



PERMANENT MISSION OF NORWAY

VN 213/2025

The Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations Office at Geneva presents its compliments to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and has the honour to refer to the urgent appeal UA NOR 2/2025 from the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, to verbal note No. 179/2025 and 211/2025 from the Permanent Mission of Norway.

We are pleased to hereby submit the final responses from the Government of Norway to the urgent appeal.

The Permanent Mission avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights the assurances of its highest consideration.

WAT



Geneva, 26 November 2025

the Secretariat of the United Nations office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights,
Ms. Federica Donati, Officer-in-Charge, Special Procedures Branch

Geneva

FN - Norges faste delegasjon Geneve
Case Postale 274

Your ref.

Our ref.
25/5662 - JAA

Date
13.11.2025

URGENT APPEAL FROM SPECIAL PROCEDURES

Reference is made to the urgent appeal sent by the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children.

The Special Rapporteur has asked for our observations on four points, and we can mention the following:

1. Please provide any additional information and any comment you may have on the above-mentioned allegations;

The information the Special Rapporteur has received, does not include any details concerning [REDACTED] criminal convictions. We therefore attach the relevant judgments from Vestre Innlandet District Court and Eidsivating Court of Appeal. They are not translated, but a translation of the most important passages is integrated in our response.

We note that there seems to be a spelling mistake in the background information from the Special Rapporteur, [REDACTED] is described as a 31-year-old man, and it is later mentioned that he was arrested in November 2021. According to court documents, he is born in 1984, and the arrest was made in November 2020.

[REDACTED] is referred to as a victim of trafficking in the letter from the Special Rapporteur. In our opinion, this is not an accurate description. We point to our

explanation in our preliminary response of how possible victims of trafficking are assisted in Norway. While well aware of the need for early identification of victims, it is regularly impossible from available information to immediately conclude if a migrant worker is a victim of forced criminality or other forms of forced labour. Therefore, formal identification is not required for a person to be entitled to assistance and protection as a victim of trafficking. Assistance from ROSA or other various government funded assistant providers is based on a low threshold approach. Likewise, a reflection period can be granted when a person is a possible victim.

During the course of a criminal investigation, there is a need for a broader assessment. Our Supreme Court has in a ruling from 2017 (HR-2017-1124-A) given the following guidance:

“When national and international sources are viewed in context, there is reason to say that the question of whether forced labour exists within the meaning of the Criminal Code depends on a comprehensive assessment of the specific situation. Forced labour may exist even if the person concerned could have broken away in and of itself, if the situation, realistically assessed, nevertheless left little choice. Working and wage conditions, housing and sanitary conditions play a role, as do the degree of freedom of movement and isolation, the use of force and various forms of subordination or dependence. It is important whether the victim is a minor or an adult. The means of pressure that bind the person concerned can be physical or psychological, explicit or implicit. And they can have the character of blackmail, for example by the person concerned having to endure miserable working and wage conditions in order to avoid the employer notifying the police or immigration authorities of illegal residence or other circumstances that would cause the employee difficulties. Withholding wages could also put the worker in a trapped situation, for example because he or she would then be unable to obtain a ticket for the return journey, or by leaving the workplace would risk losing wages already earned.”

Based on our available information, including statements from the Director of Public Prosecutions and from Innlandet Police District, the Ministry has the following view of events (the person at hand described as “A”):

1 Prior to the District Court judgment.

A was arrested in connection with the search of a cannabis plantation at [REDACTED] in November 2020. Already during his first police interview, he claimed to have been a victim of human trafficking/forced labor. This was further elaborated upon in a second interview, and the police therefore initiated an investigation into human trafficking. A lawyer was appointed as *victim’s counsel*, providing free legal assistance.

Information was obtained from his immigration case, establishing that he had arrived in Norway as a seasonal agricultural worker. Interviews were conducted with both the farmer and the accountant of the farm where he was supposed to work. He was not registered as having residence or received any wages there. However, one of the employees at the farm stated that he had been there and worked for 2–3 weeks but left due to dissatisfaction with the work tasks.

It was, however, revealed that already in connection with his residence permit decision, he had been in contact with the other suspect in the narcotics case. Through witness interviews, it was also established that he had temporarily stayed at an address in [REDACTED] upon arrival in Norway. He stayed at that address for two weeks. The owner of the residence did not know where he went after leaving.

The interview report from the Norwegian Embassy in [REDACTED] was obtained. A currency transaction search was conducted in the case, revealing money transfers from two of the individuals involved in the narcotics case to A's wife in [REDACTED]. Furthermore, two money transfers from A himself to his wife were found. In total, the police identified transfers amounting to approximately NOK 33 000 and USD 2 500 to A's wife in [REDACTED].

In connection with the handling of the narcotics case before the District Court, the question of whether A had been subjected to human trafficking was raised. However, at that time, the investigation had not yet been completed. The issue of whether the non-punishment principle was applicable was raised already during the opening statements. A gave testimony before the District Court on the matter, but no other evidence was presented beyond the currency transfers. At that point, attempts had been made to verify some of the information provided by A, including how he arrived in Norway and where he had stayed, but at that time, there were no suspects or accused persons in the case.

2 The District Court judgment

The Ministry includes here the relevant passages of the District Court judgment. (unofficial translation):

(page 4 in attachment)

"Defendant A justified his plea of not guilty by stating that he came to Norway with a valid entry permit and visa as a seasonal worker, but that the work situation had become completely different than expected and that he had been subjected to human trafficking. He explained that he knew that his residence permit expired in October 2019, and that if he had received the salary as agreed, he would have worked six months on the farm he came to and then returned to [REDACTED]. Although he was not physically threatened, he claimed that his lack of language skills and travel restrictions during the corona pandemic meant that he felt he had no other choice but to take on the work as a "gardener" on the cannabis plantation in order to be able to afford to return home to his family in [REDACTED]. The organisers of the hashish cultivation withheld money. Originally, he had believed that he was supposed to be tending plants for medicinal purposes. He believed that the fact that [REDACTED] was also almost hermetically sealed during the corona pandemic made the situation extra demanding and vulnerable for him.

B, for his part, stated that A was the ringleader, or at least had a central role in the hashish plantation operation. B partially admitted criminal responsibility, and justified this by saying that he had a limited role by renting out the house to the hashish plantation operation in exchange for a dividend payment. He denied having been inside the house while it was rented out, and thus having participated in rigging and facilitating

it. B's explanation contradicts A, who claimed that B was in the house relatively often on various errands.

The court does not find that there is evidence to rule out that the defendant A is a victim of human trafficking, cf. Section 257 of the Criminal Code, and that he felt compelled to behave as described in the indictment. The defendant's explanation is supported by witness D from Rosa and the UDI's decision of 28.05.2021 on granting a reflection period, cf. Section 8-3 of the Immigration Regulations. Even if the matter is judged to be human trafficking, the court finds it proven beyond any reasonable and sensible doubt that the degree of coercion and exploitation in the case is not significant. Reference is made in this context to the degree of freedom, access to means of communication and the defendant A's living conditions.

Section 17 of the Criminal Code sets a high threshold for an otherwise criminal act to become lawful due to an emergency. Even though the defendant A was in a difficult situation, he had alternatives to committing criminal acts. He had a mobile phone, some cash, and lived and spent most of his time alone on the plantation. The home was in a residential area close to the city center, and he had the opportunity to seek help from others and not least contact the police. Case law shows that the threshold for being acquitted where one claims to have acted under duress is high.

.....

(page 5)

Norwegian authorities have focused on human trafficking. In 2016, the government prepared an action plan against human trafficking. The action plan sets out a coordinated effort against human trafficking, in which public authorities and private organisations work together to stop the abuses and protect the victims. After the Norwegian authorities became aware that the defendant A could be a victim of human trafficking, he received protection in the form of follow-up from ROSA and the granting of a reflection period.

In the present case, the police have also launched an investigation into possible human trafficking based on defendant A's statement. The prosecutor stated that the investigation has not been concluded, but that the police have so far not been able to conclude that the defendant A has been a victim of human trafficking.

This case has certain similarities to LE-2021-39648, which concerned the operation of a cannabis plantation, and where the question of whether the defendant was a victim of human trafficking and what criminal consequences this would entail in that case arose. After concluding, as in our case, that it could not be ruled out that the defendant was a victim of human trafficking, the Court of Appeal wrote:

"The criminal law allows for the right to refrain from prosecuting victims of human trafficking, cf., among other things, the criminal law principle of opportunity. Section 17 of the Criminal Code may apply if the coercion is sufficiently massive or the victim's offense is less serious, and the law allows for both the waiver of sentencing and the reduction of sentences. The Court of Appeal cannot see that there is legal basis that a victim of human trafficking must be acquitted of punishment if the person concerned –

as part of the exploitation – commits criminal acts. Reference is made to Rudolf Christoffersen's article in "Straff & frihet, festskrift til Tor-Aksel Busch" (Gyldendal 2019) page 151:

No country in Europe has interpreted the "non-punishment" principle to the extent that there is immunity from criminal prosecution for victims of human trafficking. Victims of human trafficking are, like everyone else, at the outset responsible for their actions.

Against this background, the Court of Appeal finds that the Norwegian authorities – both in the specific case, legislation and case law – have fulfilled their obligations under the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings ETS No. 197, including the "non-punishment" principle in Article 26. The issue also has several common features with situations where, for example, a drug courier is exploited for his vulnerable position and acts on the basis of threats and violence as a result of an unsustainable debt to his backers.

The defendant's arguments about emergency law and non-punishment are not accepted."

The legal basis outlined here by the Court of Appeal is sufficient for the court's view in the present case as well. The court cannot see that there is a basis for finding that the Norwegian authorities, neither in this case, in legislation nor in case law, have violated international conventions by which Norway is bound. Attorney Herberg has referred to the judgment of the ECHR from 16.02.2021 "CASE OF V.C.L. AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, which he believed substantiated that the Norwegian authorities have not followed up on their international obligations to uncover and prosecute human trafficking. Consequently, he believed that the Norwegian authorities have committed a violation of the convention. In this regard, the court notes that this decision from the ECHR was known to the Supreme Court, when by decision of 19.08.2021 they refused to consider the aforementioned Court of Appeal judgment in which human trafficking and possible violations of international conventions were a central theme.

The court concludes that defendant A's allegations about emergency law, non-punishment, and that Norwegian authorities have violated international conventions regarding the detection and follow-up of suspected human trafficking are unfounded.

Defendant A had helped to rig the house for the cannabis plantation operation, and was told that if the police came, he was to take all the blame. Defendant A can therefore not state that he was unaware that cannabis cultivation was illegal in Norway, or that he thought the plants were for medical use and did not realize that he was illegally connecting electricity."

3 Investigations between the court cases

After the narcotics case had been adjudicated in the district court but before it was heard by the court of appeal, two individuals were given the status of suspects in the trafficking case. These were the second convicted person in the narcotics case and an employee at the farm. Both individuals were interviewed.

Additionally, certain inquiries were made regarding other persons who had applied for residence permits in Norway to work for the same farmer. The police were unable to verify the whereabouts of one individual who was said to have come to Norway together with A. Information was also obtained regarding this individual's residence permit application.

Several inquiries were conducted concerning 15 addresses in the [REDACTED] area. A was interviewed two additional times in connection with this investigation.

The human trafficking case had not been concluded prior to the Court of Appeal proceedings. At that time, no further investigative steps were planned, but the prosecutor chose to keep the case open in the event that new information emerged during the proceedings that could be further examined.

During the Court of Appeal proceedings, several witnesses related to the human trafficking case were heard, including the two suspects. Furthermore, the investigator testified regarding the investigation and its current status.

4 The Appeal Court judgment

(From page 7)

"The Court of Appeal's assessment

Conviction according to the indictment requires that the prosecution has presented full evidence of the facts and that there is necessary guilt, and any reasonable and sensible doubt shall benefit the defendant. In a situation where the defendant states that he has been a victim of human trafficking, because he has been in a coercive situation that has made it impossible to refrain from committing the criminal acts, this cannot be ruled out unless the Court of Appeal finds it proven beyond any reasonable and sensible doubt that he has not been in such a situation.

It is not disputed that the objective conditions for punishment are met for items I, II and III of the indictment. However, it is submitted that A has been a victim of human trafficking, and that he must therefore be acquitted of all of the charges. It is submitted that there is an emergency measure pursuant to Section 17 of the Criminal Code, and that conviction would be contrary to the principle of non-punishment in Council of Europe Convention No. 197 on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings.

The police have investigated whether the defendant has been a victim of human trafficking, because the defendant has stated through several interrogations that he was in a coercive situation at the time of the crime. This investigation has not been concluded, and interrogations were conducted as late as week 11 of 2022. The Norwegian authorities have also ensured follow-up from the national aid agency ROSA, and have granted him continued right to residence through a so-called reflection period.

Section 17 of the Criminal Code may apply if the coercion is sufficiently massive or the victim's offense is less serious. The criminal law also allows for both waiver of sentencing and reduction of the sentence as a result of the coercive situation. However, as stated in LE-2021-39648, Section 17 of the Criminal Code sets a relatively high

threshold for an otherwise punishable act to become lawful due to an emergency situation.

The defense has argued that the defendant must be acquitted if it cannot be ruled out that A is a victim of human trafficking. The following was stated regarding this issue in LE-2021-39648:

“The Court of Appeal cannot see that there is legal basis that a victim of human trafficking must be acquitted of punishment if the person concerned – as part of the exploitation – commits criminal acts. Reference is made to Rudolf Christoffersen's article in "Straff & frihet, festskrift til Tor-Aksel Busch" (Gyldendal 2019) page 151:

No country in Europe has interpreted the "non-punishment" principle to the extent that there is immunity from criminal prosecution for victims of human trafficking. Victims of human trafficking are, like everyone else, at the outset responsible for their actions.

Against this background, the Court of Appeal finds that the Norwegian authorities – both in the specific case, legislation and case law – have fulfilled their obligations under the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings ETS No. 197, including the “non-punishment” principle in Article 26. The issue also has several common features with situations where, for example, a drug courier is exploited for his vulnerable position and acts on the basis of threats and violence as a result of an unsustainable debt to his backers.”

The Court of Appeal agrees with this, but clarifies that there may be situations where the degree of coercion is so prominent and massive that the perpetrator should not be punished. However, this is not the situation in this case.

The Court of Appeal does not place any reliance on A's explanation that he was in a coercive situation at the time of the criminal acts, and the overall evidence provides grounds to rule out that he was a victim of human trafficking.

In the assessment, it is natural to look at the situation upon A's arrival in Norway in April 2019, because A claimed that he was already in a coercive situation because he did not receive the hourly wage he was supposed to receive on the farm and because D also withheld part of his salary.

Based on the testimonies of farmer E and D, the Court of Appeal assumes that the latter has had a kind of foreman role towards the foreign seasonal workers on the farm. D has also recruited workers from [REDACTED] for several years, through his contacts in the [REDACTED] community in Norway. He has also helped them on several occasions with the paperwork related to applying for a residence permit, entering into employment contracts, etc. E could not say with certainty that A had ever worked on the farm, because he has not found any trace of his name on time sheets, lists of salary transactions, etc., but could not rule this out either. D confirmed for his part that A and C had worked on the farm for 2-3 weeks, but that they left the farm quickly because they were dissatisfied with the work tasks. D was not aware of where they went or what they did in Norway after this. F, with whom A and C lived, confirmed that after 2-3 weeks, and without warning, A and C had packed their things and moved out of the residence.

In the Court of Appeal's view, there is nothing to indicate that A was exploited on E's farm, either by E himself or by D. The Court of Appeal relies on D's explanation that A left the farm voluntarily because he was dissatisfied with his work duties. At this time, he had earned a few thousand kroner, at least NOK 7,600, which he sent to his wife. The amount would have constituted a significant portion of the cost of a plane ticket to [REDACTED].

In the period from May 2019 to the summer of 2020, it is unclear what A did in Norway. Although A claimed that he does not remember where he worked, who he worked for or how much he earned, it is clear that he earned money continuously. This indicates that he could have returned home to [REDACTED] if he really wanted to. During the appeal hearing, a search of the foreign exchange transaction register revealed that A transferred NOK 8,595 to his wife on May 28, 2019, and a further NOK 14,423 was transferred on June 12, 2019. These amounts are in addition to the above-mentioned transfers of NOK 7,600 in April 2019 and NOK 9,000 in the summer of 2020. When confronted with the amounts, he confirmed that he had made the transfers, but then claimed that some of the amounts were C's money that was to be passed on to the latter's wife. He explained that he had not mentioned these transfers earlier because he had not been asked about them. He claimed that travel restrictions related to the corona pandemic had put an end to his return trip anyway. The Court of Appeal assumes that this could not have been a real issue before the spring of 2020, when the first countries introduced restrictions. The Court of Appeal also finds it striking that A remembered in detail what happened in the first weeks after arriving in Norway, and then what happened from the summer of 2020 until he was arrested, while he remembered almost nothing from the period between his stay at E's farm and until he started the renovation work at (address). Furthermore, it is striking that he did not reveal information about money transactions that had been made during the relevant period. The Court of Appeal's view is that A deliberately tried to portray his situation as much more difficult than it was, which obviously weakens the credibility of his explanation in general.

The Court of Appeal also does not trust A's explanation that from the summer of 2020 he was in an "invisible dependency relationship" with B, in that B engaged him to carry out extensive renovation work without paying the agreed salary. Based on A's and B's explanations, it is assumed that they both voluntarily participated in the cannabis production. A has at least participated by having the role of gardener, while B has at least participated by letting A and possibly other helpers grow cannabis in his house. There is much that may indicate that A did not have the resources to finance the construction of the production premises alone, as according to Police Chief DD, electronics and ventilation worth several hundred thousand kroner had been installed in the home. It is not clear whether B was responsible for the financing, or whether there are other people behind it. In any case, this is not decisive for the Court of Appeal's assessment related to the human trafficking issue.

The Court of Appeal assumes that A knowingly and intentionally became involved in cannabis production, and that he did so in order to achieve a significant financial profit. It is not inconceivable that the production was stopped before A received any proceeds from the production, but he was in possession of 101 US dollars and almost 6,000

Norwegian kroner when he was arrested. Combined with the fact that he has acknowledged having earned money in the period from May 2019 to the summer of 2020, and that he has transferred not insignificant amounts to his wife in [REDACTED] during the same period, there is nothing to indicate that A did not have money to buy a plane ticket home. A also confirmed that he lived alone at (address) before the arrest, that he was free to call whoever he wanted with his own mobile phone and that he could also freely walk in the surrounding area if he wanted to. Overall, he had every opportunity to leave Norway if he wanted to, and not least he had the opportunity to contact the authorities or the police if he felt that he was in a forced situation. He has indeed claimed that he contacted the [REDACTED] embassy at some point, but the Court of Appeal does not believe this. Regardless of whether B owed him money in connection with the renovation work, he has not been in a real forced situation while the work on the cannabis plantation was ongoing.

The fact that the national aid agency ROSA has assumed that A may have been a victim of human trafficking is not suited to change the Court of Appeal's assessment. ROSA appears to have based its assessment on A's own information, and this is information that the Court of Appeal does not place any reliance on.

The arguments that A must be acquitted as a result of human trafficking cannot therefore be advanced. The acts described in the indictment can therefore result in punishment, provided that other criminal liability conditions are met.”

5 Final assessment by the prosecution

A comprehensive assessment was carried out following the judgment in the Court of Appeal, taking into account the possibility of obtaining further information, the evidence available at that time, as well as the evaluation of the human trafficking issue made by the Court of Appeal.

Overall, the prosecuting authority concluded that the strict standard of proof required in criminal cases had not been met for any of the suspects, and the human trafficking case was therefore dismissed in May 2022 due to insufficient evidence.

6 Conclusion

In the view of the Ministry, an evaluation of the available information does not raise concerns to any human rights violations during the course of police investigations or court proceedings. While elements and indicators of trafficking indeed were present initially, later investigations gave reason for other conclusions. Broad considerations were given by the courts on the possible application of the non-punishment principle.

2. Please provide any information if any consideration was given during the asylum proceedings to evidence of trafficking in persons for forced criminality, and the fear of reprisals if Mr. Nguyen was returned to his country of origin

Reference is made to our letter dated 5 October.

3. Please provide information on the measures being taken to ensure compliance with the State's obligation of due diligence to prevent trafficking in persons, including, in particular, victims of trafficking for forced criminality, and to ensure early identification

and effective access to protection, and access to effective remedies, including to compensation;

Norway's ongoing broad efforts against trafficking are outlined in detail in the three reports developed as part of the evaluation rounds carried out by GRETA. We also point to our reply to GRETA's questionnaire in connection with the ongoing fourth evaluation round.

<https://www.coe.int/en/web/anti-human-trafficking/norway1>

We attach (in Norwegian) the *National Strategy against Trafficking (2025-2030)* launched in May 2025. The strategy points to the need for improvements in several areas, and outlines the measures to be implemented in the strategy period, in order to meet our ambitious targets and fulfil recommendations from GRETA. The need for all stakeholders to understand the dynamics of trafficking, and especially to identify possible victims of forced criminality and forced labour is underlined.

At a Council of Europe meeting of National Anti-Trafficking Coordinators and Rapporteurs or equivalent mechanisms in September 2025, Norway presented a recent trafficking case. An important element was that the criminal case against a vulnerable person who had distributed drugs was dismissed by the prosecution, since the suspect was found to have been a victim of trafficking for forced criminality.

4. Please provide information of any measures taken to ensure that the principle of non-punishment of victims of trafficking in persons is adequately and promptly applied as soon as there are reasonable grounds for believing that a person is a victim of trafficking, and especially in cases of trafficking in persons for forced criminality;

Since 2020, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions has highlighted in its annual guidelines that the Norwegian authorities are obliged to protect victims of human trafficking. This document, which sets out the objectives and priorities for each year, is the most important internal governance document for the prosecuting authority. All employees are expected to be familiar with its content.

Between 2020 and 2024, the annual guidelines emphasized that suspects in cases of work-related crime may themselves be victims of trafficking or forced to commit other crimes. Reference was made to Article 26 of the Council of Europe Convention on action against trafficking in human beings, which obliges states to provide for the possibility of not imposing penalties on victims for their involvement in unlawful activities, to the extent that they have been compelled to do so.

The annual guidelines also included a direct link to the article "*Do victims of human trafficking have the right to be exempt from prosecution for criminal acts they have committed as part of their exploitation?*" by public prosecutor and former GRETA member Rudolf Christoffersen. The article raises critical questions about the prosecuting authority's previous practice in this area. The guidelines also refer to the European Court of Human Rights' decision in *V.C.L and A.N v. UK* from 2021, which,

among other things, states the obligation to investigate whether a suspect has been a victim of human trafficking as soon as there is a "credible suspicion" of this.

While the above-mentioned information is not repeated in the annual guidelines for 2025, this is due to a restructuring of the document and does not mean that the previous guidelines do not still apply.

The Director of Public Prosecutions has also addressed the issue in other contexts, such as conference speeches and panel discussions. In these settings, the Director has been concerned with reducing two possible blind spots: firstly, the risk that victims of human trafficking are not identified as such when they come to the attention of the police for other reasons, and secondly, a possible lack of awareness among officials regarding the application of the "non-punishment" principle.

Pursuant to section 226 of the Norwegian Criminal Procedure Act, the police must investigate whether there are mitigating circumstances. If a victim of human trafficking committed a crime as part of the exploitation, the criminal case against the victim may be dropped, settled with no prosecution or the sentence reduced, according to various general provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act. The penalty may also be reduced for serious crimes.

For over 10 years, the Norwegian police have had its own expertise group on human trafficking. The group is led by a police inspector from The National Criminal Investigation Service (Kripes), and consists of representatives from all the country's police districts. Two experienced public prosecutors also participate in the group. This group regularly arranges courses and conferences for the police on, among other things, the investigation of human trafficking cases. The non-punishment principle has been discussed several times, most recently in a well-attended one-day seminar (in Oslo and online) for police and prosecutors on 18 November this year where the topic was *Children exploited for forced criminality*. The seminar focused on the need for investigating if children committing serious crimes could be victims of trafficking.

There are currently no dedicated training programs or seminars for specialization in the prosecution of human trafficking cases. However, within the prosecuting authority, several public prosecutors have developed particular expertise in the field through practice and partaking in various national competence groups against human trafficking. These prosecutors are generally assigned to lead the prosecution in such cases, which ensures a degree of specialization in handling human trafficking matters.

We take this opportunity to express our gratitude for the efforts carried out by the Special Rapporteur aimed at improving the global response against human trafficking in all its forms.

Yours sincerely

Anders Schiøtz Worren

Deputy Director General

Jan Austad
Specialist Director

The document is approved electronically, as such no handwritten signatures are required.