children, and that the suicide helpline "TUSAANNGA" could not keep up with demand. It recommended that Greenland implement the suicide prevention strategy, strengthen prevention efforts and allocate sufficient resources for mental health care and other preventive measures, including the suicide helpline.¹⁶

16. The DIHR noted that the Police Authority in Greenland did not disaggregate data in relation to reports of violence in its statistics. It recommended that Greenland and Denmark ensure comprehensive data and statistics about violence, including violence against children

and psychological violence, and implement awareness-raising to increase knowledge and education on psychological violence.¹⁷

17. The DIHR noted that the Inatsisartut Act on Equality and Anti-Discrimination did not address the right to reasonable accommodation and accessibility for persons with disabilities. It recommended that Greenland introduce an amendment to ensure the explicit right to reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities.¹⁸

18. The DIHR recommended that Greenland and Denmark ensure comprehensive data and statistics in all areas in Greenland, and disaggregated data collection on the Inuit population.¹⁹

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with human rights mechanisms

19. International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) recommended that Denmark ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.²⁰

B. Promotion and protection of human rights

1. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

Equality and non-discrimination

20. The Institute of Solidarity for peace and freedom (ISPF), the Institute of Development for everyone (IDE) and Joint submission 2 (JS2) reported that ethnic and religious discrimination persisted in Denmark.²¹

21. Joint submission 1 (JS1) and JS2 welcomed the adoption of a national action plan against racism in February 2025. However, they were concerned that the plan had limitations in scope and lacked a clear definition of racism. JS1 was also concerned that the plan only named Jews and Greenlanders as specific target groups and omitted Muslims, Afro-Danes, Roma and migrants. JS2 recommended that Denmark include in the national action plan against racism the definition of racial discrimination and expand measures to address discrimination and hatred against all religious and ethnic minorities, including Muslims.²²

22. JS1 was concerned that the national action plan against racism also failed to include clear prohibitions on racial or religious profiling. It recommended that Denmark introduce such bans.²³

23. ISPF was concerned that hate crimes targeting Muslims continued to occur in Denmark and that underreporting and shortcomings in the recording of religiously motivated bias affected the accuracy of official statistics. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights/Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE-ODIHR) and JS1 recommended that Denmark establish a standardized system for disaggregated hate crime data collection.²⁴

24. ISPF and IDE were concerned about the persistence of Islamophobic discourse and stereotyping, including in political and media contexts, and the limited counter-speech by public authorities, which contributed to the stigmatization of Muslims. They recommended that Denmark consistently condemn Islamophobic and racist rhetoric and ensure the effective enforcement of hate-speech legislation.²⁵

25. Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights (MAAT), ISPF and IDE expressed concern about the Parallel Society Act. MAAT expressed concern that the Act, which targeted neighbourhoods with a high proportion of residents from “non-Western” backgrounds, was leading to the reduction or demolition of social housing and the termination of rental contracts, resulting in housing insecurity, stigmatisation of affected residents and

barriers to their inclusion in Danish society. MAAT, ISPF, IDE and JS1 recommended that Denmark review and repeal discriminatory policies under the Parallel Society Act and refrain from classifying neighborhoods based on racial or cultural criteria that were leading to discrimination and exclusion.²⁶

26. JS2 was concerned that the increased digitalization created barriers to accessing public services for citizens who were digitally challenged, including persons with disabilities. JS2 recommended that Denmark ensure effective non-digital alternatives, such as personal service and telephone contact, to ensure equal access to public services.²⁷

Right to life, liberty and security of person, and freedom from torture

27. JS2 was concerned that coercive measures continued to be excessively used in psychiatric institutions and that the 10-year plan adopted in 2025 aiming to reduce coercion by 30 per cent by 2030 lacked a necessary preventive approach. It recommended that Denmark adopt a preventive approach in psychiatric care by ensuring that adequate support, care and treatment were provided to reduce the need for coercive measures.²⁸

International humanitarian law

28. JS2 recommended that Denmark adopt a case-by-case assessment of arm export licenses and prohibit exports if there was an overriding risk that this would contribute to breach of international humanitarian law. It also recommended that Denmark ensure that guidance and advice to business enterprises operating in situations of armed conflict and occupation received timely raising of their awareness about international humanitarian law.²⁹

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law

29. JS2 welcomed initiatives related to prison reform, including measures concerning pre-trial detention. However, it expressed concern that pre-trial detention continued to be used extensively, and that remand prisoners could experience severe psychological consequences and restricted contact with the outside world. JS2 and the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) of the Council of Europe (CoE) were also concerned that, in some cases, remand prisoners were subjected to de facto isolation for up to 23 hours a day. JS2 recommended that Denmark enhance efforts to reduce the use of pre-trial detention and review the legal and practical framework governing remand prisoners' contact with the outside world.³⁰

30. The CPT and JS2 expressed concern that, while the maximum duration of solitary confinement as a disciplinary measure for adults had been reduced, the law continued to allow up to 28 days in "exceptional circumstances", and juveniles could still be placed in solitary confinement. JS2 recommended that Denmark prohibit the use of solitary confinement as a disciplinary measure exceeding 14 consecutive days and abolish its use for juveniles.³¹

31. The CPT and JS2 were concerned about overcrowding in Danish prisons. They recommended that Denmark expand non-custodial measures.³²

32. JS2 was concerned that the plan by Denmark to establish a prison in a third country for foreigners convicted by Danish courts would outsource responsibility for the proper treatment of detainees. JS2 recommended that Denmark reverse its decision to establish a prison in a third country.³³

Fundamental freedoms

33. MAAT was concerned that restrictions on peaceful assembly and use of force in the policing of demonstrations had occurred, including detentions in February 2025. MAAT recommended that Denmark refrain from using excessive force against peaceful demonstrators.³⁴

34. ADF International stated that the new provision criminalizing the improper treatment of religious texts, introduced following incidents involving the burning of the Qur'an, may restrict freedom of expression.³⁵

35. European Association of Jehovah's Witnesses (EAJW) expressed concern about reports of hate incidents and acts of violence affecting Jehovah witnesses in Denmark, including in the context of the peaceful public manifestation of their beliefs. It recommended that Denmark ensure the effective protection of freedom of religion or belief, including its public manifestation, and strengthen measures to prevent and address hate incidents and violence against Jehovah witnesses.³⁶

Right to privacy

36. JS2 was concerned that expanded access for the Danish Security and Intelligence Service (PET) to collect personal data without prior judicial authorization, together with increased use of artificial intelligence and the use of facial recognition by Copenhagen police, could be misused, increase pressure on minority individuals and negatively impact the right to protest. JS2 recommended that Denmark require court orders for access to citizens' data and ban facial recognition in public spaces, in line with human rights standards.³⁷

Right to social security

37. ISPF expressed concern that a rule introduced in 2023 requiring social assistance recipients to work 37 hours per week if they or their partner were classified as "non-Western" singled out non-Western immigrants and risked unlawful discrimination, while echoing rhetoric portraying "non-Western" immigrants as a burden on the system. ISPF recommended that Denmark re-examine the 37-hour work requirement for "non-Western" immigrants and ensure that it did not disproportionately impact immigrant families.³⁸

Right to an adequate standard of living

38. JS2 was concerned that 49,500 persons lived in poverty and the social benefit reform would reduce income for an estimated 11,000 children, particularly affecting refugees and vulnerable groups. It was also concerned that, during the first six years after arrival, refugee children only had gradual access to child support available to all other children in Denmark. JS2 recommended that Denmark initiate a national action plan to combat child poverty and ensure equal support for all children.³⁹

Right to health

39. Fondation Jérôme Lejeune was concerned that Denmark's prenatal and preimplantation screening programmes led to high termination rates and a decline in births of children with Down syndrome. It recommended that Denmark conduct an independent multidisciplinary review of human rights implications of these programmes and ensure safeguards for non-directive counselling and the provision of balanced information to parents.⁴⁰

40. The European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) highlighted the adoption, on 24 April 2025, of a proposal relating to abortion raising the limit for abortion to 18 weeks of pregnancy.⁴¹

Right to education

41. IDE and JS2 were concerned about persistent discrimination in education for ethnic-minority students. IDE specified that such discrimination included lower expectations and reduced opportunities, and limited training for teachers on diversity and anti-racist pedagogy. IDE recommended that Denmark revise school curricula to include education on diversity and the contributions of all cultural groups, provide intercultural training for educators, and encourage public broadcasters to feature minority perspectives. JS2 recommended that Denmark ensure learning environments free from discrimination and harassment and produce guidelines and practices fostering non-discriminatory educational environments.⁴²

Development, Business and human rights

42. MAAT welcomed that Denmark had established a budget adjustment mechanism ensuring that average spending on official development assistance reached 0.7 percent of gross national income over multi-year periods. It reported that Denmark was among the

countries that had achieved the United Nations target on official development assistance and that, in 2024, Danish official development assistance amounted to approximately USD 3.2 billion. MAAT recommended that Denmark further increase its development assistance in light of current uncertainties facing the field of humanitarian aid and relief, following major reductions in funding by other countries.⁴³

43. JS2 was concerned that some former ministers, members of Parliament and other officials moved directly into high-level private-sector jobs without restrictions. JS2 recommended that Denmark introduce rules addressing post-employment restrictions for top executive functions after public service.⁴⁴

2. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women

44. MAAT reported high rates of violence against women, noting that 47.5 percent of women had experienced physical or sexual violence or threats thereof, and referred to an increase in femicides. It recommended that Denmark consider adopting a specific law to combat all forms of violence against women and girls, implementing comprehensive solutions to address violence against women and strengthening penalties under existing laws on femicide.⁴⁵

45. The Institute for Protection of Women's Rights (IPWR) expressed concern that domestic violence remained a serious problem in Denmark and noted persistent gaps in practice, including the minimization of violence against women in relation to custody and visitation decisions, and the underuse of restraining and protective orders despite a strong legal framework to combat violence against women. IPWR recommended that Denmark strengthen training for judges, law enforcement and family court professionals on the gendered nature of domestic violence. IPWR and the CoE's Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (GREVIO) recommended that Denmark ensure the application of restraining orders and protective measures.⁴⁶

46. JS2 welcomed that Denmark's rape provision had been amended to be based on lack of consent. However, it was concerned about a gap between reported cases of rape and estimated higher prevalence, a small proportion of reported cases of rape resulting in convictions, and a high number of suspected femicides in the first half of 2025. JS2 recommended that Denmark take measures to standardize and increase the quality of police handling of cases of rape and ensure full implementation of the Istanbul Convention.⁴⁷

47. While noting that Denmark was widely recognized as a pioneer in gender equality, IPWR expressed concern that persistent gender pay gaps remained, as the average Danish woman earned 12.3 percent less than the average Danish man in 2023, linked to occupational and hierarchical segregation. IPWR recommended that Denmark ensure that all employers assess and address gender pay gaps, including by performing regular audits and sharing their findings publicly, particularly in fields that experience high levels of occupational segregation.⁴⁸

Children

48. JS2 expressed concern that a significant number of children in Denmark continued to be subjected to corporal and psychological violence by parents, step-parents or foster parents, as reflected in recent national survey data. It expressed concern that only very few cases of psychological violence were brought to the judicial system. JS2 recommended that Denmark adopt a comprehensive national strategy to prevent and combat violence against children, strengthen awareness-raising and education programmes, and increase knowledge and application of the criminalisation of psychological violence against children.⁴⁹

Persons with disabilities

49. OSCE-ODIHR was concerned that citizens under guardianship deprived of legal capacity were disenfranchised, therefore also ineligible to stand for elections, contrary to international standards protecting the political rights of persons with disabilities.⁵⁰

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons

50. JS2 welcomed that, in 2023, Denmark had introduced an administrative procedure allowing minors who did not identify with the gender assigned to them at birth to obtain a new official personal identification number reflecting their gender identity. However, it expressed concern that legal gender recognition regardless of age had not been adopted, following the rejection of a parliamentary proposal in January 2025. JS2 recommended that Denmark allow legal gender recognition regardless of age.⁵¹

51. JS2 was concerned that allegedly unnecessary and irreversible medical treatment and surgery were performed on intersex children and that no impartial investigation had been conducted into recurring allegations. It recommended that Denmark prohibit, prevent, investigate and provide redress for human rights violations against intersex persons.⁵²

Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers

52. JS2 reported that rejected asylum seekers were required to reside in return centres subject to access control and mandatory residence, reporting and notification obligations, with sanctions for non-compliance ranging from warnings to detention. It recommended that Denmark ensure that conditions in return centres complied with the prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment.⁵³

53. The CPT and JS2 were concerned that the conditions at the Ellebæk return centre were prison-like. JS2 recommended that, in this centre, Denmark improve conditions, remove prison-like regimes and ensure compliance with obligations to prevent inhuman and degrading treatment.⁵⁴

54. JS2 expressed concern that administrative detention safeguards at the Ellebæk return centre were insufficient, indicating that rejected asylum seekers awaiting deportation and newly arrived asylum seekers could be administratively detained there, including for prolonged periods, with limited access to information, telephones and visits. It recommended that Denmark use administrative detention only as a measure of last resort.⁵⁵

55. JS2 was concerned that the constant stress of living in return centres, limited living conditions and indefinite stays negatively affected children's health and wellbeing. JS2 recommended that Denmark ensure that children were not accommodated in return centres.⁵⁶

56. JS2 was concerned that refugees and stateless persons faced barriers to permanent residence and citizenship, including strict requirements such as long-term full-time employment, high-level Danish language proficiency, and mandatory tests on Danish society, culture and history. It also raised concerns about the potential retroactive revocation of citizenship granted due to administrative error. It recommended that Denmark facilitate access to citizenship for stateless persons and refugees, including by relaxing language, work and knowledge of society requirements, and ensure that citizenship granted due to authority error was not revoked years later.⁵⁷

57. JS2 expressed concern that Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT+) asylum seekers, particularly those originating from countries where homosexuality was criminalised, faced obstacles in accessing international protection, as Danish authorities often did not recognise persecution by non-State actors and applied stereotyped expectations regarding how sexual orientation and gender identity should be disclosed or expressed during asylum interviews. JS2 recommended that Denmark adopt clear asylum guidelines and provide specialised training for asylum interviewers, in line with Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' guidance, on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity-related claims.⁵⁸

3. Specific regions or territories

58. The CPT reported that Nuuk Prison, the only closed-unit prison in Greenland, offered good material conditions and no evidence of ill-treatment, but faced challenges related to overcrowding, mixing of detainee categories, limited activities and contact rights for remand prisoners, and insufficient healthcare and staffing. The CPT recommended that Greenland reduce overcrowding in Nuuk Prison through alternative measures, expand activities for

remand prisoners, strengthen healthcare and staff capacity, and review the issue of voluntary isolation.⁵⁹

59. Also in Greenland, Just Atonement Inc. (JAI) was concerned about the persistence of violence against Greenlandic women and girls, limited maternity care putting women's health at risk, and very high suicide rates.⁶⁰

60. JAI was also concerned about the historical population control practices (the so-called "coil campaign") beginning in the 1960s in Greenland, involving non-consensual IUD insertions affecting Inuit women. It recommended that Denmark open a criminal inquiry into human rights violations in the context of the so-called "coil campaign" and make information related to the investigation publicly available.⁶¹

61. JAI was also concerned about the removal of Inuit children from their families in Greenland between the 1950s and 1970s and their placement with Danish adoptive families, in some cases without the proper consent of their parents. It recommended that Denmark investigate the deprivation of children's human rights in this context.⁶²

62. MAAT expressed concern about the recent use by Denmark of culturally inappropriate and linguistically inaccessible psychological tests to assess parental competence in Greenlandic families, which resulted in discriminatory assessments and, in some cases, the unjustified removal of children from their families. JAI recommended that Denmark investigate the deprivation of children's human rights in this context as well.⁶³

63. JAI recommended that Denmark recognize the continued legacy of colonization in Greenland and consider implementing a truth and reconciliation process.⁶⁴

64. JAI also recommended that Denmark affirm the right to self-determination for Inuit Greenlanders, specifying that implementation could include seeking reparations for violations of the Inuit right to self-determination caused by high-emission states, with particular emphasis on natural resource exploitation and ice sheet melt.⁶⁵

65. JAI expressed concern that climate change impacts in Greenland, including ice sheet melt and permafrost thaw, were threatening habitability and subsistence livelihoods of Inuit Peoples and facilitating increased resource exploitation for Danish exports, giving rise to concerns regarding Inuit self-determination. It recommended that Denmark continue implementing the Climate Act while ensuring the inclusion of Inuit input, in particular in future adaptation plans, in cooperation with Inuit Greenlanders and in line with their right to self-determination and the principle of free, prior and informed consent.⁶⁶

66. MEGD expressed concern that the Faroe Islands were preparing to implement structural adjustments to ensure long-term economic sustainability seemingly without planning any comprehensive impact assessments. It indicated that this would, without careful planning, most likely affect the rights of children with disabilities in a negative way and may imply regressions. MEGD recommended that the government of the Faroe Islands develop a strategy on how to continually ensure that comprehensive impact assessments are being made in connection with such structural adjustments, so that future reforms ensure children with disabilities' rights to participate in society on an equal footing with others and only minimally affect their rights in a negative way.⁶⁷

67. MEGD expressed concern that children in the Faroe Islands had limited access to remedies in relation to violations of their rights. It reported that the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure was not in force for the Faroe Islands, limiting children's possibilities to raise complaints. MEGD further noted that existing mechanisms, including the Children's Ombudsman, were limited to administrative matters and did not cover complaints concerning broader structural or legislative issues. MEGD recommended that the Faroe Islands remove the territorial reservation to the Optional Protocol to ensure full access to all children.⁶⁸

Notes

¹ A/HRC/48/10 and the addendum A/HRC/48/10/Add.1, and A/HRC/48/2.

² The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org (one asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with A status).

Civil society

Individual submissions:

ADF International	ADF International, 1202 Geneva (Switzerland);
EAJW	EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES, 1950 KRAAINEM (Belgium);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, The, Strasbourg (France);
Fondation Jérôme Lejeune	Fondation Jérôme Lejeune, Paris (75015) (France);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva (Switzerland);
IDE	Institute of Development for everyone, Tehran (Iran (Islamic Republic of));
IPWR	The Institute for Protection of Women's Rights, Tehran (Iran (Islamic Republic of));
ISPF	Institute of Solidarity for peace and freedom, golestan (Iran (Islamic Republic of));
JAI	Just Atonement Inc., New York (United States of America);
MAAT	Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights, Cairo (Egypt);
MEGD	MEGD (Faroese Disability Organizations), Tórshavn (Denmark).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: Coordination des Associations et des Particuliers pour la Liberté de Conscience, Paris (France); EMISCOYouth for Human Rights;
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: Coalition of NGOs for UPR-Denmark, 2100 Copenhagen (Denmark); Action Aid Denmark, Amnesty International, Association of Immigration Lawyers, Better Psychiatry – National Association of Relatives, Children's Welfare, Danish Association of Legal Affairs, Danish Humanist Association, Danish Association for Penal Reform (KRIM), Danish Family Planning Association, Danish Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, Danish United Nations Association, DIGNITY - Danish Institute Against Torture, DRC Danish Refugee Council, Disabled People's Organisations Denmark, Ellebæk Contact Network, EuroMed Rights, European Network Against Racism – ENAR, Forsete – Think tank, International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims (IRCT), Intersex Denmark, Joint Council for Children's Affairs, KULU – Women and Development (KULU), KVINFO, LGBT Asylum, LGBT+ Denmark, National Council for Children, NewEurope, OASIS, PEN Denmark, Refugees Welcome, Save the Children Denmark, The Migrant Circle, UNICEF Denmark, Women's Council in Denmark, and Youth for Human Rights.

National human rights institution:

DIHR	Danish Institute for Human Rights, Copenhagen (Denmark).
------	--

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE	Council of Europe, 67075 Strasbourg Cedex (France);
OSCE-ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights/Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw (Poland).

³ DIHR, p. 6.

⁴ DIHR, p. 7.

⁵ DIHR, p. 8.

⁶ DIHR, pp. 8–9.

⁷ DIHR, p. 8.

⁸ DIHR, p. 8.

⁹ DIHR, p. 9.

- 10 DIHR, p. 10.
- 11 DIHR, p. 10 and 11.
- 12 DIHR, p. 11.
- 13 DIHR, Annex 1, p. 4.
- 14 DIHR, Annex 1, p. 4.
- 15 DIHR, Annex 1, p. 5.
- 16 DIHR, Annex 1, p. 6.
- 17 DIHR, Annex 1, p. 6.
- 18 DIHR, Annex 1, p. 3.
- 19 DIHR, Annex 1, p. 9.
- 20 ICAN, p. 2.
- 21 ISPF, p.1, IDE, p. 1 and JS2, para. 2.
- 22 JS1, pp. 2–4 and JS2, pp. 2–3.
- 23 JS1, pp. 3–6.
- 24 ISPF, pp. 1–2, OSCE-ODIHR, para. 8 and JS1, p. 2.
- 25 ISPF, pp. 2–3 and IDE, pp. 3–4.
- 26 MAAT, p. 7, ISPF p. 1, IDE, para. 2 and p. 4, and JS1, p. 6.
- 27 JS2, para. 4.
- 28 JS2, para. 14.
- 29 JS2, para. 6.
- 30 JS2, para. 8 and CoE, para. 10.
- 31 CoE, para. 20 and JS2, para. 7.
- 32 CoE, para. 9 and JS2, para. 9.
- 33 JS2, para. 10.
- 34 MAAT, pp. 2–7.
- 35 ADF International, pp. 5–6–7.
- 36 EAJW, paras. 4, 8 and 31.
- 37 JS2, para. 12.
- 38 ISPF, pp. 2–4.
- 39 JS2, para. 18.
- 40 Fondation Jérôme Lejeune, pp. 2–6–7.
- 41 ECLJ, para. 4.
- 42 IDE, pp. 2–4 and JS2, p. 3.
- 43 MAAT, para. 1.
- 44 JS2, para. 5.
- 45 MAAT, pp. 3–4–7.
- 46 IPWR, para. 3 and CoE, para. 21.
- 47 JS2, para. 21.
- 48 IPWR, pp. 1–2.
- 49 JS2, para. 19.
- 50 OSCE-ODIHR, para. 5.
- 51 JS2, para. 20.
- 52 JS2, para. 15.
- 53 JS2, para. 28.
- 54 CoE, para. 8 and JS2, para. 28.
- 55 JS2, para. 25.
- 56 JS2, para. 28.
- 57 JS2, para. 29.
- 58 JS2, para. 27.
- 59 CoE, para. 13.
- 60 JAI, para. 7.
- 61 JAI, paras. 6 and 24.
- 62 JAI, paras. 9 and 24.
- 63 MAAT, para. 6 and JAI, paras. 6 and 24.
- 64 JAI, para. 24.
- 65 JAI, para. 27.
- 66 JAI, paras 12 and 19.
- 67 MEGD, para. 3.
- 68 MEGD, para. 11.