



ECRI REPORT ON AUSTRIA

(fourth monitoring cycle)



Adopted on 15 December 2009

Published on 2 March 2010

Foreword

The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) was established by the Council of Europe. It is an independent human rights monitoring body specialised in questions relating to racism and intolerance. It is composed of independent and impartial members, who are appointed on the basis of their moral authority and recognised expertise in dealing with racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance.

In the framework of its statutory activities, ECRI conducts country-by-country monitoring work, which analyses the situation in each of the member States regarding racism and intolerance and draws up suggestions and proposals for dealing with the problems identified.

ECRI's country-by-country monitoring deals with all member States of the Council of Europe on an equal footing. The work is taking place in 5 year cycles, covering 9/10 countries per year. The reports of the first round were completed at the end of 1998, those of the second round at the end of 2002, and those of the third round at the end of the year 2007. Work on the fourth round reports started in January 2008.

The working methods for the preparation of the reports involve documentary analyses, a contact visit in the country concerned, and then a confidential dialogue with the national authorities.

ECRI's reports are not the result of inquiries or testimonial evidences. They are analyses based on a great deal of information gathered from a wide variety of sources. Documentary studies are based on an important number of national and international written sources. The in situ visit allows for meeting directly the concerned circles (governmental and non-governmental) with a view to gathering detailed information. The process of confidential dialogue with the national authorities allows the latter to provide, if they consider it necessary, comments on the draft report, with a view to correcting any possible factual errors which the report might contain. At the end of the dialogue, the national authorities may request, if they so wish, that their viewpoints be appended to the final report of ECRI.

The fourth round country-by-country reports focus on implementation and evaluation. They examine the extent to which ECRI's main recommendations from previous reports have been followed and include an evaluation of policies adopted and measures taken. These reports also contain an analysis of new developments in the country in question.

Priority implementation is requested for a number of specific recommendations chosen from those made in the new report of the fourth round. No later than two years following the publication of this report, ECRI will implement a process of interim follow-up concerning these specific recommendations.

The following report was drawn up by ECRI under its own and full responsibility. It covers the situation up to 3 July 2009 and any development subsequent to this date is not covered in the following analysis nor taken into account in the conclusions and proposals made by ECRI.

SUMMARY

Since the publication of ECRI's third report on Austria on 15 February 2005, progress has been achieved in a number of areas covered by the report.

There have been major changes on the legislative front with the adoption by the *Länder* in 2005 and 2006 of the Equal Treatment Acts, which complement the federal acts that came into force in 2004, thus completing the process of transposing Directives 2000/43/EC¹ and 2000/78/EC² into Austrian law. At federal level, the new legislation prohibits discrimination on the basis of "ethnicity" in the areas of employment, social protection, social benefits, education, access to goods and services and the provision of goods and services available to the public, including housing, and, in the field of employment, discrimination on the grounds of beliefs or religion. It states that differences in treatment based on citizenship are legitimate only in matters relating to the admission, residence and status of stateless persons and non-EU citizens. Discrimination, both direct and indirect, harassment, instruction to discriminate and retaliation are prohibited. Positive action, on the other hand, is permitted.

As well as judicial remedies, victims can turn to non-judicial, specialised bodies: the new federal legislation widens the mandate of the Commission for Equal Treatment and the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment and establishes a separate body to deal with discrimination in employment in the federal public sector. At provincial level, each of the nine *Länder* has, in the areas within their competence, either widened the mandate of existing bodies or set up new ones.

The new federal legislation also makes it an administrative offence to publish discriminatory job advertisements.

In the field of education, the authorities have taken steps to address the disadvantaged educational position of non-Austrian children and have continued their efforts to implement the principle of intercultural education. In the field of employment, legislative amendments which came into force in January 2006 extend the right to stand for election to the Chamber of Labour (hitherto reserved for Austrian citizens) and works councils (hitherto reserved for EEA citizens) to all employees, irrespective of their nationality. In the field of housing, long-term resident third country nationals, in all the *Länder*, are now eligible for social housing on the same terms as Austrian citizens.

Generally speaking, the situation of the Roma in Austria has improved in recent years, including in terms of their exposure to racism and discrimination.

As regards migrants, people who came to Austria for the purpose of family reunification can now obtain a permit entitling them to work after one year of residence. There have also been moves to facilitate integration, such as the setting-up in Vienna of a special department within the municipal council. At the same time, the conclusion of an agreement between the federal government and the *Länder* and the adoption of new legislation have paved the way for an improvement in the care provision for asylum seekers without resources, and unaccompanied minor asylum seekers in principle receive specialised care and are the subject of appropriate monitoring.

Lastly, efforts to raise awareness and provide training for those working in the criminal justice system in the statutory provisions and issues relating to racism and xenophobia have been vigorously pursued, and in Vienna there have been encouraging moves to recruit police officers of immigrant background.

¹ Implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin.

² Establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation.

ECRI welcomes these positive developments in Austria. Despite the progress made, however, some points continue to give cause for concern.

With regard firstly to legal standards, the report notes that Austria is not a party to Protocol No. 12 to the European Convention on Human Rights, which lays down a general prohibition of discrimination. In addition, naturalisation remains, in principle, subject to renunciation of previous citizenship and, except for those which come under the Prohibition Statute³, the criminal law provisions against racism and intolerance are rarely applied; the same is true of Austria's criminal administrative law. The provision which requires employers, when making staff cuts, to dismiss foreign workers first (Section 8(2) of Act No. 218/1975) has not been repealed. Furthermore, the new federal legislation on equal treatment makes an inappropriate distinction between employment and other fields and contains a number of gaps. The specialised bodies responsible for combating discrimination lack the kind of structural independence required to command full public confidence and, particularly in the case of the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment, do not have the resources they need to carry out their tasks. Overall, the fragmented nature of the new anti-discrimination legislation and the number of institutions and procedures involved renders the Austrian system complex in a way that is liable to alienate the public and undermine its effectiveness.

In the field of education, non-Austrian children continue to suffer a disadvantage compared with Austrian children; in particular, they are over-represented in schools for pupils with special needs. There are still major disparities between citizens and non-citizens in the employment sector, and it has also been found that foreign nationals and visible minorities are discriminated against in access to housing and services intended for the public. There are no legal provision prohibiting discriminatory housing advertisement.

Black people and Muslims are especially vulnerable to racism and discrimination and the Roma, who continue to suffer a socio-economic disadvantage compared with the rest of the population, still face serious difficulties. Antisemitic prejudice remains very much alive in Austria and there are reports of Jewish, and also Muslim, memorials, cemeteries and places of worship being desecrated. Migrants still have to contend with a restrictive family reunification policy based on a system of annual quotas, and the "integration contract" which they are required to fulfil in order to obtain a long-term residence permit has a coercive element that would be better replaced by incentives and measures to promote integration. Asylum seekers, meanwhile, are faced with a negative climate generated, to a large extent, by certain politicians and media, and have access to only limited legal support.

More generally, the issue of racism and xenophobia in political discourse and in certain sections of the media is all the more worrying as the authorities do not appear to have taken any meaningful steps to find solutions.

The response of the criminal justice system to allegations of racist or discriminatory behaviour on the part of the police continues to fall short, in that there is still no fully independent investigation body and, although the authorities are giving the matter serious attention, training for law enforcement officials in non-discrimination and policing in a multicultural society could stand to be improved.

³ See paragraph 18 below

In this report, ECRI asks the Austrian authorities to take further steps in a number of areas; it makes a series of recommendations, including the following.

ECRI strongly recommends that the Austrian authorities ratify *inter alia* Protocol No. 12 to the European Convention on Human Rights. It also recommends that they adopt a more flexible approach to dual nationality and repeal Section 8(2) of Act No. 218/1975.

ECRI recommends that the authorities take steps to ensure that the criminal administrative law provisions for combating discrimination are duly applied, and that they make it a criminal administrative offence to publish discriminatory advertisements for housing.

ECRI recommends that the authorities embark on a reform of the equal treatment legislation, with a view to enhancing protection against racial discrimination and simplifying and harmonising the standards, legal mechanisms and institutions involved.

ECRI recommends that the authorities take urgent steps to provide more financial and human resources to the Ombudsperson for Equal Treatment in the field of employment, irrespective of ethnicity, religion and beliefs, age and sexual orientation, and to the Ombudsperson for Equal Treatment, irrespective of ethnicity and gender, in other areas, so as to enable them to fully perform all the tasks that have been assigned to them. It further recommends that the requisite measures be taken forthwith to ensure that their full independence is enshrined in law and in practice, and to enable them to apply to the courts whenever they deem necessary.*

ECRI recommends that the authorities evaluate as soon as possible the effectiveness of the measures taken to rectify the disadvantaged educational position of non-Austrian children and consider, if necessary, a more radical reform of the school education system. It reiterates its recommendations that the authorities take meaningful steps to reduce the disparity between citizens and non-citizens in the field of employment, and carry out research into discriminatory practices and barriers or exclusionary mechanisms in public and private sector housing affecting the housing possibilities of minority groups, in order to inform targeted policy responses.

ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities abolish the quota system for family reunification and encourages them to adopt a national action plan for integration, based on a two-way approach to integration, with the focus on seeking mutual recognition between the majority population and the minority groups concerned.

ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities ensure that asylum seekers have access to appropriate legal support throughout the asylum procedure, not least with regard to any detention measures that might be imposed on them.

ECRI strongly recommends that the authorities systematically condemn, in the strongest possible terms, all forms of racism and xenophobia in political discourse, and reiterates its call for the adoption of *ad hoc* measures to combat the use by political parties or their representatives of racially inflammatory or xenophobic discourse.

ECRI recommends that the authorities promote the reestablishment of a regulatory mechanism for the press, compatible with the principle of media independence, that would make it possible to enforce compliance with ethical standards and rules of conduct including the refusal to promote, in any form, racism, xenophobia, antisemitism or intolerance. It suggests that the authorities consider enacting legislation, if there is no other option.*

* The recommendations in this paragraph will be subject to a process of interim follow-up by ECRI no later than two years after the publication of this report.

ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the authorities ameliorate the response of the criminal justice system and of the persons responsible for internal control within the different police units to allegations of racist or discriminatory behaviour on the part of the police. It reiterates in particular its call for the establishment of a fully independent body with powers to investigate individual complaints of human rights violations on the part of the police, including acts of racism and racial discrimination.*

ECRI reiterates its strong recommendation that the authorities introduce a comprehensive and coherent data collection system that would make it possible to assess the situation with regard to the different minority groups in Austria and to determine the scale of any manifestations of racism and direct and indirect racial discrimination. It further recommends that they develop and implement, in close consultation with civil society, a long-term national strategy for combating racism and intolerance, including a comprehensive, long-term information and awareness campaign against racism and intolerance.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Existence and implementation of legal provisions

International legal instruments

1. In its third report on Austria, ECRI recommended that the Austrian authorities ratify Protocol No. 12 to the European Convention on Human Rights (in force since 1 April 2005) without delay.
2. Austria has not ratified this instrument. As in the third monitoring cycle, the Austrian authorities have stated that their position in this matter stems from a concern to avoid adding to the workload of the European Court of Human Rights. They have further indicated that, by the same token, they do not in any case intend to ratify Protocol No. 12 as long as Protocol No. 14 to the European Convention on Human Rights (ratified by Austria on 23 January 2006), which amends the control system of the Convention with a view to maintaining and improving its long-term effectiveness, has not entered into force.
3. ECRI firmly reiterates that Protocol No. 12 is one of the most important international instruments for combating racial discrimination, and that its ratification by Austria would make it possible to combat this phenomenon more effectively at national level.
4. *ECRI strongly recommends that Austria ratify Protocol No. 12 to the European Convention on Human Rights.*
5. In its third report, as in its second, ECRI called on Austria to ratify the Revised European Social Charter and the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education, and to sign and ratify the Convention on the Participation of Foreigners in Public Life at Local Level, recommending that the Austrian authorities apply the provisions contained in Chapters A, B and C of this last instrument. ECRI further recommended that the Austrian authorities ratify the Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems, and that they sign and ratify the United Nations Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.
6. The Austrian authorities have stated that the process of ratifying the Revised Social Charter is ongoing, that the relevant Ministries, the *Länder* and the social partners are currently examining which measures have to be adopted for its implementation, and that further steps will be taken in the light of this examination. They added that Austria intends to sign and ratify the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education. They have also stated that they are going to consider ratifying the Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime in connection with the transposition of the EU Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law. They have made it clear, however, that they do not intend to sign the Convention on Participation of Foreigners in Public Life at Local Level, and that it has been decided not to sign the United Nations Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families; in ECRI's opinion, this is regrettable as both of these conventions have the potential to play an important role in combating racism and discrimination.

7. *ECRI strongly encourages Austria to pursue and conclude, as soon as possible, the process of ratifying the Revised Social Charter, to sign and ratify the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education and to ratify the Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems.*
8. *ECRI strongly recommends that Austria sign and ratify the Convention on the Participation of Foreigners in Public Life at Local Level and the United Nations Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.*

Constitutional provisions and other basic provisions

9. Made up of various laws and special provisions, the Austrian Constitution includes a number of equality clauses of varying scope: Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which merely prohibits discrimination in the enjoyment of the rights and freedoms recognised by this same Convention and its Additional Protocols (which have constitutional status); Article 2 of the Basic Law of the State (*Staatsgrundgesetz*) and Section 7 of the Constitutional Federal Act of 1 October 1920, as amended in 1929 (*Bundesverfassungsgesetz*), which establish the general principle that “all citizens” are equal before the law but do not specifically mention the racial criterion; Articles 66 and 67 of the Treaty of Saint Germain of 1919 which, in common with the other two texts, guarantees equality to “Austrian citizens”; Section 1 of the Act of 3 July 1973 implementing the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, paragraph 1 of which prohibits racial discrimination in any form, stating that “legislation and implementing measures must refrain from making distinctions on the sole basis [*dem alleinigen Grund*] of race, skin colour, descent or national or ethnic origin”, and paragraph 2 of which states that this provision “shall not prevent Austrian citizens from being granted special rights or being subjected to special obligations insofar as this is not contrary to Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights”.
10. Although the Austrian authorities had informed ECRI that the Constitutional Court had interpreted this last provision as prohibiting discrimination in a general way and as also covering differential treatment between Austrian citizens and non-citizens, ECRI was not entirely convinced that federal constitutional law unambiguously enshrined the principle of equal treatment. Accordingly, in its third report, it underlined the importance of enhancing protection against discrimination on the basis of nationality and of avoiding the use of restrictive expressions such as “difference of treatment solely or exclusively based on” [*dem alleinigen Grund*] when defining discrimination; noting that an “Austrian Convention” (*Österreich-Konvent*) had been set up to consolidate all the constitutional provisions in a single document, it invited the Austrian authorities to take this opportunity to review the existing constitutional provisions against racism and racial discrimination in the light of its General Policy Recommendation No. 7.
11. The Austrian authorities have informed ECRI that the “Austrian Convention” submitted its report and proposals to Parliament in 2005, but that the plans to consolidate the country’s constitutional texts have so far been unsuccessful owing to lack of agreement between the ruling parties. ECRI remains convinced of the need – notwithstanding the clarification provided by the case-law of the Constitutional Court – to include in the Constitution a clause enshrining in unambiguous terms the principle of equal treatment, the state’s commitment to

promoting equality, and the right of individuals to be free from discrimination on grounds such as race, colour, language, religion, nationality and national or ethnic origin.

12. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the Austrian authorities revise their constitutional provisions against racism and racial discrimination in the light of its General Policy Recommendation No. 7 on national legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination and, in particular, that protection against discrimination on the basis of nationality be enhanced.*

Citizenship legislation

13. In its third report, ECRI noted that a large number of persons were living in Austria without Austrian citizenship even though they satisfied the requirements for naturalisation. Considering the requirement to renounce previous citizenship in order to obtain Austrian citizenship to be a particularly important factor in this context, ECRI recommended that the Austrian authorities initiate a public debate with a view to adopting a more flexible approach to dual nationality, especially for persons born in Austria.
14. The Austrian authorities have given no indication that such a debate is under way. Nor have they suggested that they, for one, are willing to consider adopting a more flexible approach in this matter. If anything, indeed, the general trend in recent years has been towards a tightening of the statutory requirements for obtaining Austrian citizenship through naturalisation (resulting in a sharp decline in the number of naturalisations: 35,000 in 2005, 26,256 in 2006 and 14,041 in 2007⁴).
15. The Austrian authorities have pointed out that the requirement to renounce previous citizenship in order to obtain Austrian citizenship is designed to restrict the possibilities for multiple nationality, in keeping with Austria's commitments under the Convention of 6 May 1963 on the Reduction of Cases of Multiple Nationality and Military Obligations in Cases of Multiple Nationality. This Convention states *inter alia* that nationals of the Contracting Parties who are of full age and who acquire the nationality of another Party shall lose their former nationality and cannot be authorised to retain their former nationality (Chapter I, Article 1). ECRI observes, however, that in the second Protocol to this Convention, opened for signature in Strasbourg on 2 February 1993 (and which has not been signed by Austria), this principle is balanced, among other things, against the need for migrants who have settled permanently in Council of Europe member states to complete their integration by acquiring the nationality of the host state. It notes, *inter alia*, that where a national of a Contracting Party acquires the nationality of another Contracting Party on whose territory either he was born and is resident, or has been ordinarily resident for a period of time beginning before the age of 18, each of these Parties may provide that he retains the nationality of origin. ECRI further notes that the Parties to the Convention of 6 May 1963 – of which Austria is one – concluded, in 2007, an agreement on the interpretation of Article 12, paragraph 2, under which any Contracting Party may at any time, in so far as it is concerned, denounce Chapter I of the Convention on the Reduction of Cases of Multiple Nationality. ECRI sees this not only as evidence of the current trend in European states towards a more flexible approach to the issue of dual nationality, but also as confirmation that it remains open to Austria to adopt such an approach, in keeping, moreover, with the European Convention on Nationality (ratified by Austria on 6 November 1997) which, in particular, leaves it to internal law to determine whether the acquisition of its nationality is subject to renunciation of the nationality of origin.

⁴ Federal Chancellery, News from Austria, No. 04/08.

16. ECRI reiterates its view that the requirement to renounce the nationality of origin in order to obtain Austrian nationality carries with it the risk that many non-citizens who are otherwise eligible to apply for naturalisation will be deterred from doing so and consequently deprived of the opportunity to thus support their integration process in Austria.
17. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities review their approach to dual nationality, in particular by allowing persons who arrived in Austria before the age of 18 or who were born there to acquire Austrian citizenship without having to renounce their nationality of origin.*

Criminal law provisions against racism

18. Section 283 of the Criminal Code punishes incitement – in a manner likely to jeopardise public order – to hostile action against a church or religious community established in the country or a group defined by their affiliation to such a church or religious community, or to a race, nation, ethnic group or state (paragraph 1); it also punishes publicly agitating against such a group or insulting or disparaging it, in a manner that violates human dignity (paragraph 2). At the same time, under Section 115 of the same code, it is an offence to insult, in public or in the presence of several others, mock, injure or threaten to injure a third person; Section 117(3) states that such offences shall be prosecuted *ex officio* by the Public Prosecutor (*Ermächtigungdelikt*), subject to the victim's consent, if they are committed by reason of the injured party's membership of one of the groups mentioned in Section 283(1) and if there has been a violation of human dignity. In addition, Section 33(5) of the Criminal Code establishes racist and xenophobic motivation as an aggravating circumstance for all crimes. The Prohibition Statute (*Verbotsgesetz*) and the Insignia Act (*Abzeichengesetz*) contain other relevant provisions, such as making it an offence to set up, support or promote Nazi organisations aimed at undermining the sovereignty of the state or jeopardising public order, to participate in such organisations, to deny or trivialise Nazi crimes using means accessible to several persons, to disseminate printed or other material of a racist nature, to wear in public Nazi insignia or to distribute them, etc.
19. In its third report, noting that 2003 had seen a marked increase in the number of offences and charges brought under the Prohibition Statute, most of the offences having reportedly been committed by juveniles and young adults belonging to the skinhead movement, ECRI encouraged the Austrian authorities to pursue their efforts to counter far-right groups or groups inspired by National Socialist ideology and their activities. It appears from the available data and the information supplied to ECRI by civil society and the Austrian authorities that the authorities are continuing to address this issue with due diligence by rigorously implementing the Prohibition Statute, and that there has been no significant increase in the activities of these organisations in Austria in recent years.
20. ECRI further noted in its third report that Section 283 of the Criminal Code was rarely applied by the courts. It conceded that this might be partly due to the fact that, where it was linked with National Socialist ideas, behaviour that constituted an offence under Section 283 was in fact prosecuted under the Prohibition Statute. Another reason, in its view, was that in order for Section 283(1) to be applied, the act of incitement must be likely to jeopardise public order and target a specific group, and that the elements constituting the offences contained in Section 283 were not clearly defined, which resulted in them being construed very narrowly in case-law. ECRI accordingly recommended that the Austrian authorities keep the effectiveness of the existing criminal law provisions against racism and xenophobia under close review and, in particular, that the legislation aimed at countering forms of racism and xenophobia other than those linked to

the above-mentioned organisations be complemented or fine-tuned, with attention being drawn to ECRI's General Policy Recommendation No. 7. ECRI regrets to note that the criminal law provisions in question – which do not appear to have been applied any more extensively in recent years – have remained unchanged, despite, moreover, similar requests not only from civil society but also from the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination⁵. It is hopeful, however, that they will be suitably revised in the light of the EU Council Framework Decision referred to above.

21. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities pursue their efforts to combat far-right groups or groups inspired by National Socialist ideology and their activities.*
22. *ECRI recommends that the authorities take into account its General Policy Recommendation No. 7 on national legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination when incorporating into Austrian law the obligations arising from the EU Council Framework Decision on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law (2008/913/JAI).*
23. In its third report, ECRI recommended that the Austrian authorities collect comprehensive statistical data on the implementation of all criminal law provisions against racism and intolerance and, in particular, Section 33(5) of the Criminal Code. ECRI further encouraged them to step up their efforts to train all those working in the criminal justice system in the existing provisions against racism and xenophobia and to continue raising these persons' awareness of the need to actively counter all such manifestations.
24. ECRI notes that the official statistics still cover only offences under the Prohibition Statute or Section 283 of the Criminal Code; racist insults as such (Sections 115 and 117(3) of the Criminal Code combined) and cases involving the application of Section 33(5) of the Criminal Code are not listed separately. Also, unless there is a link with the activities of extremist groups, the statistics do not provide any information on who committed these offences, and give only a partial picture of who the victims are (the offences covered are divided into five categories: racist, antisemitic, xenophobic and, since 2007, anti-Muslim and "others"). The result is that, at the time of writing, the authorities still had no official statistical system that would make it possible to carry out a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the Austrian criminal justice system in combating racism. It would appear that things are changing, however. The Austrian authorities have informed ECRI that a working group has been set up in the Ministry of Justice to develop a more victim-oriented system of collecting criminal justice data, that would include data on the racist or xenophobic motivation of any offences. The working group is due to present its initial findings at the end of 2009 and the new arrangements could come into effect in 2010. Apparently, too, a directive issued by the Minister for the Interior in 2006 calls on police officers to consider the possible racist, xenophobic or antisemitic nature of all offences reported to them and to immediately inform the Federal Agency for State Protection and Counter-Terrorism (*Landesamt für Verfassungsschutz und Terrorismusbekämpfung*). Also, since January 2009, prosecutors have reportedly been instructed to inform the Ministry of Justice of any cases being handled by them which might come under Section 33(5) of the Criminal Code.
25. As regards awareness-raising and training for those working in the criminal justice system, the Austrian authorities have pointed out that as part of their initial training, police officers are now required to complete a compulsory 56-hour module on fundamental rights, one of the aims of which is to sensitise them to diversity and discrimination issues. The trainees are further required to attend a

⁵ CERD/AUT/CO/17, § 15

3-day seminar on eliminating prejudice, including notably ethnic prejudice. Serving officers can also attend the seminar as part of their on-going training. By the end of 2008, some 4,500 law enforcement officials had participated in training of this kind, i.e. more than a fifth of the total number. There are also other optional training opportunities for serving officers, under the programme entitled "policing in a multiethnic society" (*Polizeiliches Handeln in einer multiethnischen Gesellschaft*), for example. The Austrian authorities have further indicated, *inter alia*, that as part of their basic training, judges and prosecutors are required to attend not only seminars on combating racism and discrimination but also, since 2008, a 3-day course on fundamental rights. In addition, serving judges and prosecutors have access to optional on-going training in the form of seminars on a wide range of topics, including combating discrimination. In 2007, "Judges' week" (*RichterInnenwoche*), a major annual gathering of the legal professions, focused on issues relating to fundamental rights, including non-discrimination, and in 2008 there were numerous seminars to commemorate the events of 1938. Judges and prosecutors also have the opportunity to attend training courses on racism and discrimination run by bodies such as the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN) and the Academy of European Law (ERA).

26. ECRI is pleased to note the thoroughness with which this matter is being addressed in Austria. Referring however to its General Policy Recommendations No. 1 on combating racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance and No. 11 on combating racism and racial discrimination in policing, it wishes to emphasise how important it is that racist and xenophobic offences should actually be prosecuted. With regard specifically to Section 33(5) of the Criminal Code, it has been informed that this provision is very rarely applied, a fact not disputed by the Austrian authorities. Indeed, no court decision implementing this provision has been noted. According to some NGOs, this is due to the fact that racist and xenophobic motives are not given serious consideration at any stage in the procedure: either by the police when recording complaints – despite the above-mentioned 2006 directive – or later on, by the public prosecutor's office and the trial courts. This tends to support the view that the efforts to raise awareness and train those working in the criminal justice system in action against racism, xenophobia and discrimination and in the application of the relevant statutory provisions need to be stepped up.
27. *ECRI encourages the Austrian authorities to press ahead with the reform of the system of collecting statistical data on the implementation of the criminal law provisions against racism and intolerance; it recommends that they extend it to include all incidents perceived as being racist by the victim or any other person – including in particular incidents which might constitute an offence under Section 33(5) of the Criminal Code – and provide for the collection of information not only on charges brought, convictions and acquittals but also on the complaints filed, whether or not they lead to prosecution.*
28. *ECRI encourages the authorities to pursue and further develop the activities to raise awareness among those working in the criminal justice system of the need to counter racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance to provide them with training in this area. It recommends that such programmes be made a compulsory part of on-going training, and that special emphasis be placed on awareness-raising and training in the implementation of the relevant criminal law provisions.*

Administrative law, civil law and anti-discrimination bodies

29. In its third report, ECRI recommended *inter alia* that the Austrian authorities adopt civil and administrative anti-discrimination legislation in all key fields of public life and set up a specialised body to combat racism and racial discrimination. Since then, there has been a marked improvement in the situation, with the transposition into Austrian law of Directives 2000/43/EC⁶ and 2000/78/EC⁷. As regards the areas covered by ECRI, the new federal legislation consists of the following acts, which came into force on 1 July 2004: the (new) Equal Treatment Act (*Gleichbehandlungsgesetz*), on discrimination on the basis of “ethnicity” (*ethnische Zugehörigkeit*) and, in the field of employment only (excluding the public sector), on the basis of religion or beliefs, age or sexual orientation; the “federal” Equal Treatment Act (*Bundes-Gleichbehandlungsgesetz*), on discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, religion or beliefs, age or sexual orientation in the context of employment of federal civil servants; the Commission for Equal Treatment and the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment Act (*Bundesgesetz über die Gleichbehandlungskommission und die Gleichbehandlungsanwaltschaft*). By March 2006, moreover, the nine *Länder* had adopted the necessary equal treatment legislation to complement the transposition of the directives, in the areas within their competence⁸. Some of the laws enacted are more ambitious than those adopted at federal level (basically in that they extend the scope of the protection against discrimination on non-ethnic grounds to areas not related to employment).

- **Criminal administrative law**

30. At the time when the third report on Austria was adopted, the country’s administrative law included two provisions for combating discrimination. The first was Section IX (1) 3 of the Introductory Act to the Code of Administrative Procedure of 1991 (*Einführungsgesetz zu den Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetzen 1991; EGVG*), under which discriminating against a person solely on the basis of their race, skin colour, national or ethnic origin, beliefs, religion or disability, or preventing them from accessing places or services intended for the public, without good cause, constitutes an administrative offence punishable by a fine of up to EUR 1,090 (merely making discriminatory comments is apparently not enough to constitute an offence: the victim must have suffered a tangible disadvantage; *Unabhängiger Verwaltungssenat* of Vienna; 15 January 1996, UVS-03/P/48/001129/96). The second provision was Section 87 of the Trade Licence Act (*Gewerbeordnung*), under which a trading licence may be withdrawn if its holder is guilty of discrimination on one of the grounds mentioned above. These provisions – which ECRI considered insufficient on their own – have been supplemented by the introduction of a new administrative offence, namely publishing discriminatory advertisements for employment (Sections 23 and 24 of the Equal Treatment Act; the penalty is a caution in the case of a first offence, and a fine of up to EUR 360 thereafter).

31. The authorities do not appear to have taken any particular steps to provide increased training for those working in the administrative justice system in the implementation of these provisions, which, by and large, are still not being applied. The Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment has informed

⁶ Implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin.

⁷ Establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation.

⁸ According to the explanations provided, the legislation relates mainly to the employment of local and provincial civil servants and forestry and agricultural workers.

ECRI that of 112 complaints filed between January 2005 and September 2006, 103 were dismissed by the administrative authorities, and that only 7 cases have been examined at second instance under Section IX (1) 3 EGVG since it came into force. In January 2005, for example, an anti-racism NGO which had identified about a hundred housing or job advertisements specifying for instance “no foreigners” or “for Austrians only” had applied to the administrative authorities under Section 24 of the Equal Treatment Act and Section IX (1) 3 EGVG. It was told that it had no standing to bring an action under the former and that it had no right to be informed of any action taken on complaints relating to the latter as it was not a party to the proceedings. The NGO then turned to the People’s Ombudsperson (*Volksanwalt*) who examined all the procedures conducted in Vienna under Section IX (1) 3 EGVG over the above-mentioned period and found that the provision in question had been applied inconsistently, that only a small number of complaints had actually resulted in (small) fines and that the authorities were still inclined to treat breaches of the anti-discrimination regulations as trivial. According to the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment, another reason why the criminal administrative law provisions are never or hardly ever implemented is that, although victims of administrative offences can file a complaint (*Bestrafungsantrag*) with the local administrative authorities (*Bezirksverwaltungsbehörde*), they do not have standing as a party to the proceedings, cannot lodge an appeal and are not even informed of the outcome of the proceedings.

32. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities take steps to ensure that the criminal administrative law provisions designed to combat discrimination are duly applied, including if necessary amendments to facilitate their implementation and increased awareness-raising and training for those working in the administrative justice system. In addition, referring to its General Policy Recommendation No. 7 on national legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination, it invites the authorities to consider reforming the procedure, so that victims of violations of these provisions can take part in court proceedings.*

- **Civil law and anti-discrimination bodies**

33. The new federal legislation prohibits discrimination on the basis of “ethnicity” (*ethnische Zugehörigkeit*) in the fields of employment, social protection (including social security and health care), social benefits, education, access to goods and services and the provision of goods and services available to the public, including housing. While that possibly also covers discrimination on linguistic grounds, discrimination on the basis of beliefs or religion is not expressly prohibited, other than in the field of employment. Nationality and national origin used not to feature in the list of prohibited grounds; indeed, the law expressly stated that the principle of equal treatment did not cover differences in treatment based on citizenship. A welcome amendment to the Equal Treatment Act, however, which came into force on 1 August 2008, makes it clear that differences in treatment based on citizenship are legitimate only in matters relating to the admission, residence and status of stateless persons and non-EU citizens. Discrimination, both direct and indirect, harassment, instruction to discriminate and retaliation are prohibited. Positive action, on the other hand, is permitted. Victims can apply to specialised, non-judicial bodies (see below). They also have access to the civil courts – where representation by counsel is usually mandatory – and the labour courts. They can claim compensation for non-pecuniary loss and, in principle, either seek compensation for pecuniary loss or ask the courts to order measures to eliminate discrimination.
34. With regard to the anti-discrimination bodies, the new federal legislation referred to above widens the mandate of the Commission for Equal Treatment and the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment – which used to deal only with

gender equality – and establishes a separate body to tackle discrimination in employment in the federal public sector (the federal commission for equal treatment, *Bundes-Gleichbehandlungskommission*). Structurally speaking, these institutions come under the Federal Ministry for Women's Issues. At provincial level, each of the nine *Länder* has, in the areas within their competence, either widened the mandate of existing bodies or set up new ones; the bodies thus created vary greatly in terms of their structure and sphere of action.

35. The Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment, whose independence is enshrined in law, comprises three institutions: the ombudsperson for equal treatment between women and men in the field of employment (in the private sector); the ombudsperson for equal treatment in the field of employment (in the private sector), irrespective of ethnicity, religion and beliefs, age and sexual orientation; the ombudsperson for equal treatment, irrespective of ethnicity and gender, in other areas. Anyone who believes they have been discriminated against on one of the grounds prescribed by law can apply to the competent ombudsperson who, as well as providing information and free, confidential legal advice, can negotiate with the person responsible for the alleged discrimination (such as an employer) in order to reach a friendly settlement and, failing that, refer the matter to the Commission for Equal Treatment, where he or she takes part in the Commission's deliberations as an expert with the right to ask questions and to file motions. The tasks of the ombudspersons also include carrying out research and surveys and publishing reports and recommendations on discrimination issues. Every two years, they submit a progress report to the Austrian Parliament containing their observations.
36. The Commission for Equal Treatment is an administrative body, divided into three chambers (*Senaten*) along the same lines as the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment. Each chamber is chaired by a federal official appointed by the Minister for Women's Issues; the other members, who are all volunteers, are appointed by ministries and social partners (whom they represent). Each chamber delivers expert opinions on matters within its competence, either *proprio motu* or at the request of one of the interest groups represented in it or of the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment. The Ombudspersons, employers, members of works committees and the victims themselves can ask the commission to examine individual cases; representation by counsel is not mandatory. If the competent chamber finds that the principle of equal treatment has been infringed, it will ask the person or body responsible to put an end to the discrimination and will advise on the measures to be taken to this end; it cannot impose penalties. If the person or body does not comply, the interest groups represented in the chamber or the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment can bring a civil action to obtain a declaratory judgment; while the court is not bound by the commission's opinion, it must at least have regard to it and if it disagrees with the opinion, explain why. The "federal" commission for equal treatment has similar functions in relation to the employment of federal civil servants.
37. In ECRI's view, the new federal legislation is certainly an improvement. It is, however, deeply disappointed to note the distinction that is made in terms of discriminatory grounds between employment and other areas; referring to its General Policy Recommendation No. 7, it wishes to emphasise that, in its view, the law should provide that the prohibition of discrimination on a ground such as race, skin colour, language, religion, nationality or national or ethnic origin applies equally in all areas. More generally, it appears to ECRI that lawmakers have confined themselves to the minimum required by the transposition of Directives 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. ECRI further notes that numerous other criticisms have been levelled by civil society. For example, it is felt that Austrian lawmakers

have not taken sufficient steps to alter the burden of proof: once the plaintiff has produced evidence of discrimination, the respondent merely has to show that it is more likely that there was another reason for the difference in the treatment complained of. It is also felt that the penalty for discriminatory job advertisements is too lenient, and the scope of the prohibition of harassment too narrow. NGOs, furthermore, cannot apply to the courts in their own right and, while they can represent victims before the Equal Treatment Commission, they can only do so before the courts in cases where representation by counsel is not mandatory; only one NGO (*Klagsverband zur Durchsetzung der Rechte von Diskriminierungsopfern*) has the right to intervene as third party, and no third party intervention is permitted in proceedings relating to the employment of federal civil servants. Other points where NGOs have expressed criticisms are:

- a. the fact that, in the case of discriminatory non-recruitment or non-promotion, compensation for non-pecuniary loss is limited to EUR 500 if the employer can show that the damage caused by discrimination consists solely in the failure to consider an application. The European Committee of Social Rights, moreover, has ruled that imposing this upper limit is not in conformity with Article 1 § 2 of the European Social Charter⁹;
 - b. the fact that the law covers neither discrimination which is not directed against specific individuals, nor discrimination by association, nor racial profiling;
 - c. the fact that there is no criminal administrative law provision on discriminatory advertisements for housing; etc.
38. The development of the specialised bodies is also a positive step. ECRI notes, however, that being attached to the Chancellery, the federal bodies lack the kind of structural independence needed for full public confidence in an area such as combating racism (a similar problem arises with the provincial bodies). This is true not only of the Commission but also of the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment as, in Austrian law, in order for a body to be fully independent, a constitutional provision is required. The fact, too, that they come under the Ministry for Women's Issues probably means there is less awareness of their competencies in areas other than gender equality, and a recent study published by the European Union's Fundamental Rights Agency shows that few people know of their existence¹⁰. It would also appear that the bodies are not being provided with adequate resources. This is patently the case with the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment: in 2008, it had only three full-time lawyers and one half-time lawyer to deal with all matters other than gender equality in the field of employment. All the lawyers were based in Vienna and the total budget for training and awareness-raising was only EUR 40,000. Under these circumstances, it is difficult for the Office to provide effective support to potential victims of racial discrimination outside the capital, and to perform some important tasks, such as conducting research and surveys on this subject and large-scale awareness-raising activities. ECRI further considers that the length of the procedure before the Equal Treatment Commission (according to the information received, it often lasts several months, even up to a year) is liable to deter individuals from making use of it, thus undermining the effectiveness of the system put in place by lawmakers.

⁹ Conclusions XIX-1 (24 October 2008)

¹⁰ EU-MIDIS at a glance, Introduction to the FRA's EU-wide discrimination survey; in Austria, 84% of respondents with a Turkish background and 82% of those from the former Yugoslavia said they did not know of any organisation offering support or advice to people who had been discriminated against.

39. Overall, ECRI was struck by the fragmented nature of the anti-discrimination legislation (more than 20 laws at federal and *Land* level) and by the number of agencies and procedures involved. All this gives the existing system a degree of complexity which cannot be explained by the country's federal structure alone and which is liable not only to alienate the public but also to undermine its effectiveness. This is a weakness that has been highlighted not only by civil society but also by a number of international bodies¹¹.
40. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities embark on a reform of the equal treatment legislation, with a view to improving protection against racial discrimination and simplifying and harmonising the standards, legal mechanisms and institutions involved. It refers them to its General Policy Recommendations No. 2 on specialised bodies to combat racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance at national level, and No. 7 on national legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination, and urges them to involve in this process not only the institutions concerned but also civil society, in particular the specialised NGOs.*
41. *ECRI recommends that the authorities take urgent steps to provide more financial and human resources to the Ombudsperson for Equal Treatment in the field of employment, irrespective of ethnicity, religion and beliefs, age and sexual orientation, and to the Ombudsperson for Equal Treatment, irrespective of ethnicity and gender, in other areas, so as to enable them to fully perform all the tasks that have been assigned to them. It further recommends that the requisite measures be taken forthwith to ensure that their full independence is enshrined in law and in practice, and to enable them to apply to the courts whenever they deem necessary.*

II. Discrimination in various fields

Education

42. There appears to be no data collection or monitoring of racist incidents in schools, nor any recent, country-wide study on this subject.
43. *Referring to its General Policy Recommendation No. 10 on combating racism and racial discrimination in and through school education, ECRI invites the Austrian authorities to set up a system to monitor racist incidents at school and compile data on these phenomena. It further suggests that they carry out a national survey on racism and direct discrimination in schools.*
44. In its third report, ECRI recommended that the authorities step up their efforts in terms of implementing the principle of intercultural education, stressing the need for thorough training of all teachers in this area, the need to ensure that the number of teachers who provided education in German as a second language or in a non-German mother tongue was adequate and the need for sustainable funding of initiatives aimed at putting the principle of intercultural education into practice.
45. Making pupils aware of cultural differences and presenting diversity as a positive force have been recognised cross-curricular teaching objectives since the 1990s and, in its third report, ECRI noted that various activities had been conducted in this field, based around the provision of training for head teachers and teachers and the provision of information to parents. Some NGOs complain, however, that there is no real strategy in this area and it seems that, in the case of initial teacher training, only nursery school teachers receive training in intercultural education as a matter of course. The authorities have, however, pointed out that, in 2006-2007, under a programme entitled "inter-culturality, an opportunity", and

¹¹ CERD/C/AUT/CO/17, §§ 12 and 24; CommDH(2007)26, §§ 53-54; ACFC/OP/II(2007)005, § 42

then again in 2007-2008, as part of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue, the Ministry of Education supported various school projects relating to interculturality and education in German as a second language or in a mother tongue other than German. This same ministry has adopted an action plan to promote language training for the period 2008-2010, which aims *inter alia* to improve teacher training in these areas, and the federal government which came to power after the 2008 elections has pledged to continue this policy. ECRI further notes that, overall, mother tongue education is available in eighteen languages other than German, and that the number of children following these programmes, the number of hours taught and the number of teachers involved have remained stable, as has the proportion of the children concerned receiving such education (approximately 20%). With specific regard to access for persons belonging to national minorities to mother tongue or bilingual education, ECRI refers to the latest reports and opinions on Austria produced by the Committee of Experts on the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages¹² and the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of Minorities¹³, from which it is clear that difficulties remain, especially outside the areas traditionally inhabited by these minorities.

46. *ECRI encourages the Austrian authorities to continue their efforts to implement the principle of intercultural education.*
47. In its third report, ECRI recommended that the authorities address the disadvantaged educational position of non-citizen children and take the necessary measures to rectify this, urging them in particular to address the disproportionate representation of those children in special needs schools (*Sonderschulen*) designed for children with disabilities.
48. Various studies show that the situation has remained unchanged. The drop-out rate for children of immigrant background is four times higher than for Austrian children, and a significantly higher proportion of children whose mother tongue is not German end up on the track that leads to shorter studies and early entry into working life (*Hauptschule*) without receiving a full secondary education. In 2006-2007, furthermore, 2.33% of these children were in *Sonderschulen* (the national average was 1.56%), and they accounted for 26.5% of all special needs pupils, even though they made up only 15.5% of the general school population.
49. The authorities have, however, taken steps to rectify this situation, with the focus on providing more German language teaching at the pre-school stage. Since 2006, children of pre-school age who do not have a sufficient command of German can attend special language support programmes in nursery schools, to enable them to catch up before they enter primary school (similar provision is available in primary and, to some extent, secondary education). There have also been local initiatives along these lines. The authorities have further stated that the federal minister for education has issued a circular¹⁴ on the factors to be taken into account when assessing whether a child requires special needs education, which states that under no circumstances is mere lack of proficiency in the language of instruction to serve as a criterion here; the authorities point out that the federal government formed after the 2008 general elections has pledged to continue this policy. 2008 also saw the setting-up within the Federal Ministry of Education of a department for migration, intercultural education and language policy, whose task is to co-ordinate efforts to implement strategies for the integration of migrants in the education system.

¹² ECRML(2005)1 and ECRML(2009)1

¹³ ACFC/OP/II(2007)005

¹⁴ Circular No 19/2008, 5 August 2008

50. ECRI welcomes these measures. Although it is obviously too early to assess their effectiveness, they show that the authorities are determined to raise the bar and ensure that these children enjoy the same opportunities as others. ECRI observes, however, that the measures fail to address a cause of inequality that has been highlighted not only by NGOs but also by recent research such as that conducted under the OECD's PISA programme¹⁵. It is the early streaming of children (from the age of 10) on either a vocational (*Hauptschule*) or an academic track (*Allgemeinbildende Höhere Schule*): a high proportion of children from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds are channelled into vocational education from a very early age, effectively shutting them out of higher education.
51. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities evaluate as soon as possible the effectiveness of the measures taken to rectify the disadvantaged educational position of non-Austrian children and consider, if necessary, a more radical reform of the school education system; it reiterates its view that the problem of the over-representation of non-citizen children in special needs schools needs to be addressed as a matter of priority. It calls on the authorities to draw inspiration from its General Policy Recommendation No. 10 on combating racism and racial discrimination in and through school education.*

Employment

52. Various documents¹⁶ point to the continuing existence of major disparities between citizens and non-citizens in the field of employment: the unemployment rate for non-EEA citizens is noticeably higher than for Austrians. They face an increased risk of losing their jobs, have lower incomes and standards of living, and tend to be concentrated in industries characterised by a high degree of job insecurity, low wages, limited career opportunities, irregular working hours and tough working conditions. They also have great difficulty in getting their qualifications recognised.
53. At the same time, while the number of discriminatory job advertisements has reportedly declined since the entry into force of Section 24 of the aforementioned Equal Treatment Act, racism and direct discrimination continue to be a feature of the employment sector in Austria. This is clear from reports received *inter alia* from the Fundamental Rights Agency, the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment and NGOs. The Office of the Ombudspersons has indicated that a high proportion of the complaints of ethnic or religious discrimination which it receives concern employment (206 out of 375 in 2006; 226 out of 397 in 2007) and draws particular attention to the case of Muslims – especially women wearing headscarves – who are excluded from jobs because employers fear negative reactions from customers. ECRI notes, however, that the authorities have provided support for various projects run by NGOs and the social partners, which are aimed at combating racism and discrimination in employment and promoting diversity within firms.
54. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the Austrian authorities take significant steps to reduce the disparity between citizens and non-citizens in the employment sector. It also reiterates its recommendation that issues relevant to the position of non-citizens and persons of immigrant origin and other relevant minority groups on the labour market be given greater consideration in the national action plans for employment.*

¹⁵ Programme for International Student Assessment

¹⁶ See in particular the summary provided in the Raxen National Focal Point for Austria, Data Collection Report 2007, October 2007, and Update, January 2008

55. In its previous reports, ECRI called for the repeal of Section 8(2) of the Aliens Employment Act No. 218/1975, which requires employers, when making staff cuts, to dismiss foreign workers first. This provision, which was found by the European Committee of Social Rights to be incompatible with Article 1 § 2 of the European Social Charter¹⁷, was amended in July 2005: it now applies only to foreign workers when they first enter the labour market. According to the European Committee of Social Rights, however, although the scope of the disputed provision has been reduced, Section 8(2), which also provides that in the event of reduced activity in the company, the employment contracts of foreign nationals may be terminated if such action might prevent shorter working hours for all workers, still constitutes discrimination based on nationality and is therefore incompatible with Article 1 § 2 of the Charter¹⁸. ECRI further notes that the authorities, which have merely informed it that Section 8(2) is not applied in practice, have provided no evidence that this difference in treatment is objectively and reasonably justified.
56. *ECRI strongly recommends that the authorities repeal Section 8(2) of the Aliens Employment Act No. 218/1975.*
57. Legislative amendments which came into force in January 2006 extend the right to stand for election to the Chamber of Labour (hitherto reserved for Austrian citizens) and works councils (hitherto reserved for EEA citizens) to all employees, irrespective of their nationality, in keeping with the recommendations made by ECRI in its previous reports. ECRI welcomes this move. It appears, however, that few foreign workers actually sit on these bodies.
58. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities cooperate with the labour market partners in order to identify any practical barriers to the election of foreign workers to the Chamber of Labour and works councils, and ways of removing such barriers.*

Housing and goods and services intended for the public

59. In its third report, ECRI recommended that research be carried out into discriminatory practices and barriers or exclusionary mechanisms in public and private sector housing affecting the housing possibilities of minority groups, in order to formulate targeted policy responses. It further recommended that access by non-EU citizens to social housing be improved.
60. ECRI is pleased to note that since 2006, following the transposition of Directive 2003/109/EC¹⁹, long-term resident third country nationals, in all the *Länder*, are now eligible for social housing on the same terms as Austrian citizens.
61. The authorities give no indication of having carried out the recommended research. Various documents, however, point to the existence of direct discrimination against foreign nationals and visible minorities when it comes to obtaining access to housing. The Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment states, in particular, that discriminatory advertisements for housing are fairly common, and suggests introducing a specific administrative criminal offence, similar to that which exists in the field of employment. It also appears from these documents that, compared with Austrian citizens, non-EU citizens often have less secure tenancy agreements and that a greater proportion of them live in cramped, poorly furnished, inadequately heated flats; they are more likely

¹⁷ Conclusions XIV-1, XVII-1 and XVIII-1

¹⁸ Conclusions XIX-1 (24 October 2008)

¹⁹ Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents

to experience problems of overcrowding, and pay more for the same quality of housing. According to NGOs, moreover, racist neighbourhood conflicts are commonplace.

62. Direct discrimination, particularly against black people, is also a problem when it comes to accessing goods and services intended for the public, such as shops, restaurants and nightclubs. A high proportion of the complaints received by the Office of the Ombudspersons for Equal Treatment concern this sector. This highlights the need, mentioned earlier in this report²⁰, to ensure the effective implementation of Section IX (1) 3 of the Introductory Act to the 1991 Code of Administrative Procedure and Section 87 of the Trade Licence Act.
63. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities adopt statutory provisions prohibiting discriminatory advertisements for housing and establishing a specific criminal administrative offence, similar to that referred to in Sections 23 and 24 of the Equal Treatment Act on job advertisements, and ensure that they are implemented.*
64. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the Austrian authorities carry out research into discriminatory practices and barriers or exclusionary mechanisms in public and private sector housing affecting the housing possibilities of minority groups, in order to inform targeted policy responses.*

Administration of justice

65. In its third report, ECRI noted that non-citizens were seriously over-represented in the prison population, that, in particular, 60% of pre-trial detainees were reported to be non-citizens, and that the differential between pre-trial detention and final convictions was remarkably higher for non-citizens than for Austrian nationals. It recommended that the authorities undertake research on the incidence of direct and indirect racial discrimination in the criminal justice system, particularly as regards pre-trial detention and imprisonment. The authorities, who do not appear to have acted on this recommendation, have stated that in November 2008, 3,348 of the 8,063 persons detained in the Austrian penal system were foreign nationals (i.e. 41.52%) awaiting trial for a criminal offence.
66. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the Austrian authorities undertake research on the incidence of direct and indirect racial discrimination in the criminal justice system, particularly as regards pre-trial detention and imprisonment, so as to be able to adopt targeted measures where necessary.*

Sport

67. Inside football stadiums, overt forms of behaviour such as verbal abuse of black players and the display of antisemitic banners are not uncommon. The authorities say they are aware of the problem and are keeping a watchful eye on the most extreme groups of supporters in particular. The 2008 European Football Championship, which was held in Austria and Switzerland in June 2008, is said to have been exemplary in this respect, presumably thanks to the joint efforts of the authorities, the organisers and NGOs, with their strong focus on prevention and awareness-raising.
68. Football, however, is reportedly the only sport where public racist incidents are recorded, and there do not seem to be any official studies or arrangements for collecting data on racism and direct and indirect discrimination in sport in general. According to non-governmental sources, however, the area of sport in Austria is not easily accessible to foreign nationals and minorities. Very few of them are

²⁰ See above "Criminal administrative law"

involved in the administration of sport, for example. Certain regulations, moreover, are liable to lead to exclusion or segregation. In ECRI's view, this is manifestly the case with the championship rules (*Meisterschaftsregeln*) of the Austrian football federation (*österreichischer Fussball-Bund*), which, in amateur football, limit the number of non-Austrian nationals to a maximum of three per team and, in parallel, state that clubs may be registered as "foreigners only", in which case only 3 Austrian players per team are allowed.

69. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities carry out a study on racism and direct and indirect discrimination in sport, with a view to identifying measures to rectify the situation. In this respect, it draws their attention to its General Policy Recommendation No. 12 on combating racism and racial discrimination in the field of sport.*
70. *ECRI recommends that the authorities contact the Austrian football association as soon as possible to have it review the rule which imposes conditions based on nationality for the composition of amateur football teams.*

III. Racism in public discourse

Exploitation of racism and xenophobia in politics

71. In its third report, as in its second, noting with concern the widespread use of racist and xenophobic discourse in politics in Austria, ECRI recommended that an annual debate be instigated in Parliament on the subject of racism and intolerance. It further reiterated its call for not only increased efforts to implement the criminal law provisions, but also the adoption of *ad hoc* measures targeting more specifically the use of racially inflammatory or xenophobic discourse by exponents of political parties, including, in particular, legal provisions allowing for the suppression of public financing for those political parties whose members are responsible for racist or discriminatory acts.
72. The annual debates which ECRI called for have not taken place and no specific measures appear to have been adopted. Yet the situation remains very worrying. The far-right parties, which won almost 30% of the vote in the 2008 general elections, are openly exploiting prejudices against minorities, immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, Jews and Muslims. The problem is particularly acute during campaigning for European, national and local elections: there have been numerous reports of manifestos, slogans and remarks by candidates or leaders of these parties stigmatising in particular migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and Muslims. During the campaign for the European elections in June 2009, the problem was further exacerbated by the use by these parties of racist and xenophobic arguments in the context of the discussion on the enlargement of the European Union.
73. ECRI further notes that civil society has criticised the ruling parties and politicians for failing to sufficiently condemn this sort of behaviour, and in some cases even succumbing to the use of xenophobic stereotypes themselves, for electoral reasons. ECRI notes for its part that the institutional response to this serious problem has been ambiguous. On the one hand, for example, anti-Muslim statements made by the candidate of one of the above-mentioned far-right parties in the Graz city council elections were duly and very strongly condemned by senior figures, including the President and the federal Chancellor, and Parliament lifted the immunity of the individual concerned in November 2008 so that she could be prosecuted under Section 283 of the Criminal Code; on the other hand, a member of the same party, who also belongs to a controversial far-right organisation, was elected Deputy Speaker of the *Nationalrat*, the lower house of Parliament.

74. Referring to its declaration of 17 March 2005²¹, ECRI reiterates, in the strongest possible terms, that it categorically condemns the use of racist, antisemitic and xenophobic elements in political discourse. Political parties must resist the temptation to approach issues relating to minority groups in general, and to asylum seekers, refugees and immigrants in particular, in a negative fashion; on the contrary, they must take a firm stance against all forms of racism, discrimination and xenophobia and formulate a clear political message in favour of diversity and pluralism.
75. *ECRI strongly recommends that the Austrian authorities systematically condemn, in the strongest possible terms, all forms of racism, xenophobia and antisemitism in political discourse.*
76. *ECRI reiterates its call for the adoption of ad hoc measures to combat the use by political parties or their representatives of racially inflammatory or xenophobic discourse and, in particular, of legal provisions allowing for the suppression of public financing for parties which promote racism or xenophobia. In this respect, it draws the authorities' attention to the relevant provisions of its General Policy Recommendation No. 7 on national legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination.*

Media

77. In its third report, ECRI encouraged the authorities to impress on the media, without encroaching on their editorial independence, the need to ensure that reporting did not contribute to creating an atmosphere of hostility and rejection towards members of minority groups and the need to play a proactive role in countering such an atmosphere. It considered that the adoption and implementation of codes of self-regulation could be useful here. It emphasised the importance of giving media professionals special training on the role of reporting in a diverse society, and the need for persons of immigrant origin to be better represented in the media profession.
78. This recommendation was intended as a response to the publication in the press of discriminatory advertisements for jobs and housing, and to the fact that certain sections of the press were contributing to the "ethnicisation" of crimes and sensationalist reporting on immigration and asylum issues. The authorities do not appear to have taken any meaningful steps to find a solution to this worrying problem and, except for a reduction in the number of discriminatory job advertisements (probably due to the fact that they have been banned under the new federal legislation on equal treatment, which also punishes employers and agencies which place such advertisements²²), the situation has not improved. In this respect, ECRI is especially concerned about the irresponsible editorial policy operated by some newspapers, which is contributing to the spread of racist and xenophobic stereotypes.
79. ECRI notes that discrimination based on race, ethnic origin, religion, nationality or gender is expressly prohibited by the code of conduct for the Austrian press (*Ehrenkodex für die österreichischer Presse*) which was introduced by the press's self-regulatory body (the Austrian Press Council, *österreichischer Presserrat*), and has been signed by numerous newspapers and magazines. The Austrian Press Council, however, has not been functioning since 2002, owing to the departure of the Austrian Newspaper Association (*Verband österreichischer Zeitungen*) to which most of the Austrian press belong. Since then, Austria has

²¹ ECRI Declaration on the use of racist, antisemitic and xenophobic elements in political discourse

²² See above "Criminal administrative law"

had no effective press regulatory body, which no doubt partly explains the unfortunate developments referred to above.

80. ECRI therefore considers that, in the circumstances described above, a press regulatory mechanism needs to be established in Austria, that would make it possible to enforce compliance with ethical standards and rules of conduct including the refusal to promote, in any form, racism, xenophobia, antisemitism or intolerance. In ECRI's view, the current situation might warrant legislative action, with due regard, of course, for the principle of media independence. ECRI further notes that, in the case of broadcasting, Austrian lawmakers have stepped in not only to incorporate in the programming principles of both private and public broadcasting companies a ban on incitement to hatred on grounds of race, religion and nationality, but also to establish mechanisms of this kind. The general feeling, indeed, is that the criticisms levelled here at sections of Austria's written press do not apply to the broadcast media, even though problems do occasionally arise.
81. With regard in particular to the representation of persons of immigrant origin in the media professions, this is clearly poor. For example, there are almost no journalists of immigrant origin or belonging to ethnic minorities in the daily press or in regular programmes on public TV. There have been some moves to correct this problem, mainly by independent media, and the setting-up in 2005 of the Okto cable TV station (*Wiener Community-TV Okto*; although financed by the city of Vienna, it has independent status), which is creating broadcasting opportunities for minorities other than national ones, is a step in the right direction. ECRI has also been informed that the public broadcaster ORF2 has a weekly programme entitled *Heimat, Fremde Heimat* (Homeland, foreign homeland) which seeks to inform minorities, including ethnic minorities, about issues that specifically affect them and to inform the majority population, and which is presented by journalists who are themselves from minority backgrounds. The fact remains, however, that ethnic minorities have very little visibility in the mainstream media.
82. In its third report, ECRI also recommended that the authorities ensure adequate availability of electronic media in the languages of national minorities, and ensure that the public service adequately catered for the needs of all minority groups that made up Austrian society, including groups other than national minorities. The law requires the Austrian broadcasting corporation (*Österreichischer Rundfunk und Fernsehen*; ORF) to broadcast a reasonable proportion of programmes in the languages of national minorities, and allows it to co-operate with private broadcasters for this purpose. ECRI refers here to the latest opinions and reports on Austria produced by the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of Minorities²³ and the Committee of Experts on the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages²⁴, from which it appears that problems still exist in this area, even though there has been some progress. There are no similar provisions for other minorities and, in the Austrian public broadcasting landscape, *Heimat, Fremde Heimat* is the exception rather than the rule.
83. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities promote the reestablishment of a regulatory mechanism for the press, compatible with the principle of media independence, that would make it possible to enforce compliance with ethical standards and rules of conduct including the refusal to promote, in any form, racism, xenophobia, antisemitism or intolerance. It suggests that the authorities consider enacting legislation if there is no other option.*

²³ ACFC/OP/II(2007)005

²⁴ ECRML(2005)1 and ECRML(2009)1

84. *More generally, ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the authorities impress on the media, without encroaching on their independence, the need to ensure that reporting does not contribute to creating an atmosphere of hostility and rejection towards members of minority groups and the need to play a proactive role in countering such an atmosphere. It also reiterates its suggestion that the authorities should encourage them to this end to not only adopt and implement codes of self-regulation, but also provide special training for media professionals on the role of reporting in a diverse society, and to improve the representation in media professions of persons of immigrant origin or belonging to ethnic minorities.*
85. *ECRI encourages the authorities to pursue their efforts to improve the availability of electronic media in the languages of national minorities, and recommends that they ensure that public service broadcasting caters for the needs of all minority groups, including groups other than national minorities.*

Internet

86. The criminal legislation on racist or neo-Nazi behaviour²⁵ applies to offences committed via the Internet, and Internet access providers can themselves be prosecuted for the content of the sites hosted on their servers. The Internet is monitored in this respect by the Federal Agency for State Protection and Counter-Terrorism (*Verfassungsschutz und Terrorismusbekämpfung*) of the Ministry of the Interior, which has set up a facility to enable users to report any neo-Nazi, racist or antisemitic material published on the Internet; they can also report it to the ISPA (*Internet Service Providers Austria*) which works with the Ministry of the Interior and service providers. The Internet is also monitored by the Federal Criminal Police Office (*Bundeskriminalamt*), which cooperates with the Federal Agency for State Protection and Counter-Terrorism. The scheme seems to have paid off, as the authorities have told ECRI that there have been relatively few cases of the Internet being used to disseminate racist, xenophobic or antisemitic comments and material. Some NGOs, however, point to signs that the problem may have intensified in recent years.
87. *ECRI encourages the Austrian authorities to pursue their efforts to prevent the Internet from being used to disseminate racist, xenophobic or antisemitic comments and material, and recommends that they maintain a high level of vigilance in this respect. It draws their attention to its General Policy Recommendation No. 6 on combating the dissemination of racist, xenophobic and antisemitic material via the Internet.*

IV. Racist violence

88. There are reports of acts of violence against property such as the desecration of Muslim or Jewish cemeteries, places of worship and memorials, which are often ascribed to far-right sympathisers; the NGOs have confirmed that several such alarming incidents are reported each year. There is nothing to indicate, however, that racist violence against persons is a major problem in Austria. Fears have nevertheless been expressed about a possible worsening of the situation, as certain events recorded by the authorities could be seen as early signs of an increase in violent incidents involving skinheads, in particular between these groups and young people belonging to ethnic minorities²⁶.
89. *ECRI strongly encourages the Austrian authorities to ensure that all acts of racist violence, whether directed against property or people, are thoroughly*

²⁵ See above "Criminal law provisions against racism"

²⁶ Raxen National focal point for Austria, Data collection Report 2007

investigated with a view to prosecution, and to keep a close watch on far-right groups and skinheads, while at the same time bearing in mind that racist violence can be committed by other persons as well.

V. Vulnerable/target groups

Black persons

90. A study by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia published in May 2006²⁷, together with the findings and reports produced by NGOs, show that the situation described in ECRI's third report still obtains today: in Austria, black people are especially vulnerable to racism and discrimination, notably in the fields of employment, housing and access to public places and in their dealings with the police. They suffer from being associated, in the minds of some, with drug trafficking, prostitution and abuse of the asylum system. ECRI remains convinced that this situation is closely connected with the hostile rhetoric used by certain political parties and certain sections of the press and also with the behaviour of some officials, in particular among the police.
91. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the Austrian authorities take steps to effectively combat and prevent racism and discrimination against black people. In this respect, it considers that the situation calls inter alia for the introduction of a campaign specifically aimed at improving the public image of this section of the population. It invites the authorities to involve civil society, in particular NGOs representing the interests of black people, in both the design and implementation of these measures.*

Muslims

92. The situation with regard to racism and discrimination against Muslims remains problematic. In particular, a number of women and girls who wear headscarves continue to encounter problems in their everyday lives, on the labour market, in schools and other educational establishments and in public areas. During election campaigns in particular, the far-right parties engage in overtly anti-Muslim rhetoric - which is neither universally nor systematically condemned by the other parties and their representatives - focusing on the alleged Islamisation of Austria. There are recurring cases of Muslim cemeteries and graves being desecrated, and practising Muslims who wish to build mosques face considerable, in some cases insurmountable, difficulties. In 2007, for example, a plan to build a Muslim centre on the outskirts of Vienna sparked a mass protest by local residents and, more recently, in Carinthia and Vorarlberg, the town planning laws were amended in what appears to be an indirect attempt to make it more difficult to build mosques.
93. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the Austrian authorities take steps to effectively combat and prevent racism and discrimination against Muslims. In this respect, it draws their attention to its General Policy Recommendation No. 5 on combating intolerance and discrimination against Muslims, and invites them to involve civil society, in particular the NGOs representing the interests of Muslims, in both the design and implementation of these measures.*

Jews

94. ECRI refers here to the section of the report entitled "Antisemitism" (below).

²⁷ EUMC, Migrants' experiences of Racism and Xenophobia in 12 member States, Pilot Study

Roma

95. Generally speaking, the situation of the Roma in Austria has improved in recent years, including in terms of their exposure to racism and discrimination. The fact that the extermination of the Roma by the Nazis is now recognised and commemorated is also a positive sign. It is clear from NGO reports²⁸, however, that the Roma continue to suffer a socio-economic disadvantage compared with the rest of the population, and still face serious difficulties in the areas of education, employment and housing: they are under-represented at all levels of education, have a high educational drop-out rate and, except in Burgenland, are often being placed in special needs classes (*Sonderschule*); their access to the labour market is limited; they have difficulty obtaining housing and, in rural areas, often live apart from the rest of the population. This is at least partly due to the lingering prejudice against them, prejudice which continues to be peddled by certain sections of the press and public figures and which also affects the police's attitude towards them. ECRI's attention has also been drawn to the plight of non-autochthonous Roma who are liable to suffer double discrimination.
96. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities pursue their efforts to combat racism and discrimination against the Roma, especially in the field of education, and, to this end, involve civil society, in particular the NGOs representing Roma interests, in the design and implementation of new measures. It draws their attention to its General Policy Recommendation No. 3 on combating racism and intolerance against Roma/Gypsies.*

Other national minorities

97. In its third report, ECRI expressed particular concern at the "climate of hostility reportedly promoted against the Slovenian minority in Carinthia" and in which the then Governor was reported to have played an active role, especially in connection with his open refusal to implement rulings of the Constitutional Court granting certain rights to the members of this group. ECRI notes in particular that, despite the efforts of the federal authorities and NGOs like the so-called Carinthian Consensus Group (*Kärntner Konsensgruppe*), the Constitutional Court decision of 13 December 2001 requiring topographical signs to be bilingual in areas where Slovene speakers form more than 10% of the population, has still not been executed. It is concerned about this situation, as it poses a serious threat to the rule of law. For all other matters, ECRI refers to the latest opinion on Austria produced by the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of Minorities²⁹ and to the reports of the Committee of Experts on the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages³⁰ on the implementation of this instrument in Austria.
98. *ECRI urges the authorities, at every level, to take all necessary measures to ensure the execution of the Constitutional Court decision of 13 December 2001.*

Non-citizens: migrants and asylum-seekers

99. The law governing the reception and status of non-citizens has changed since the third report, following the adoption in 2005 of legislation on the aliens police, asylum and settlement and residence. Known as the *Fremdenrechtspaket* ("package" of laws on aliens), these new provisions have been criticised by civil society, which sees them as engendering discrimination.

²⁸ See also: ACFC/OP/II(2007)005

²⁹ ACFC/OP/II(2007)005

³⁰ ECRML(2005)1 and ECRML(2009)1

- **Migrants**

100. ECRI notes that the Austrian system of immigration control continues to be based on an annual immigration quota (which the *Länder* share among themselves), divided between labour immigration and – the biggest share – immigration for the purpose of family reunification. Spouses and under-age children of nationals of countries not members of the European Economic Area who are lawfully resident in Austria may obtain a settlement permit on this last ground. Where an application is rejected because the quota has been exceeded, the person is placed on a waiting list. The waiting period, which varies from one *Land* to another, can be as much as three years, after which applicants are exempt from the quota constraint. ECRI fails to see why immigration control requires families to be separated for such prolonged periods. It further observes that the new legislation makes family reunification more difficult, by significantly increasing the minimum income that applicants are required to have (which is reportedly why the number of people admitted for family reunification purposes fell in 2006³¹). It further notes that, compared with those of the 27 other countries covered by the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX)³², Austria's family reunification policy is classified as one of the least favourable. ECRI is concerned about this, since what is at stake is the fundamental right to respect for family life.
101. In its previous reports, ECRI also expressed concern at the precariousness of the status of many immigrants. On this point, it should be noted that a new type of residence permit was introduced in 2005, in connection with the transposition of the aforementioned directive 2003/109/EC. The "long-term EU residence permit" (*Aufenthaltsstitel Daueraufenthalt-EG*) is designed to replace the certificate of residence (*Niederlassungsnachweise*) mentioned in the third report; it can be obtained by foreign nationals who, *inter alia*, have been lawfully resident in Austria for at least five years and have fulfilled the terms of the new "integration agreement" (see below), and it gives full access to the labour market. The situation of people arriving in Austria for family reunification purposes has also reportedly improved: although in principle, such persons are granted a restricted residence authorisation (*Niederlassungsbewilligung-beschränkt*), making access to the labour market conditional on the grant of a specific work permit, they can now obtain, after a year, an unrestricted residence authorisation (*Niederlassungsbewilligung-unbeschränkt*), which gives them access to the labour market.
102. With specific regard to the issue of integration, ECRI recommended that the authorities provide non-citizens without sufficient knowledge of the German language with German language training that met their needs. Noting in this context that the "integration contract" (*Integrationsvereinbarung*) introduced in Austria in 2002 as a condition for permanent or long-term residence in the case of third country nationals was based around the requirement to attend German and civic education classes or else face sanctions, up to and including deportation, ECRI pointed out that coercion was not an appropriate way to achieve integration.
103. The new Settlement and Residence Act which came into force in January 2006 retains this system (certain categories of people are exempt, however, either by law – on the grounds of their age or health, for example – or if they can show that they already have a sufficient command of German). The new Act explains that

³¹ International Migration Outlook: SOPEMI – 2008 Edition – OECD

³² MIPEX measures policies to integrate migrants in 25 EU Member States and 3 non-EU countries. MIPEX is led by the British Council and Migration Policy Group, and produced by a consortium of 25 organizations, including Universities, research institutes, think-tanks, foundations, NGOs and equality bodies (<http://www.integrationindex.eu>).

the purpose of the “integration contract” is the acquisition of a basic knowledge of German, sufficient for writing, reading and participating in social, economic and cultural life in Austria. It divides the contract into two modules. The first focuses on learning to read and write in German, and the relevant classes (75 hours) are normally reimbursed by the state. The second module (300 hours of classes compared with 100 under the former arrangement) is aimed at helping the student to acquire a higher level of German (A2) than before; the state refunds half of the course fee (i.e. up to EUR 750) if the “integration contract” is completed within two years after receiving the settlement permit; the rest is payable by the individuals concerned, although help is available from other agencies (the city of Vienna, for example, contributes up to EUR 300). The authorities have explained that the courses can be taken at 92 accredited institutes, in 300 different locations. Failure to complete the “integration contract” can still lead to non-renewal of the settlement permit and, ultimately, deportation. The authorities emphasise, however, that there has been only one case of expulsion so far (in February 2008), that 95% of the candidates pass first time and that those who fail can re-enrol. They also say that the response to the scheme has been positive, not least because a better knowledge of German makes it easier to find employment. ECRI still has some doubts, however, about the coercive aspect of the scheme. As it has already pointed out, the threat of sanctions is not the best way to persuade non-citizens to attend integration classes; the focus, rather, should be on incentives and measures to promote integration.

104. ECRI accordingly welcomes the setting-up in Vienna of department MA17, *Integrations- und Diversitätsangelegenheiten*, which has a non-coercive approach and works with civil society to promote integration and diversity. Itself staffed by people of different origins, it provides newly arrived immigrants with the help they need to find their way around in their new environment, and supports measures and projects aimed not only at integrating foreigners, through German language teaching, for example, but also at promoting public acceptance of diversity and fostering inter-culturality. ECRI strongly encourages this approach, based on the idea that integration is a two-way process, involving mutual recognition between the majority population and minority groups: effective action against racism and intolerance requires collective acceptance of diversity.
105. ECRI observes that in Austria, integration is, to a large extent, a local matter. There is, for example, no federal integration policy as such, nor a particular federal ministry with responsibility for this matter. The authorities have stated, however, that the Federal Ministry of Interior is preparing a national action plan for integration (NAP), and that a first step has been the creation of the “Integration Platform” that brings together all stakeholders from the local, provincial and federal level to work out the NAP, which, according to the authorities shall be adopted in the autumn of 2009.
106. In its third report, noting that in Vienna, the right to vote and to stand for election in local elections had been granted to non-EU citizens with 5 years of residence, ECRI recommended that similar measures be introduced throughout Austria. In June 2004, however, the Constitutional Court found this measure to be incompatible with the federal Constitution, with the result that a constitutional amendment is now required for foreigners to take part in local elections. The authorities have stated that in the absence of a consensus between the 9 *Länder* on this issue, no such amendment is envisaged. In ECRI’s view, this is regrettable, as allowing foreigners to participate in local elections is likely to make for a more integrated society. It notes, however, that some municipalities have set up advisory bodies whose members are designated by local migrant associations (*Migrantenvereine*), which include non-EU citizens, enabling them to

have a say in local affairs; the advisory committee on integration – *AusländerIntegrationsbeirat* – in Linz is one example.

107. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities strictly ensure that, in terms of both their application and their design, the conditions for family reunification are compatible with non-citizens' right to respect for family life. In particular, it recommends that the quota system for family reunification be abolished.*
108. *ECRI recommends that the authorities ensure that the training provided in connection with the "integration contract" is of good quality, tailored as far as possible to individual competencies and needs and inexpensive. It further recommends that they closely monitor the application of the sanctions provided for and ensure that their impact is not disproportionate to the aim being pursued, and suggests that they look into the possibility of replacing the coercive aspect of the "integration contract" with incentives and measures to promote integration.*
109. *ECRI encourages the authorities to adopt a national action plan for integration, based on a two-way approach to integration, with the focus on promoting mutual recognition between the majority population and the minority groups concerned.*
110. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the authorities grant non-EU citizens the right to vote and to stand as candidates in local elections, and invites them to initiate a debate with a view to amending the federal Constitution to this end. It recommends that, as an interim measure, they encourage the setting-up at local level of advisory bodies whose members would be elected by non-EU citizens.*

- **Asylum seekers**

111. In its third report ECRI expressed great concern at the negative climate concerning asylum seekers in Austria, noting in particular that public statements by politicians disregarded the fundamental nature of the right to asylum and tended to depict asylum seekers, explicitly or by inference, as economic migrants and a threat to security, economic stability and, in some cases, preservation of national identity. It also noted that certain categories of asylum seekers were particularly stigmatised and underlined that some media had contributed to the establishment of this climate and that public debate on this issue was taking an increasingly intolerant line, with at times racist and xenophobic overtones.
112. ECRI notes that no significant progress has been made in recent years. The events which took place in Carinthia in 2008 are an illustration of this. In January the then Governor sent a populist, xenophobic letter to the inhabitants of one of the major towns in the *Land*, where violent acts, ascribed to Chechen asylum seekers, had been perpetrated, inviting them to denounce "violent" asylum seekers (*gewalttätige Asylwerber*) so that he could initiate their deportation and ensure Carinthia would remain safe. Later in the year he announced the opening, in a secluded former children's home, of a special camp for asylum seekers (*Sonderanstalt für Asylwerber*) suspected of violence, where four or five people had already been placed "as a security measure to protect the people of Carinthia". He subsequently announced, using loaded terms, that one of the objectives was to concentrate Chechen asylum seekers there with a view to facilitating their subsequent deportation; his spokesman specified that the centre was not solely intended for people who already had a criminal conviction and that the aim was to place those concerned under constant supervision so that no criminal acts could be committed.
113. ECRI recalls in the strongest possible terms that asylum seekers are people potentially fleeing persecution or a risk of persecution by reason of their "race", religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, or the risk of a violation of their right to life or their right not to be subjected to torture

or to inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, or who are fleeing an armed conflict that places them in danger. They must not, whether in words or in deeds, be treated as criminals or as individuals suspected of having committed an offence.

114. ECRI nonetheless wishes to underline that it also perceives some encouraging signs. It regards as very positive projects such as the ones entitled *Miteinander Vielfalt erleben* ("Let's experience Diversity together"), *Neuland, Menschen von Nebenan* ("Next door People") and *TschetschenInnen-Europäer wie wir* ("Chechens, Europeans like us"). The latter, for example, financed by the Ministry of the Interior and the European Refugee Fund and managed by a local NGO, aims to combat the prejudice encountered by Chechen asylum seekers and refugees in Carinthia.
115. *ECRI firmly reiterates its recommendation to the Austrian authorities that they refrain from generalisations and stigmatising remarks concerning asylum seekers, or specific groups of asylum seekers.*
116. *ECRI strongly encourages the authorities to implement at national level, in association with civil society, in particular NGOs representing the interests of asylum seekers and refugees, a campaign aimed at improving the public image of this section of the population.*
117. In its third report, as it already had done in the second, ECRI expressed concern about the fact that asylum seekers were placed in detention pending the examination of their applications, and that this measure had become systematic in certain *Länder*. It also expressed concern - although noting that the situation appeared to be improving - at the practice of separating families by detaining the adult male and accommodating his wife and children in distant facilities for asylum seekers.
118. ECRI notes that the number of asylum seekers in detention considerably increased following the entry into force, in January 2006, of the new Aliens Police Act. Section 76(2) of this Act provides that an asylum seeker may be held in pre-deportation detention (*Schubhaft*) by decision of the police authorities alone in the following cases: 1) where an enforceable deportation order has been issued; 2) where a deportation procedure has been initiated; 3) where, before the filing of an application for international protection, an enforceable deportation order or an enforceable residence ban had been imposed; 4) where it may be assumed, on the basis of the outcome of the interrogation, search and photographing and fingerprinting procedures, that the alien's application for international protection will be rejected owing to Austria's lack of responsibility for examining the application. Although 662 asylum seekers were in pre-deportation detention in 2005 (or 9% of the total), those in this situation in 2006 numbered 2,700 (31%). Many of these cases of detention had their basis in the fourth paragraph of Section 76(2) of the Act, which in principle concerns situations covered by Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003 of 18 February 2003 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the member state responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the member states by a third country national (known as "Dublin II").
119. ECRI however notes with satisfaction that, following a judgment by the Federal Constitutional Court of 14 June 2007 (G 14/07), ruling that each situation must be the subject of a specific examination and that detention must be proportionate to the aim being pursued and be utilised only as a last resort, the number of asylum seekers in pre-deportation detention has significantly decreased (1,330 cases founded on Section 76(2)§4 in 2006, 773 in 2007, 331 in 2008, and some fifty by the end of April 2009). The authorities are now making greater use of the more

lenient measures (*gelinderes Mittel*) provided for in Section 77 of the Act (1,158 cases in 2007, 1,809 in 2008 and 440 by the end of April 2009). It seems that, as a consequence, the number of family separations has considerably decreased. The authorities also informed ECRI of measures aimed at significantly improving the conditions under which foreigners are detained pending their deportation, including plans for the construction of a specially designed building.

120. *ECRI strongly recommends that the authorities ensure that detention of asylum seekers is used only as a last resort and that, if necessary, it takes place in facilities suited to their specific status. It encourages them to pursue their efforts to avoid separating the members of asylum seekers' families.*
121. In its third report ECRI urged the authorities to ensure that no asylum seeker was left destitute, recommending to this end that they establish a legally enforceable right of access to federal care and make available adequate housing capacities. It also recommended that they monitor practice in the reception centres where asylum seekers were accommodated pending a decision on the admissibility of their application and ensure that appropriate standards were observed there.
122. ECRI notes that care provision for asylum seekers has significantly improved in recent years: whereas, in its second report, it noted that, up to 2004, only between 20 and 30% of asylum seekers benefited from basic federal care, the authorities have indicated that 90% now receive federal or provincial support to cover their essential needs in terms of accommodation, food provision, health care and so on. Moreover, decisions to refuse basic care provision can now be appealed against before independent administrative panels (*Unabhängige Verwaltungssenate*). This is the outcome of the conclusion, in 2004, of an agreement between the federal government and the *Länder* (*Grundversorgungsvereinbarung*) and the passing, in 2005, of a new federal Basic Welfare Support Act (*Bundesgesetz, mit dem die Grundversorgung von Asylwerbern im Zulassungsverfahren und bestimmten anderen Fremden geregelt wird ; Grundversorgungsgesetz – Bund 2005 – GVG-B 2005*) and of legislation at *Land* level.
123. The federal Act makes it obligatory for the federal government to provide basic welfare assistance to indigent asylum seekers during the admissibility procedure and to those whose application has been declared inadmissible (or whose application has been rejected on the merits and whose appeal does not have suspensive effect). At this stage the persons concerned are in principle accommodated in reception centres under the responsibility of the federal authorities; according to non-governmental sources, these facilities would be of an acceptable standard overall if it were not for overcrowding in certain cases, the excessively strict regulations in force there and inadequate social counselling. After their applications have been declared admissible and until a decision is taken on the merits, indigent asylum seekers are cared for by the *Länder* (the federal government bears 60% of the cost). According to non-governmental sources, they are not able to choose the areas to which they are sent and, for economic reasons, are accommodated in often isolated facilities, which are of a variable quality. The authorities also indicated that, in some *Länder*, asylum seekers are regularly required to move to other accommodation, which poses problems for the children's schooling, especially since the asylum procedure can take some time.
124. Recognised refugees are taken care of by the integration fund (*Österreichischer Integrationsfonds*), which provides them with support intended to facilitate their integration, in particular with regard to housing, language learning and access to jobs.

125. As stated in the third report, unaccompanied minor asylum seekers in principle receive specialised care and are the subject of appropriate monitoring. However, according to non-governmental sources, insufficient provision has been made for specific reception facilities and it happens that unaccompanied minors find themselves in standard reception centres.
126. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities ensure that no asylum seekers are left destitute and, in particular, that all have access to acceptable accommodation.*
127. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities ensure that unaccompanied minor asylum seekers benefit from specific care provision, particularly regarding their accommodation, and appropriate monitoring.*
128. In its third report ECRI expressed concerns about legislation that came into force in 2004. The aim was to speed up asylum procedures and the provisions related, *inter alia*, to limitation of stay for asylum seekers in Austria during the appeals procedure, refusal to initiate a procedure for applications submitted at the border by asylum seekers coming from Switzerland and Liechtenstein and the ban, with a few exceptions, on submitting fresh facts in the appeal procedure. The authorities have indicated that these provisions are no longer in force: they were partly invalidated by the Constitutional Court, and - as mentioned above - the asylum law was subsequently amended. ECRI nonetheless notes that another measure intended to speed up the procedure, more recently adopted by Parliament, has met with fierce criticism. This concerns the elimination of the second judicial instance in asylum matters: decisions taken by the Federal Asylum Office (*Bundesasylamt*) can now be appealed on the merits, only before the Asylum Court (*Asylgerichtshof*), which with effect from July 2008 replaced the Independent Federal Asylum Review Board (*Unabhängiger Bundesasylsenat*); asylum seekers whose applications are rejected are therefore deprived of the possibility of appealing on the merits to the Administrative Court (*Verwaltungsgerichtshof*), although in principle this remedy is available in all matters.
129. ECRI is also concerned about the limited nature of the legal assistance available to asylum seekers without resources. Except for those who have been able to enter into contact with an NGO offering legal counselling, they have no access to this kind of support in the initial reception centres during the first interview with the Federal Asylum Office aimed at determining the application's admissibility. However, if following this interview the office deems that the application is a priori inadmissible, the person concerned is referred to a legal adviser (*Rechtsberater*) provided by the Ministry of the Interior, who, after interviewing the asylum seeker, accompanies them to a second interview with the office. According to non-governmental sources, the legal advisers have little time to devote to each case, with the result that their contribution is of variable benefit. Asylum seekers whose requests are dismissed at this stage and who wish to appeal have no access to a public system of free legal support; they are dependent on the NGOs, which do not have offices in the initial reception centres and have only limited resources. Asylum seekers whose applications are declared admissible are taken care of by the *Länder* during the procedure on the merits. The authorities are obliged by law to give them access to specialist advisers (*Flüchtlingsberater*); in practice, to this end the Ministry of the Interior concludes contracts with the NGOs present in the towns where the Federal Asylum Office's field agencies are located and funds a number of hours of counselling per week. The advisers assist asylum seekers with the post-admissibility procedure, including on appeal, except before the Constitutional Court (where representation by counsel is mandatory). Nonetheless, according to non-governmental sources, the resources mobilised in this way are generally inadequate (in the Linz field agency, for example, the

adviser is apparently present only five hours a week) and the material conditions offered to these advisers on the field agencies' premises are often scarcely conducive to effective action (there is not always an office set aside for their use and they also sometimes have no Internet access, access to interpretation, etc.). In addition, since asylum seekers are usually accommodated outside the major conurbations, sometimes in very isolated locations, they are not easily able to attend appointments with the advisers in the federal asylum office's agencies. Legal aid in the strict sense is possible only in connection with proceedings before the Constitutional Court.

130. Lastly, asylum seekers placed in detention centres pursuant to Section 76(2) of the Aliens Police Act have access only to social counselling and voluntary return assistance: they do not have a right to receive legal support so as to challenge their deprivation of liberty. According to non-governmental sources, asylum seekers without financial resources who had no legal representation before they were placed in detention are thus deprived of the possibility of doing so.
131. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities ensure that asylum seekers have access to appropriate legal support throughout the asylum procedure, not least with regard to any detention measures that might be imposed on them.*

VI. Antisemitism

132. ECRI observes that commemoration of the Holocaust is institutionalised in Austria. It notes, for example, that the anniversaries of the *Kristallnacht* pogrom (9 November 1938) and the liberation of the concentration camp of Mauthausen (5 May 1945) are commemorated through events involving senior officials, and that in 2005 a high-level Austrian delegation attended the ceremonies to mark the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. It further notes that Austria co-sponsored the United Nations Resolution condemning any attempt to deny or minimise the Holocaust, adopted in 2007. At the same time, dissemination of revisionist material via the Internet is said to have declined since the introduction of the European arrest warrant. Recent statements by the leader of one of the far-right parties, however, calling for the abolition of the Prohibition Statute (*Verbotsgesetz*), are a source of grave concern for ECRI, which notes that this is the first time a party represented in Parliament has openly voiced such demands. Antisemitic stereotypes are still very much alive in Austria³³ and the available statistics show no signs of a decrease in antisemitic incidents. In particular, cases involving the desecration of memorials, Jewish cemeteries and synagogues are not uncommon. Various factors, moreover, support the finding made in ECRI's third report that antisemitism is no longer the preserve of individuals inspired by National-Socialist or other far-right ideologies; it has also surfaced among Muslim fundamentalists and representatives of the extra-parliamentary far left.
133. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the Austrian authorities continue and intensify their efforts to address all manifestations of antisemitism, including those not directly connected with National Socialist ideology. It draws their attention to its General Policy Recommendation No. 9 on combating antisemitism.*

³³ This is clear from the surveys conducted on a regular basis by the Anti-Defamation League. The survey carried out in 2008/2009 (Attitudes Toward Jews in Seven European Countries February 2009) indicates that 47% of respondents in Austria thought that the statement "Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country" was "probably true" (compared with 47% in 2007); 36% the statement that "Jews have too much power in the business world" (compared with 37% in 2007); 37% the statement that "Jews have too much power in international financial markets" (compared with 43% in 2007), and 55% the statement that "Jews still talk too much about what happened to them in the Holocaust" (compared with 54% in 2007).

VII. Conduct of law enforcement officials

134. In its third report, ECRI noted that Austrian NGOs had been receiving allegations of ill-treatments by police officers, many of them involving non-citizens or Austrian citizens belonging to ethnic minorities. It also noted that persons belonging to minority groups, in particular Blacks, were widely reported to have been disproportionately subject to police checks and to have been verbally abused in a racist way, harassed or even physically abused by law enforcement officials. In the absence of public, official statistics concerning *inter alia* the ethnic origin of the people filing complaints about the police and of a specific record of the complaints made about racist behaviour, it is not possible to accurately gauge the extent of this problem. That the problem continues to exist, however, is clear from the findings and conclusions of NGOs, which are borne out by the work of the Human Rights Advisory Board (*Menchenrechtsbeirat*)³⁴, the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment of the Council of Europe³⁵, the United Nations Committee against Torture³⁶, the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination³⁷ and the United Nations Human Rights Committee³⁸. The media, moreover, regularly report cases of ill-treatment by the police that could be linked to racial prejudice, such as the beating-up in February 2009 in the Vienna metro of a black American teacher, Mike B., by undercover police officers who mistook him for a drug dealer.
135. In its previous reports, ECRI recommended that the authorities ameliorate the response of the criminal justice system and of the persons responsible for internal control within the different police units to allegations of racist or racially discriminatory behaviour on the part of the police, calling in particular for the establishment of an independent body with powers to investigate individual complaints of human rights violations on the part of the police, including acts of racism and racial discrimination. ECRI further recommended that the authorities condemn publicly and unequivocally any manifestation of racist or racially discriminatory behaviour on the part of the police and that they make it clear publicly and at a high level that such manifestations would not be tolerated, and would be promptly and thoroughly investigated and punished.
136. The developments in the Wague case – mentioned in the third report – and a later, similar case, suggest that there is still much room for improvement. In 2003 Mr Wague, a Mauritanian national, had been taken in hand by the Vienna police following an altercation with his employer. After being forcibly restrained, he lost consciousness and was left unattended for a time. He died before he could be taken to hospital. The police officers involved were not suspended and, before the investigation had even begun, their superiors and the Minister for the Interior publicly declared that the police had acted lawfully. Even though the Independent Administrative Panel (*Unabhängiger Verwaltungssenat*) concluded otherwise in January 2004 and ruled that Mr Wague's fundamental rights had

³⁴ The Human Rights Advisory Board (HRAB) was set up in 1999, in response to repeated recommendations by the CPT to visit places of detention under police authority and to monitor the administrative and coercive power exercised by the police and security services with reference to human rights. Although the HRAB is administratively attached to the Federal Ministry of the Interior and makes recommendations to the Minister for the Interior, its operational independence is guaranteed by a constitutional provision. In 2007, it examined around 200 complaints filed in 2004 against police officers for ill-treatment, and found that over half of the complainants were non-Austrians or of non-Austrian origin (11% were of Sub-Saharan origin).

³⁵ CPT/Inf (2005) 13

³⁶ CAT/C/AUT/CO/3

³⁷ CEDR/C/AUT/CO/17

³⁸ CCPR/C/AUT/CO/4

been infringed, no disciplinary action was taken and there was no official apology. The doctor who accompanied the police during the events and only one of the police officers involved were convicted in 2005 of involuntary manslaughter and given suspended prison sentences of 7 months (which were reduced to 4 months on appeal in 2007). The later case concerns Bakary J., a Gambian national who, in 2006, resisted attempts to deport him. The three police officers in whose custody he had been placed took him to a vacant building where they were joined by a fourth officer and proceeded to threaten and assault him, inflicting serious injuries. Charged with physically and mentally abusing a prisoner, the first three officers were given (in August 2006) 8-month suspended sentences and the fourth officer, a 6-month suspended sentence, the court having found various mitigating factors in their favour (previous good conduct, the difficult and stressful nature of their work, and Bakary J.'s refusal to co-operate). The four officers had been suspended from duty during the trial but in December 2006, the Vienna police disciplinary board allowed them to return to duty and handed down fines (equivalent to five months' salary in the case of the first three officers and four months' salary in the case of the fourth), which were reduced by the appeals board in September 2007. On application by the Ministry of the Interior, however, the Administrative Court (*Verwaltungsgerichtshof*) found in October 2008 that the board had underestimated the seriousness of the breaches committed by the officers in question and ordered that its decision be revised. ECRI notes that the attitude of the authorities in this case has certainly been different from that displayed in the Wague case, in that they refrained from expressing support for the officers concerned while the criminal proceedings were pending, suspended them from duty and seem to want proper disciplinary action to be taken. It also observes, however, that the authorities failed to take this opportunity to publicly condemn the potentially racist aspect of the events and that after the trial, the Interior Minister made a public reference to the victim's criminal record possibly in an attempt to mitigate the police officers' actions. More generally, there are various factors to indicate that the investigations conducted by the police into allegations of ill-treatment by officers remain slow and inadequate, that prosecutors are reluctant to prosecute them, that the courts are inclined to give too much weight to the police's version of events and that complainants continue to find themselves facing counter-charges for resisting the police or defamation.

137. Anyone who believes they have been ill-treated by the police can file a complaint with the Independent Administrative Panel for violation of their individual rights (*Massnahmenbeschwerde*) or for failure to comply with the Ministry of the Interior directive on the action of the public security services³⁹ (*Richtlinienbeschwerde*), which provides *inter alia* that police officers and gendarmes "must refrain from any behaviour or activities that might give rise to the impression of prejudice or that could be perceived as discrimination" on the grounds, *inter alia*, of race, colour, national or ethnic origin or religion. This body, however, is only competent to decide whether the police acted lawfully; it cannot investigate, make decisions about individual responsibility, impose penalties or award compensation; representation by counsel is not mandatory, but there is no entitlement to legal aid and applicants who lose their case must bear the cost of the proceedings. Individuals can, however, also complain to the police about any failure to comply with the above-mentioned directive: their complaint will be examined by a superior of the officer complained of, who will carry out an internal inquiry and inform the complainant whether they believe there was misconduct, and who may invite the complainant to a meeting with a view to reaching a friendly settlement. The complainant is not told what, if any, disciplinary action is

³⁹ Verordnung des Bundesministers für Inneres, mit der Richtlinien für das Einschreiten der Organe des öffentlichen Sicherheitsdienstes erlassen werden (Richtlinien-Verordnung - RLV) BGBl. Nr. 266/1993

to be taken. Where the alleged behaviour constitutes a criminal offence, the victim can file a complaint either with the prosecutor's office or with the police, which must in that case report it to the prosecutor's office within 24 hours. On receiving a complaint of this kind, the prosecutor's office is bound to undertake an investigation. In the case of allegations of serious ill-treatment, the investigation will normally be carried out by the Bureau for Internal Affairs (*Büro für Interne Angelegenheiten*; BIA), which must also be notified of any complaints of this kind and may decide to carry out an investigation itself. The BIA is a special unit within the police, which is responsible for investigating allegations of ill-treatment or corruption on the part of public officials. Where the offences are of a less serious nature, the investigation will normally be conducted by the Special Investigations Office of the Vienna Federal Police Department (the BBE – *Büro für Besondere Ermittlung* –, which comes under the authority of the Vienna chief of police) or, in the other *Länder*, by other police units.

138. The Austrian authorities emphasise that the BIA is an independent body which, although attached to the Ministry of the Interior, is located in another department (Sektion IV, *Service und Kontrolle*), away from the police (Sektion II, *Generaldirektion für die öffentliche Sicherheit*), and receives no instructions concerning the conduct of the investigations with which it is charged. The fact, however, that the BIA is part of the Interior Ministry and is staffed by officials from units within this same ministry who, after being assigned for a given period, then return to their original posts, and the close organic connection with the police that this engenders mean that the BIA lacks the kind of structural independence required for victims of police misconduct to have full confidence in the system, and hence for the system to be effective. Austrian civil society, too, reports a certain lack of public confidence in the current system of investigation. In ECRI's view, however, public confidence in the system is particularly important when the police behaviour complained of is of a racist or discriminatory nature. Further noting that the BIA investigates only the most serious allegations and referring in particular to its General Policy Recommendation No. 11⁴⁰, ECRI emphasises the need to establish a fully independent body to investigate any alleged racial discrimination or racially motivated misconduct on the part of the police. In its view, such independence requires, *inter alia*, that the body in question be structurally separate from the Ministry of the Interior and be seen to have no connection with the police.
139. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities set up a system to collect data on the ethnic origin of persons who file complaints against the police and to specifically record complaints of racist behaviour.*
140. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the authorities ameliorate the response of the criminal justice system and of the persons responsible for internal control within the different police units to allegations of racist or racially discriminatory behaviour on the part of the police. In particular, it reiterates its call for the establishment of an independent body with powers to investigate individual complaints of human rights violations on the part of the police, including acts of racism and racial discrimination.*
141. *ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the authorities condemn publicly and unequivocally any manifestation of racist or racially discriminatory behaviour on the part of the police and that they make it clear publicly and at a high level that manifestations of racism shall not be tolerated, and shall be promptly and thoroughly investigated and punished.*

⁴⁰General Policy Recommendation No. 11 on combating racism and racial discrimination in policing, June 2007, CRI(2007)39; see in particular paragraph 10 and the explanatory memorandum

142. With regard in particular to racial profiling, ECRI, in its third report, recommended that the authorities ensure that national legislation concerning identity checks and national and international standards on protection from arbitrary arrest and detention were strictly abided by in all circumstances. More specifically, it recommended that they consider introducing a system of registration in connection with police checks that would enable individuals to document how frequently they were checked, in order to identify possible patterns of direct or indirect racial discrimination. The authorities, however, have told ECRI that the Ministry of the Interior sees no need to introduce a registration system of this kind, and that there is no statutory basis for doing so. It appears from NGO reports, however, that, while the situation has improved in recent years, racial profiling is still going on in Austria. Referring to its General Policy Recommendation No. 11 on combating racism and racial discrimination in policing, ECRI wishes to emphasise that, in order to effectively combat such practices, it is essential to identify them and gauge their extent; this calls for the adoption of a specific approach to monitoring and assessing police practice.
143. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities give due emphasis, in police training, to the need to avoid racial profiling, so that any action taken is effectively based on the existence of reasonable suspicion that an offence has been, or is going to be, committed and not on prejudice. It further reiterates its recommendation that a system be introduced that would make it possible to gauge the extent of such practices, with a view to improve the standards where necessary.*
144. ECRI also recommended in its third report that the authorities continue their efforts to provide adequate initial and on-going training in human rights to law enforcement officials, notably in non-discrimination and policing in a multicultural society. ECRI notes that the training efforts in association with NGOs have been vigorously pursued in recent years and even expanded. In particular, as has already been stated, initial police training now includes a compulsory 56-hour module on fundamental rights. Trainees are further required to attend a 3-day seminar on eliminating prejudice, including notably ethnic prejudice. Serving officers can also attend this seminar as part of their on-going training. By the end of 2008, some 4,500 police officers had participated in training of this kind, i.e. more than a fifth of the total number. The programmes, which are supplemented by other optional training for serving officers, now include instruction in the use of non-racist language by the police, as recommended by the Human Rights Advisory Board and ECRI. ECRI welcomes these moves. Given, however, that awareness-raising and training for police officers are key factors in the fight against racism and racial discrimination in policing, ECRI considers that programmes of this type should be a compulsory part of on-going training.
145. *ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities continue their efforts to provide law enforcement officials with training in human rights, focusing on the fight against all forms and manifestations of racial discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance and on policing in a multicultural society, and make it a compulsory part not only of their initial, but also of their on-going training.*
146. ECRI is interested to note the appointment in the Vienna police of a human rights co-ordinator, to improve the internal culture in this area and act as a contact point for NGOs.
147. In its third report, ECRI reiterated its call for the adoption of measures to ensure adequate representation of members of minority groups in the police. ECRI observes that at the time of writing, the Austrian police is still largely mono-ethnic. It welcomes, however, the “Vienna needs you” campaign (*Wien braucht dich*) conducted in Vienna in 2007 in an effort to recruit police officers of immigrant

background, the long-term goal being to ensure that each of the city's 100 police stations has at least one officer of immigrant origin. Some 170 people fitting this description applied to join the police. Many of them, however, apparently failed the entrance examination and, according to the authorities, there are only about thirty people of immigrant origin among the 540 or so police cadets in Vienna in 2009. In ECRI's view, it is crucial not only to continue conducting campaigns of this kind, so as to gradually increase the percentage of police officers from minority groups, but also to extend them to the rest of the country. It is interested to note, therefore, that increasing the representation of minority groups within the police remains a priority for the federal government that came to power after the 2008 elections.

148. *ECRI encourages the Austrian authorities to pursue their efforts to implement measures designed to ensure that persons belonging to minority groups are adequately represented in the police.*

VIII. Monitoring racism and racial discrimination, awareness-raising and co-operation with NGOs

149. The authorities have stated that they are not planning to collect data broken down by national and ethnic origin because people belonging to minorities are against it. ECRI is aware of this problem. Following discussions with members of civil society, however, the ECRI delegation felt that attitudes had changed and that there was no longer categorical opposition. Observing that Austrian law does not specifically prohibit such practices, ECRI wishes to reiterate the importance of data of this kind for, *inter alia*, assessing how minority groups stand in such key areas as employment, housing, education and health, and for developing effective anti-discrimination measures.
150. At the same time, ECRI believes that the activities of the Austrian authorities in this area would be more effective if they were based on a long-term, national strategy for combating racism and intolerance, developed and implemented in close consultation with civil society, and necessarily including - apart from the specific awareness-raising measures recommended in this report - a comprehensive, long-term information and awareness campaign against racism and intolerance. Lastly, ECRI observes that there are in Austria many NGOs dedicated to combating racism, defending fundamental rights and/or protecting the interests of minority groups, which have been instrumental in achieving progress in these areas. It considers it essential that the authorities provide these organisations with on-going support, so that they have sufficient, stable funding to perform their tasks.
151. *ECRI reiterates its strong recommendation that the Austrian authorities introduce a comprehensive and coherent data collection system that would make it possible to assess the situation with regard to the different minority groups in Austria and to determine the scale of any manifestations of racism and direct and indirect racial discrimination. In this respect, it recommends that they consider collecting data broken down according to categories such as ethnic or national origin, religion, language and nationality in order to identify any manifestations of discrimination, taking care to ensure that such collection is effected, in all cases, with due regard for the principles of confidentiality, informed consent and the voluntary self-identification of persons as belonging to a particular group. This system should be developed in close co-operation with all the relevant actors, including civil society organisations. It should also take account of any double or multiple discrimination that might exist.*
152. *ECRI recommends that the authorities develop and implement, in close consultation with civil society, a long-term national strategy for combating racism*

and intolerance, including a comprehensive, long-term information and awareness campaign against racism and intolerance. It further recommends that the authorities provide on-going support to the NGOs dedicated to combating racism, defending fundamental rights and/or protecting the interests of minority groups, so that they have sufficient, stable financial resources to perform their tasks.

INTERIM FOLLOW-UP RECOMMENDATIONS

The three specific recommendations for which ECRI requests priority implementation from the Austrian authorities are the following:

- ECRI recommends that the authorities take urgent steps to provide more financial and human resources to the Ombudsperson for Equal Treatment in the field of employment, irrespective of ethnicity, religion and beliefs, age and sexual orientation, and to the Ombudsperson for Equal Treatment, irrespective of ethnicity and gender, in other areas, so as to enable them to fully perform all the tasks that have been assigned to them. It further recommends that the requisite measures be taken forthwith to ensure that their full independence is enshrined in law and in practice, and to enable them to apply to the courts whenever they deem necessary.
- ECRI recommends that the Austrian authorities promote the reestablishment of a regulatory mechanism for the press, compatible with the principle of media independence, that would make it possible to enforce compliance with ethical standards and rules of conduct including the refusal to promote, in any form, racism, xenophobia, antisemitism or intolerance. It suggests that the authorities consider enacting legislation if there is no other option.
- ECRI reiterates its recommendation that the authorities ameliorate the response of the criminal justice system and of the persons responsible for internal control within the different police units to allegations of racist or racially discriminatory behaviour on the part of the police. In particular, it reiterates its call for the establishment of an independent body with powers to investigate individual complaints of human rights violations on the part of the police, including acts of racism and racial discrimination.

A process of interim follow-up for these three recommendations will be conducted by ECRI no later than two years following the publication of this report.

Bibliography

This bibliography lists the main published sources used during the examination of the situation in Austria: it should not be considered as an exhaustive list of all sources of information available to ECRI during the preparation of the report.

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

1. Third report on Austria, 15 February 2005, CRI(2005)1
2. Second report on Austria, 3 April 2001, CRI(2001)3
3. Report on Austria, March 1999, CRI(99)7
4. General Policy Recommendation No. 1: Combating racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance, October 1996, CRI(96)43
5. General Policy Recommendation No. 2: Specialised bodies to combat racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance at national level, June 1997, CRI(97)36
6. General Policy Recommendation No. 3: Combating racism and intolerance against Roma/Gypsies, March 1998, CRI(98)29
7. General Policy Recommendation No. 4: National surveys on the experience and perception of discrimination and racism from the point of view of potential victims, March 1998, CRI(98)30
8. General Policy Recommendation No. 5: Combating intolerance and discrimination against Muslims, March 2000, CRI(2000)21
9. General Policy Recommendation No. 6: Combating the dissemination of racist, xenophobic and antisemitic material via the Internet, December 2000, CRI(2001)1
10. General Policy Recommendation No. 7: National legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination, December 2002, CRI(2003)8
11. General Policy Recommendation No. 8: Combating racism while fighting terrorism, March 2004, CRI(2004)26
12. General Policy Recommendation No. 9: The fight against antisemitism, June 2004, CRI(2004)37
13. General Policy Recommendation No. 10: Combating racism and racial discrimination in and through school education, December 2006, CRI(2007)6
14. General Policy Recommendation No. 11: Combating racism and racial discrimination in policing, June 2007, CRI(2007)39
15. General Policy Recommendation No. 12: Combating racism and racial discrimination in the field of sport, December 2009, CRI(2008)48

Other sources

16. Bundespressdienst Österreich, Medien in Österreich, 2008
17. Gemeinsamer Bericht 2004 und 2005: Teil II, Gleichbehandlungsanwaltschaft
18. Gleichbehandlungsbericht für die Privatwirtschaft 2006 und 2007: Teil I, Gleichbehandlungskommission; Teil II, Gleichbehandlungsanwaltschaft
19. Permanent Mission of Austria to the United Nations in Geneva: Preparatory Committee of the Durban Review Conference, Austrian Response to Questionnaire, 12 March 2008; written replies of the Austrian government to the questions put by the Rapporteur of the CERD, 25 July 2008
20. Report to the Austrian Government on the visit to Austria carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 14 to 23 April 2004, 21 July 2005, CPT/Inf(2005)13
21. European Committee of Social Rights, European Social Charter, Conclusions XIV-1, XVII-1 et XVIII-1 (Austria)
22. Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Second report submitted by Austria pursuant to Article 25, § 1 of the

- Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, received on 1 December 2006, ACFC/SR/II(2006)008; Second Opinion on Austria, adopted on 8 June 2007, 11 June 2008, ACFC/OP/II(2007)005; Comments of the Government of Austria on the second opinion of the Advisory Committee on the Implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by Austria, GVT/COM/II(2007)004
23. Report by the Commissioner for Human Rights, Mr. Thomas Hammerberg, on his visit to Austria 21-25 May 2007, 12 December 2007, CommDH(2007)26
 24. European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, application of the Charter in Austria, initial monitoring cycle, Report of the Committee of Experts on the Charter, 19 January 2005, ECRML(2005)1; application of the Charter in Austria, second monitoring cycle, Report of the Committee of Experts on the Charter, 12 mars 2009, ECRML(2009)2; Second Report by the Republic of Austria pursuant to Article 15§1 of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, 12 December 2007, MIN-LANG/PR (2007)9
 25. North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, Global Education in Austria, The Global Education Peer Review Process
 26. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Concluding Observations, Austria, 21 August 2008, CERD/C/AUT/CO/17
 27. Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations, Austria, 30 October 2007, CCPR/C/AUT/CO/4,
 28. Committee against Torture, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee against Torture, Austria, 15 December 2005, CAT/C/AUT/CO/3
 29. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Austria, Concluding observations, 25 January 2006, E/C.12/AUT/CO/3
 30. European Network of Legal Experts in the non-discrimination field: European Anti-discrimination Law Review, Nos 1/2005, 2/2005, 3/2006, 4/2006, 5/2007, 6-7/2008; European Network of Legal Experts in the non-discrimination field, Report on measures to combat discrimination, Directives 200/43/EC and 2000/78/EC, Austria, State of affairs up to 8 January 2007
 31. European Commission: Equality and non-discrimination, Annual Report 2005; Discrimination in the European Union: Perception, Experiences and Attitudes, Special Eurobarometer 296; Report, July 2008
 32. EUMC: Migrant's Experiences of Racism and Xenophobia in 12 Member States, Pilot Study, May 2006; Roma and Travelers in Public Education, An overview of the situation in the EU Member States, May 2006
 33. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA): FRA Working Paper, Anti-Semitism, Summary overview of the situation on the European Union 2001-2008, FRA working Paper, 2009; Annual Report 2008; EU-MIDIS at a glance, Introduction to the FRA's EU-wide discrimination survey, European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey, 2006; FRA Infobase, Austria, 2008
 34. Migration Policy Group: Developing Anti-Discrimination Law in Europe, the 25 EU Member States compared, September 2005, November 2006, July 2007
 35. OECD: Where Immigrant Students Succeed – A comparative Review of Performance and Engagement in PISA 2003, 2006; Education at a Glance 2007, Briefing Note for Austria; International Migration Outlook: SOPEMI, 2008 Edition
 36. OSCE/ODIHR: Hate Crimes in the OSCE Region - Incidents and Responses, Annual Report for 2007, Warsaw, October 2008; Holocaust Memorial Days in the OSCE Region, an overview of good governmental practices, January 2008
 37. Amnesty International: Victim or Suspect: A Question of Colour: Racial Discrimination in the Austrian Justice System, April 2009; Annual Report 2008, Human Rights in Republic of Austria, April 2009
 38. Anti-Defamation League, Attitude Towards Jews and the Middle East in Six European Countries, Austria, July 2007
 39. British Council and Migration Policy Group: Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX), Austria, September 2007
 40. Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Wohnungslosenhilfe, Austria – National report 2008

41. Euro-Islam.Info, Country Profiles, Austria, July 2008
42. European Migration Network: Reception systems, their capacities and the social situation of asylum applicants within the reception system in the EU member States
43. European Network against Racism (ENAR), ENAR Shadow Report 2007, Racism in Austria, Dr Di-Tutu Bukasa, "Die Bunten" – Forum for Dignity, Justice and Democracy, October 2008 and ENAR Shadow Reports on Austria 2004, 2005, 2006
44. European Refugee Fund, Country Report: Austria, May 2007
45. International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights: Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims in the EU, Developments since September 11 – Austria, March 2005; Human Rights in the OSCE Region, Austria, Annual Reports 2006 and 2007
46. Institute of Race Relations, European Race Bulletin n° 65, Autumn 2008
47. Österreichisches Volksgruppenzentrum, 2nd Report on the implementation of the European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in the republic of Austria, March 2007
48. RAXEN National Focal Point for Austria, Data collection Report 2007, October 2007, and Update January 2008, Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Human Rights – Research Association and ZARA – Zivilcourage and Anti-Rassismus-Arbeit, January 2008
49. Report on the Migration Committee's Study Trip to Austria, 7-9 November 2005
50. US Department of State: 2008 Human Rights Report: Austria, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labour, 25 February 2009; Country reports on Human Rights Practices - 2007, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labour, 11 March 2008; International Religious Freedom Report 2008, Austria, 19 September 2008
51. C. Whitehead and K. Scanlon, Social Housing in Europe, London School of Economics and Political Sciences, July 2007
52. Zivilcourage und Anti-Rassismus-Arbeit (ZARA), Racism Reports 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008